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ABSTRACT
No where else in America are the effects of the society’s apathy toward poverty more evident than in its neglect of its public housing developments. Fifty years ago, public housing expanded to temporarily assist American World War Two veterans and their families bridge the gap between war-time disruption and pursuit of the American Dream. Today, the families that live in public housing are much different than the ones public housing was originally built for. Today, the majority of public housing residents are minority, female heads of households with at least one child, but their needs, from nurturing their children to the financial responsibilities of maintaining a household, are far from being met. Recent attempts to redevelop public housing, while yielding more than adequate shelter for some, fall short of the more particular goals that women, themselves, have for their housing.

This thesis project posits an innovative framework by which housing administrators at all levels throughout the United States may attempt to change the historical mindset of their predecessors, acknowledge who their clients actually are and to focus on their well-being. In Chapter Two, the historical perception of woman’s place in society and the home as a subordinate is related to how women are restricted by space and poverty. Chapter Three explores alternative references for public housing by examining design projects which are developed in the private sector. Using the Orchard Park public housing development as a case study, the thesis explores ways that the solutions to the needs of poor women and their children can be implemented. The vehicle for this exploration is the design of a supportive housing model at Orchard Park for pregnant and parenting teenage women. Modernization plans and designs of supportive housing are presented in Chapters Four and Five, which reflect the realities of financial constraints on redevelopment. In conclusion, examples of other successful and innovative programs for single mothers are also discussed, proving that though the design solutions are not new, the challenge lies with the policy makers, first, to support these initiatives by funding them, and second, to filter them down to the directors of the public housing authorities which implement them.

The underlying tenet of this work is that public housing policy and design can and should be developed to support the economic, parenting and housing needs of single mothers. This project is not wishful thinking, but rather a blueprint for meaningful, positive change for the forgotten women and children of our nation’s public housing.
Chapter I: Introduction

...A hand preferred over a hand-out. To those possessing a desire and good work ethic, business development programs provide an excellent chance to break down these barriers and fulfill the dream of entrepreneurship. When you sow the seeds of opportunity, you REAP economic independence.

Audley Evens, Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Tampa, Tampa, Florida as quoted in The Final Report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing.
ENGENDERING DESIGN

Introduction
Yesterday in the mother's building in Dorchester, there were 11 other babies who had been born to five young girls living in three apartments where a father hardly ever comes through the door. Average age of mothers 22: Average age of child: 3. Here, these poor, doomed black women, surrounded by their equally doomed children, discuss killings - who shot whom and why - the way you talk about Atlanta versus Philadelphia.

These kids are not going to grow up to be Colin Powell. They will not be Michael Jordan, either, or some warm black male role model who make whites feel good about themselves.

They are going to be our worst nightmares; an army of sociopaths who are a threat to themselves, to those closest to them, and inevitably, to the richer, white world beyond the borders of their miserable existence.

Mike Barnicle - Boston Globe 10/7/93

An interest in family life and public and private efforts to preserve so-called "American values" are currently among the most controversial issues facing the nation today. The debate is fueled by diversity in family form, including the formation of single-parent households (or families), which represents one of the most dramatic changes in family composition since 1965. The single-parent household is essentially the single female headed household with minor children, and comprises the highest percentage of persons living below the poverty line in the US. Commensurably, they are twice as likely as other households in the US to have a housing problem. This housing problem refers to the lack of financial assistance available to single women which is a function of their lower incomes. The housing problem is also manifested in the fact that the greatest majority of residents of public housing in the United States are single, female heads of household.

Myths and cultural stereotypes about single mothers are built on an ideology and historical theme of poverty. Many assume that a low-income woman raising children alone is single by choice, discounting a man's decision to leave a household with unsupported children. Many believe women can pull themselves out of poverty if only they would accept employment and work hard - but if they do not work it is because they willingly chose to stay home. Mothers who turn to welfare for support are deemed lazy, and living off the public dole. Single mothers who have never been married are branded immoral. Lastly, there is a notion that poor people live in the city by choice, for the low-rent and to be near their own kind. Obviously, Mr. Barnicle is one of these mythmakers.
All of these stereotypes perpetuate injury because they cause observers to make superficial judgments. A significant underlying issue is the extent to which both images challenge the ideal of American domesticity. Though the single-parent family may be secure, the lack of a male head of household and breadwinner makes the concept of single parenthood itself threatening in a patriarchal society. These recurring stereotypical images create false impressions, and have subliminal power to cloud the debate over what families headed by single mothers need. Structural impediments for women, especially minorities, can simply be too hard to overcome.

Minority women, especially, may not be well equipped to deal with the endless red tape that confronts them at every junction, like getting welfare or food stamps, negotiating the transportation system, buying insurance, paying bills etc. Women, in much more empowering circumstances, have trouble with similar issues, but have many more avenues to go to for support.

It is a fact that “women stay with, build on, and develop in a context of attachment and affiliation with others,” and:

...that women’s sense of self becomes very much organized around being able to make, and then maintain, affiliations and friendships and that eventually for many women, especially young women, the threat of disruption of an affiliation is perceived not just as loss of a relationship, but as something closer to a total loss of self.

This starting point contains the possibilities for an entirely different (and more advanced) approach to living and functioning in which affiliation is valued as highly as, or more highly than, self-enhancement. Ways in which housing for women can strive to be more inclusive of their needs is:

- for the housing to be affordable
- for resident’s tenure to be secure
- to offer services which enable its clients to be better parents
- for the location of the housing to be accessible
- to have facilities appropriate for children
- minimal household maintenance
- opportunities for sharing and support among residents
- privacy
In the broadest sense, this thesis focuses on the impacts of the well-being of young, poor, single mothers in three areas: their economic status, their packaging of income “supports” and services, and their particular housing needs. The thesis begins in Chapter Two by examining spatial discrimination against all women and particularly minority women, and relates this marginalization to the condition of their housing. Chapter Three examines precedents for housing by women, for women, which are applicable, though are not public housing units. In Chapter Four, the thesis then focuses specifically on the redevelopment of public housing, which has been garnering attention of late.

The Case Study of Orchard Park

By using the case study of Orchard Park in Roxbury, the thesis postulates that public housing does not “fit” the needs of single, female headed households raising alone - hence the term “poor fit”. Figures 1.1 and 1.2 depict the "two" faces of Orchard Park. The face shown to the public reveals decrepit buildings and forgotten landscapes. But to the young people living at Orchard Park, seen here at a development-wide picnic, it is home, and it is their community.
Poor fit is trendy in today's fashions, especially among young, urban dwellers. But poor fit is never trendy in architecture. It is the belief of many practicing architects that in design, every client deserves a "tight fit". The architect listens to the client, and builds what the client wants and needs - very simple. Communication is obviously the key element of this transaction. But for poor, young, single mothers do not have a voice. In fact women in public housing do not have a voice, despite the fact that they are the majority of inhabitants of public housing.

But the thesis aims more particularly to dismantling the assumptions that public housing authorities persist in believing - that the notion of spending millions of dollars to do "gut" rehabilitation of its most severely distressed housing stock, giving residents a "slice of the American Dream", complete with back yard and front stoop, is enough. The dilemma is that the government refuses to acknowledge who their client really is - and in most cases, in public housing developments in large cities - their clients are women, young and old, all raising children and grandchildren in overcrowded, filthy apartments, in sites littered with trash, bottles and needles. Furthermore, over 85% of these women live below the poverty line, which means there is a severely reduced chance of their having an opportunity to change their circumstances.

The Boston Housing Authority has an opportunity to be the first public housing authority in the country to re-vision a redevelopment of public housing which includes designing a supportive residence for pregnant and parenting teenagers in the Orchard Park Housing Development in Roxbury. Orchard Park, to date, has received some comprehensive modernization funds to begin a partial redevelopment of its housing stock. This model is the mechanism for dismantling some of the incorrect assumptions that are examined in previous chapters. This demonstration model would necessitate the removal of teenage mothers from their family of origin, for an 18-24 month period. During this time, mothers and children would be able to live in the residence, attend parenting classes, build on life skills that may have been lacking, and learn what it is like to be part of a support network which women create for themselves. At the end of this period, the young woman would be able to get her own apartment.

The initial proposal for what became this thesis project, which is called "supportive housing," was brought to the housing authority by a group of interested women who work in various capacities in the community, such as - development, law, planning and social services. This group, the Young Mothers Housing Consortium, approached the Boston Housing Authority with their ideas.
to develop a building or a portion of a building at Orchard Park for residents of the development who fit the profile that would be decided upon by the Orchard Park Tenants Association (OPTA).

Simultaneously, the OPTA, was working with a group of MIT students, who were preparing a background paper for the residents to make an application for a family investment center, which would need additional funding but was essential to building the self-sufficiency of residents at Orchard Park. The building shown in Figure 1.3 is the Dearborn School, a former elementary school which many of the elder Orchard Park residents attended. Rehabilitating the Dearborn School is a beloved cause at Orchard Park. The author, being a member of the MIT group, decided to explore this thesis topic, and was invited to participate fully in the discussions between the Young Mothers Housing Consortium, Orchard Park and the Authority. The Consortium’s project became the thesis product.

At this writing, the Housing Authority has decided that the project is infeasible, and has declined to pursue it. This is very unfortunate because the Consortium counted among its members a housing developer with experience in building supportive housing, and a planning consultant who worked for the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing which addressed the state of public housing today. The sheer amount of experience of its founding members renders this a viable project, but the housing authority still declined. This is a different outcome than was hoped for, but the battle is not over yet. The client may have changed, but the arguments still needs to be made for the supportive housing model. This model is not particular to Orchard Park, necessarily. There are many developments in Boston, and indeed all over the country which have the same preponderance of single-female headed households, and similar crises with teenage pregnancies.
Who is the poor young single mother living in Orchard Park? I had an opportunity to conduct a personal interview with a teenager at Orchard Park, who representatives of the Task Force felt was at great risk in her present home situation, and who, therefore, was a woman in need of this precise type of supportive housing. The young woman is typical of many who live in Orchard Park, and lacks environmental supports—her mother was a young mother, and her father has never lived in the house with them. It is for reasons even more serious than these that young women living in urban public housing projects do indeed need to be removed from the home in order to relearn life skills that will enable them to parent their babies, and take care of themselves.

**The Client in Orchard Park**

The woman, who I’ve called "Denise," is sixteen years old and is the mother of a six month-old baby. Her mother is allegedly using drugs in the home, and after applying for her daughter's welfare, has begun to steal the checks from her daughter, leaving Denise with no visible means of support except WIC food stamps. This information came from the Orchard Park Tenant Association, not Denise. Denise has an eighteen year old sister, who doesn't live at home, who got pregnant at the same time Denise did. Denise now lives with her Mom and twelve year old sister. Denise has been taken off the lease by her mother, because she can no longer be counted as a dependent. She also has a brother who just left a drug rehabilitation clinic and is shuttling between friends' homes.

Denise does not have a relationship with the baby's father anymore, because he is in jail. They lived together briefly during the early months of her pregnancy before he was incarcerated. The baby's father has three children, all by different women residing in Orchard Park. The women have recently begun talking to one another because he is in jail, and for the sake of their children, who they feel should get to know their biological half-brothers and sisters.

Denise's parents do not live together now, and never have. She speaks to her father almost daily by phone. He warned her "not to get pregnant by that boy," but was supportive once she told him of her pregnancy. Her mother threw her out of the house after a quarrel about the pregnancy, which coincided with her sister's pregnancy, and Denise went to live with her grandmother until the birth.
After the birth, she moved back in with her mother. Her mother applied for welfare for Denise while she was pregnant, and the welfare check was mailed to Orchard Park. The check seldom got into Denise's hands though, because it was often stolen by her mother. Denise had to make arrangements with the welfare office to have the check sent to her grandmother's house across town. The penalty for this was to be taken off the welfare roll for two months.

Denise knows many other women at Orchard Park who are in similar crises. The challenge for this thesis is to design a supportive housing model for Denise and her peers. However, the model is constrained by some harsh realities. The design of the model takes place within the context of impending redevelopment of public housing, which means that certain funds are allocated to portions of the site for rehabilitation. While it was worthy for me to examine specifically what redevelopment for Orchard will be, I included the general discussions in Chapter Four, and included more specific details in an Appendix. The design of the housing is looked at through two lenses. One lens is looking through the constraint of current funding regulations, which prohibit adding habitable area. The second lens is the one which posits new funding sources or policy that would be necessary to enable new housing to be built, on the existing site.

The last chapter, Chapter Six, attempts to rewrite policy to accommodate the model, and makes suggestions for future design guidelines. This thesis will also posit examples of similarly innovative projects, to try and demystify the complicated lease and relocation agreements, emancipation status, split household regulations and eviction procedures—all the issues the housing authority balked at. It is hoped that by carefully examining these regulations, which in many cases have been on the books for years, a new solution will be realized—to re-write them in order to accommodate the specific housing needs of young minority women and their children.

Finally, the challenge is to turn a client-based thesis into a set of guidelines for future practice. This design/policy solution is not particular to Orchard Park, it has national implications. Its success should be judged on whether it convinces the authority to participate on a non-hierarchical level—the goal of a process informed by feminism. The underlying structure of the thesis is that it is first, a client-based project, conducted specifically at Orchard Park in Roxbury, and second, is the type of "unique" housing model that many public housing authorities across the country may soon be able to explore given the augmented funding of public housing redevelopment. The application in the thesis is for supportive housing for pregnant and parenting
teenage women, who are overwhelmingly minorities. The application could easily have been for supportive housing for elderly residents in public housing who want to remain there, but who have needs for services on-site. The structure is fundamentally a design exploration which has significant implications for and by policy. So, the conclusions are drawn in the forms of rewriting public housing policy which eliminates impediments to the creation of supportive housing models at Orchard Park and elsewhere, and in recommending more appropriate architectural precedents.

NOTES

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
Chapter II: Spatial Discrimination and Housing

Domestic architecture...illuminates norms concerning family life, sex roles, community relations, and social equality. Of course, architecture itself does not directly determine how people act or how themselves or others act. Yet, the associations a culture establishes at any particular time between a “model” or typical house and a notion of the model family do encourage certain roles and assumptions.

Gwendolyn Wright, Moralism and the Model Home
This chapter is organized into three parts:

- Part I: The Feminist Critique of Architecture
- Part II: Family Structure and Poverty
- Part III: Socio-spatial Discrimination Against Women in Public Housing

**PART I: THE FEMINIST CRITIQUE OF ARCHITECTURE**

The body of work that has recently come into being as the “feminist critique” is extremely diverse. Feminist architects and historians share a desire to demonstrate how limited our conception of architecture has been and how narrow its criticism. Behind this effort to open things up is the sense that women are still being excluded from architecture’s house and table, despite claims to a broadened constituency.

Historically speaking, before the 1970’s, criticism of architecture concentrated on “female values.” This predated a feminist consciousness. Female values is a problematic term given the current debate on whether the differences between men and women are biological or the result of social conditioning. The writings of the 1970’s attacked “sexism” in the “star system” of architecture and works by Gwendolyn Wright, Susanna Torre and Doris Cole can be put in this category.

The 1980’s saw a dramatic shift in the population of students in architecture schools and hence the opportunities for women in the field of teaching at accredited universities. Change at best has been token on this front. Historically, women have been, and to some degree still are, discouraged from being practitioners, and their appointments to faculty have often been temporary or part-time.

Contemporary feminist critics believe that the pretense that aesthetic considerations are ideologically neutral hides the political reality that most buildings are designed by white males for the white male establishment. These critics oppose the idea that architecture is limited by its past practice and theory, which they see as monolithic or universalizing.

Other feminist critics attack patriarchal culture, and recalling the commitment of early feminist critics in the 1970’s, to non-hierarchical modes of interaction, complexity of visual experience, and a spatial symbolism unique to women. Some such as Karen Franck,
Daphne Spain and Leslie Kanes Weisman, refine this position for the 1990's. Their work includes research on discrimination in urban and architectural design and the gender of spaces. So it is inspiration from the "female values" of the 1960's and the feminist critics of the 1970's that contemporary critics persist in. What hasn't been fully incorporated into the discussions on gender and design in the continuum of feminist criticism of architecture is the work of women architects.

**Thesis Framework**

It is from this current evolution of criticism of spatial discrimination that this thesis derives its framework. It seeks to examine issues and pose questions to promote a rethinking of accepted systems of valuation. It is interested in methodological assumptions and institutionalized operations. It is political, not detached from the specific mechanisms of power and exclusion that maintain women's "marginality." Therefore, it speaks in many voices. As architect, writer and teacher May Sarton wrote in *Plant Dreaming Deep*, "No, it is not fear, but an exceptional state of awareness that makes life here not exactly a rest."

**Spatial Discrimination and Women**

Among territorial animals, and that includes humans, the limited size of space or territory goes with lesser status; and subordinates yield space to dominants, who are freer to move into others' territory.

It is documentable that marked and basic differences in the ways that women and men relate to space do exist. There is also convincing evidence that these differences are culturally buttressed; and, that the social function of buttressing has been and continues to be, quite literally, to keep women in their place. Not only, then, is the part played by space in women's lives a reflection of their subordination, but also a cause of it.

In western culture, the size and scope of women's space, and their defense against being intruded upon in the space they do have, has been and continues to be limited. The broadest of limitations is derived from the ideology of the home as women's sphere and their concomitant exclusion from the public domain reserved for men. The different space allocation inherent in this division is obvious. The ideology has been expressed in concrete spatial terms in the design of spaces in which people spend considerable time. The
gender's differing experiences in these spaces serve as non-verbal training mechanisms for both the behavior and the self-image considered culturally appropriate for each.

In the 20th century, research begun in the 1930's, and continued through 1972, showed that American mothers were less likely than their fathers to have a room of their own in the house. During the same period a number of women spoke about the importance of personal space and equal access to spaces. Virginia Woolf, in *A Room of Her Own* describes her feelings of being restricted from entering the library at Oxford:

"Gate after gate seemed to close with gentle finality behind me. Innumerable beadles were fitting innumerable keys into well-oiled locks; the treasure-house was being made secure for another night."

During the second half of this century, about half the adult female population spends more time awake in the workplace than in their home, and women are much less likely than men to have private offices, washrooms or elevators. They have less access to alternative spaces such as company cars, boats, airplanes, and are more likely to occupy windowless offices, without symbolic access to the outdoors. The immediate reason for this is, of course, due more to their powerlessness than their gender. But the two are connected; and both are connected to the space occupied, which both expresses and perpetuates their powerlessness.

In order to understand this in terms related to urban design and a woman's place in the city, it is important to look at cultural restrictions on woman's space and their bodies themselves. "Boys are raised in our society to be spatially dominant. They are encouraged to be adventurous, to discover and explore their surroundings, and to experience a wide range of environment-
Spatial settings. In a cross-cultural study of body postures, it was found that "the most frequent postures used exclusively by women are those that take up the least amount of space".

Studies in Germany of 5000 photographs of body postures, advertisements and sculpture reveal that women make themselves small and narrow. In Figure 2.1, the diagram illustrates how a man can attempt to occupy the limited space that women do. Men do just the opposite. If a man crosses his arms and legs, and folds his hands in his lap, it could be taken as sexual immodesty and effeminate. It is unlikely a coincidence that these postures happen to represent the minimum claims to space, and that it is these bodily positions that are expansive that are for women culturally discouraged. In addition to claiming space, boys are taught to be verbally assertive (to speak up) while girls are diffident.

Girls are raised in our society to expect and accept spatial limitations. From early childhood on, their spatial range is restricted to the "protected" and homogeneous environments of the home and the immediate neighborhood. As a result many adult women are afraid to travel alone, especially to new places. The streets near their homes may indeed be the site of tasteless, sexist advertisements, contributing to the sense of having one's private territory violated. In Figures 2.2 and 2.3 the sexist advertisement in Osaka, Japan, where a "novelty" is displayed, and on a billboard where a woman is depicted in a stage of undress, show how women are subjected to visual assault on the street. Territorial behavior is intended to put and keep people in their literal and figurative social places. It is "the social complexity, inequality and the need for control of one group by another which make the territorial definition of society essential!".

Women are not only trained to range over and occupy less space than men; they also control smaller zones of personal space around
themselves than do men. People stand and sit closer to women than to men, and will approach nearer to them before stopping. Outdoors, women claim less territory than do men. Women also have less control over those spaces that they do occupy. In the case of personal space, uninvited and non-reciprocal touching is one-way that a person's control over their own space is violated or intruded upon. A number of studies indicate that social superiors initiate touching of inferiors far more often than the other way around, and that women are far more frequently touchees than touchers.

Domestic space shows the same pattern. In European culture in the 19th century women were excluded from the exclusively male domain of smoking and billiard rooms. Today, the kitchen, often defined as the women's space in the home is freely intruded upon by all members of the family. Contrarily, the den, office, study or workroom, and her husband's domain are far less subject to others' use. There is some evidence that women do consider the kitchen their territory. Domestic crimes of violence in the US are most likely to take place in either the kitchen or the bedroom. In the kitchen it is women who are more likely to be the aggressors, while in the bedroom, which has some male space connotations in the description "master bedroom", it is the male.

When challenged, women are less secure in their claim to a territory than are men, and are far more likely to yield their space and retreat. This is shown in a number of studies, some of which involved sitting down next to males and females seated alone at a multi-seat library table, and others which involved proximity in outdoor street settings. The studies show that, in both cases, that women are approached more often, and that most persons will sit down next to a woman, leaving no space between, while they were more likely to leave a space between themselves and a male subject. Women also relinquish their seats more readily than men do.

Women have adapted remarkably to the spatial limitations culturally imposed on them. Studies consistently show that women like small spaces and work well in them, while the opposite is true of men. Several experiments in which the variable was the size of a room found women more positive about the room and more cooperative in it. In a small room, women rated their work with others as more enjoyable, and they felt less aggressive. They also indicated that their self-image was better, and that they worked more effectively there. Men, on the other hand, preferred and worked better in large rooms. The same held true for girls and boys.
An even more striking illustration of women's internalization of society's discriminatory space allocation patterns comes from evidence of therapists. In a study conducted with women seeking therapy, it was found that over 84% of these women in England and the US are sufferers of agoraphobia, fear of wide open spaces. Of these, 78% were full-time housewives, 12% housewives who worked part-time, and 10% who worked away from home. In another study of Puerto Rican women seeking therapy, Puerto Rican women in New York are often described by angosocial agencies as schizoid or psychotic, and are hospitalized. The true reason, however, is that these women have merely panicked as a result of their training in a culture that frowns upon women going out in public alone, followed by their migration to New York, marriage and moving away from their neighborhood, with a resultant total reliance on their husband to deal with the outside world in their behalf.12

Becoming aware of the political aspects of space at home, at work and outdoors is the first step to correcting the inequity. Choosing whether to run counter to the cultural assumptions and regulations about women and space is the next step. A woman's choice to do so carries repercussions ranging from unpleasant personal comments to loss of jobs, which we all know is illegal.

The Architect's Role

What role can and does the female architect play in this? Both men and women bring a social identity to their work, but many male architects and educators think women architects are more interested in housing rather than houses, and in building community centers, rather than skyscrapers. Assuredly, male and female architects need to obtain commissions, no matter what. But the implication that female architects perhaps favor or are more skilled at designing housing, [because (men believe) they have an inherent understanding of how housing can be designed more equivalently for male and female needs], perpetuates the myth that houses are more the domain of the woman than the man.

The origin of this characterization is anchored in the different ways that women and men develop psychologically and morally. This will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5. Many psychologists theorize that male gender identity is tied to separation from the mother while female gender depends upon a continuing identification with the mother. Masculinity is thus defined through separation and femininity through attachment. For men, individuality, self-expression and non-interference with the rights of others become essential to integrity. For women who are encouraged to sustain relationships,
integrity depends upon the cooperation and a consideration of other peoples' needs and points of view in their own judgments and decisions. Thus, the female architect may be more facile at designing buildings which require a lengthy community participation process, or at working on projects which require multi-disciplinary teams to arrive at a solution.

**Sexual Division of Labor**

"A woman's place is in the home" is an implicit principle that male-dominated architectural and planning traditions have focused on for decades. Women, fortunately, have rejected this and have entered the workforce in droves. Dolores Hayden, in her groundbreaking essay, "What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design and Human Work," lays a foundation for strategies on designing a new paradigm of the home, neighborhood and economic design of human settlement which "support, rather than restrict, the activities of employed women and their families." Though her chronological history is correct, she fails to postulate how non-feminists, or disenfranchised minority women, might attempt to achieve the same result. Her exclusion of these populations is a fundamental criticism of the new feminism, which seeks to dispel the myth that feminism is for middle class white women by white middle class women only. For example, the emphasis in feminist discourse on equality in the workplace assumes equal access for men and women to higher education or training. Yet, many minority women do not have the basic educational benefits, whether by opportunity or inclination, that most middle-class women take for granted. [In order to be take part in the discussion on equality in the workplace, it is generally assumed that before women can compete with men] women must have some form of high school, undergraduate college or higher education.

Hayden's work relates how home came to be separated from work through the creation of suburbs after the industrial revolution.

"The male worker would return from his day in the office to a private domestic environment, secluded from the tense world of work in an industrial city characterized by environmental pollution, social degradation, and personal alienation. He would enter a serene dwelling whose physical and emotional maintenance would be the duty of his wife." Thus the suburban house was the stage set for the effective sexual divisions of labor. It was a strategy spawned by corporations and supported by advertisers. Figure 2.4 depicts the notion of women
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As "guardian angel of the house", which was used as a promotional device for home sales. The sales pitch extended into the home. Women, as "home-makers", were pressured to conform by consumption. Dream houses full of the latest household gadgets were must-haves, and some women went to work in order to get some of these gadgets.

Any house, whether urban or suburban, is organized around the same set of spaces: kitchen, dining, living room and bedrooms. These spaces require someone to undertake cooking, cleaning, child care and usually private transportation. If a woman did work, she was still expected to spend more time in private housekeeping and child care, than did spouses, and spent more time commuting because she used public transportation. This is still true today, and is supported by institutions such as residential zoning which prohibits community facilities such as child care or laundries.

Although more couples are partnering housekeeping and child care, women often pick up the slack and end up doing more than their fair share. Often they were raised to believe it was their duty in the first place and so feel a failure of accomplishment if chores or duties are not being met.

Working Toward a Range of Solutions

Working women often find that housing, employment, and child care are mutually exclusive. That is, matching the complex needs of women to a single location or to ones which are contiguous or convenient are nearly impossible. One environment that united housing services and employment would be an answer. These are rare. Existing systems of government services assume that there is a traditional household with a male worker and an unpaid homemaker. Public housing, Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and food stamps still attempt to support an ideal family living in an isolated apartment or house, with a full-time homemaker cooking meals and minding children all day.
Although many women who receive AFDC are not married, in order to receive benefits they must sign over their rights to collect child support to the state, and agree to cooperate in identifying and locating the father. If she refuses to cooperate, she faces a total loss of AFDC benefits. Once the father is found, the state collects child support from him, if he is working. The mother gets to keep a small portion of the child support collected on her behalf, but has her food stamps cut by 30 cents for every dollar collected from the father.¹⁸

To date, most attempts to address the inequities faced by women have been handled by the private sector; and as such, are profitable solutions - franchised day care, fast-food, maid service, easier credit for purchasing a washer and dryer, etc.¹⁹ These solutions obscure the failure of American housing policy, and create bad conditions for other women who will end up employed at low wages to render these services. These problems are not "private" and should not be addressed by the for-profit private sector exclusively. Non-profits, and private sector organizations are increasingly becoming the leaders in developing solutions for women’s housing needs. The non-profit raises funds for developing such projects from a range of private foundations. Such grants usually cover development costs, design, construction and implementation of service programs. Often, a single project is put together with many sources of funding.

The problem, Hayden states,

"is paradoxical: women can not improve their status in home unless their overall economic position is altered; women can not improve their status in the paid labor force unless their domestic responsibilities are altered. A program to achieve economic justice for women requires a solution that overcomes the traditional divisions between the household and the market economy, the private dwelling and the workplace."

Architectural Innovations

Many countries have begun to develop new approaches to the needs of women, mainly through the development of
special housing facilities for employed women and families. Projects by Alva Myrdal and Sven Markelius called “service houses or collective houses”, are depicted in Figure 2.5. These projects, built in 1935, were a model for mothers who wished to keep their jobs after working to support the World War II effort. The first floor includes a restaurant and child care center. The second floor is dedicated to offices and studios. They provided child care and cooking for working women and their families. They offered services on a commercial basis or ones subsidized by the state government.

Other projects include the Nina West Homes in London, which renovated 63 units of housing for single parent families. Figure 2.6 is a front elevation, and Figure 2.7 is an axonometric drawing and floor plans of the main building and the child-care center. The corridor is used as a playroom so that the children’s play areas are integrated with the dwellings. The housing is designed to facilitate shared babysitting, and the day care center is open to the neighborhood residents for a fee. Home and work have been reunited on one site for all of the families.

In the US, there has been a long history of organizing for housing to meet women’s needs. Gwendolyn Wright documents many in her book The Grand Domestic Revolution. Many of these projects, developed in the early 20th century, were still functioning by the late 1920’s. Feminists of that era failed to recognize the exploitation they created for other women when providing services, such as
daycare, for those who could afford them.

However, there is an American tradition of experimental utopian socialist communities building model towns, and of communes and collectives built in the 1960's and 1970's, which attempted to broaden the conventional definition of “family.” Some communal groups still insisted on a traditional sexual division of labor. Others attempted to have a non-sexist settlement and encouraged men to take part in nurturing activities. All of these have the predictable problems of privacy, and autonomy and governance over children’s discipline like any other “family” might have. Currently, though, most women wish not an end to a private life altogether, but for community services to support the household. They also desire solutions that reinforce economic independence and maximize their personal choices about child rearing and sociability.22

Spatial Discrimination of Poor Women

The above solutions are a call to arms for architects and planners to redesign the home environment based on the needs of whom they presumably know, which today is not the traditional two parent family. In fact, there is currently, no singular “family” model for architects and planners to be guided by. What is not taken into consideration is that there is a vast population of women and children that constitute “family” and that their needs for housing are being systematically ignored because the federal government does not want to admit they exist in the numbers they do. It simply is not enough for planners and architects to redefine zoning standards and kitchen plans. If the institutions that build publicly subsidized housing wish to ignore the statistics which say that female heads of household occupy over 85% of their housing stock, then planners and architects, and their pooled respective talent to accommodate diversity, are impotent.

Implications For Practice

When an architect ignores the wishes of a client, he or she is called ignorant and self serving, and even incompetent. As in any architectural project, when the federal government, as the client or the overseer, decides to redevelop its most severely distressed public housing stock, one presumes that the government would survey its occupant’s needs and desires. A good architect would. Not only is the federal government failing to listen to its own social policy and human service experts, but it has no process for getting information from the users of the buildings, the majority of whom are poor people.
The federal bureaucratic machine that built public housing in the early 1940's through the 1950's has blinders on. It would like to think that its client, in 1993, is the same as it was in 1945 - two-parent families with children, deserving of decent, affordable housing. Unfortunately, the buildings built to house small families are sometimes inadequate to support the needs of the client who dominates them now. The buildings are disintegrating and the outdoor spaces, once beautifully landscaped for children to play, are littered with bottles and covered by asphalt. Public housing has become a female ghetto.

PART II: FAMILY STRUCTURE AND POVERTY

The area is black. And its future is symbolized by the babies of all these young women with no husbands, no job, not much education, and inevitably no life....The baby who represents all that is to come is a black male and is today 10 months old. His mother is 16. His father is 20. The infant is one of four children from three mothers spawned by a guy who will probably die in prison.

Such statements abound in editorials all over the country. The above was an excerpt from the Boston Globe column of Mike Barnicle - “Where Beasts Prowl The Street.” It summarizes a deplorable, yet popular critique of conservative white America that calls black men animals and black women whores and dooms their children to a life of crime, welfare and drugs. What is interesting, however, is how articles such as this contribute to and reflect a lack of knowledge which collective America has on poor minority citizens.

Poverty Defined

I am sure many in white America would be surprised to know that the majority of the poor are white. Approximately four-fifths of all Americans are white; consequently the majority of the poor, approximately two-thirds, are white. It is true however, that a greater percentage of nonwhites are poorer than whites.

The most deeply rooted stereotype, is that today's poor are different from the rest of us and from the poor of earlier generations. It is commonly thought that those who were poor when they first emigrated to this country worked their way out of poverty in to the working class or beyond. It is commonly thought that today's poor are caught in a never-ending cycle of poverty, early childbearing, inadequate job skills and hopelessness. While this may be true for some, it is not characteristic of the majority of poor Americans.
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Absolute poverty and relative poverty need to be distinguished. Absolute poverty means living below the official poverty line; it means not having enough money for food, clothing and shelter. Relative poverty is much more difficult to define. If thought of in terms of being relative to other kinds of households, it is obvious. However, it springs more from the principle of equity than it does from a concern to provide the necessities of life. Is not having a telephone in this society relative poverty? Is relative poverty not having the money to buy FILA running shoes that all the twelve year old boys are wearing? In a society in which what we consume defines who and what we are, what does living outside mainstream America do to people?

The number of Americans living in poverty has been rising steadily since 1979 from 26.1 million to 33.7 million in 1982, to 35.5 million in 1983. By 1990, the number had risen to almost 38 million. Three-fourths of the families that returned to work after the recession were male-headed white families. The number of families who can be called the “poorest of the poor,” those with incomes below $5000.00 per year, has increased 40% since the late 1970’s.

The poor do not always remain poor, and there is a lot of turnover in the low income population, according to a study conducted by the Survey Research Center in Michigan as cited in Women and Children Last. This study found that over 2.6 percent could be called “persistently poor” which was defined as being poor for eight of ten years. The persistent poor are heavily concentrated into two overlapping groups - black households and female-headed households. While the Michigan report confirms that blacks, women and children are at greatest risk of poverty, it disputes the idea that if the poor had a more positive attitude, their circumstances would change, and they would climb out of poverty.

Feminization of poverty

The “feminization of poverty”, a phrase originally coined by sociologist Diana Pearce in “The Feminization of Poverty: Women, Work and Welfare,” (1978) has been caused by a convergence of several social and economic factors. These include the weakening of the traditional nuclear family; the rapid growth of female-headed families; the continuing existence of a dual-labor market that actively discriminates against female workers; a welfare system that seeks to maintain its recipients below the poverty line; the time-consuming,
unpaid domestic labor of women, particularly child care; and an administration in power in Washington that is systematically dismantling or reducing funds for programs that serve those who are most in need.

Unemployment, continuing discrimination on the basis of race, class and age, and the changing nature of the economy all contribute to the increasing impoverishment of women and children. Furthermore, a core of dependency, held by some women themselves, but fostered by almost all the social institutions of our culture, is the notion that a man will come along and take care of it for the woman, which contributes to women's lack of attention to the matters at hand.

The most disturbing parallel trend of the 1980's was that the percentage of Americans who were poor decreased, while the percentage of women and children has increased. This means that, as a whole, as Americans were moving out of poverty, women and children were moving in. Today, female-headed families are five times more likely to be poor than two parent families.30

Poor minority women

In families headed by minority women, the statistics are even more disturbing. The number of poor Hispanics, numbers available only since 1972, indicates that between 1972 and 1981, the number of poor Hispanics living in female-headed households doubled, and between 1959 and 1981, the number of blacks living in poor, female-headed households doubled as well. The Michigan report held that the:

"...single most important factor accounting for changes in family well-being was a fundamental change in family structure: divorce, death, marriage, birth or a child leaving home. Women are more affected by changes in family composition than men."

In minority families, the number of single-female heads of house-
holds has a greater implication than for whites. Over 50% of all black families with children under eighteen are headed by women. Accordingly, the divorce rate for blacks has tripled. The out-of-wedlock births to unmarried, black females ages fifteen to nineteen doubled from 1940 to 1972, and by 1972 was six times the rate for white teenagers. The number of separated and divorced black women, combined with the never married black mothers, substantially increases the risk of black women and children living in poverty. The same goes for Hispanic women and their children.

Another significant factor in the feminization of poverty is the perpetuation of the dual labor market. Women’s economic mobility is constrained by occupational, segregation, gender or race. When there are decreases in federal funding for government-supported jobs, women, most with fewer job skills, are the first to go. If there is a male figurehead in these families, his unemployment is a major factor in the poverty rate among women and children and undermines family stability. Studies have shown a clear correlation between unemployment and family violence, desertion, separation and divorce.

Welfare versus work

The welfare system, which maintains families below the poverty level, is another major factor leading to poverty. Welfare segregates women and stigmatizes children and forces women into low-pay, low-status work that offers no chance for advancement.

In the arena of social welfare, the Reagan administration did the most to exacerbate the vulnerable positions of women and children. Cutbacks in Medicaid, child health programs, community health centers, and family planning programs raised the poverty rate. Aid to Families with Dependent Children has been slashed by $2 billion. Child nutrition programs and food stamps were cut, along with Federal funds for day care.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act eliminated all job training programs and added workfare requirements under AFDC. Studies show that reduction or elimination of AFDC support caused the percentage of working mothers living below the poverty line to more than double. Blacks were worse off by every measure, drops in income, poverty and unemployment exhibiting the “minoritization” of the poor. The number of black men who are
unemployed and the rise in the number of black female headed families are interrelated, despite the evidence that blacks are gaining higher educational ground on whites. Black income is more related to the availability of job opportunities for blacks than to levels of education, blacks are being widely discriminated against in the workplace.

Perhaps the most serious recrimination of the Reagan administration has been a legitimation of negative attitudes held by many Americans toward the poor. The ideology that the poor are lazy, that if they worked harder they could make it like everyone else, that they are corrupt, free-loaders, collect double benefits, and when they receive food stamps sell them to buy liquor, and, above all, if we did not provide these benefits, they would just get a job like everyone else, permeate the minds of many Americans.

The “feminization” of poverty argument is surely the “minoritization” argument as well. It is clear that the key causes of poverty among women are different than for men. The role of unemployment among black men should be kept in mind, however. Women’s lives are bound up with the caring of others, not only children, but for parents, for men, for grandchildren, for friends, etc. Women weave the bonds that connect people, they have a “different moral sense.” But our society rewards productive work, and views these unproductive activities, such as caring, as an energy drain. Once you add caring for a home into the equation, women are working a full-time week plus. Societal expectations of women, and the lack of realistic alternatives to them, keeps women in check. It is the role of social policy to figure out how to develop supports to enable people to lead rewarding and productive lives.

Welfare and women

Now that we know who the poorest of the poor are, and who keeps them there by federal spending cuts, we should look more closely at the welfare system, because it dictates, to some degree, where a family can live, and therefore performs the task of tenant selection for public housing. For example: “by entitling recipients to money without requiring them to earn it, welfare has corroded the work ethic by enabling mothers to raise children without a father’s income - in fact, by providing cash benefits to mothers on the condition that they not marry a working man - welfare (AFDC) has promoted a massive rise in illegitimacy, and encouraged millions of men to abandon their responsibilities to their children.”
A Boston Globe editorial claims that the legacy of the welfare state is the corrosion of values of self-respect, and a willingness to work, which are the building blocks of self-sufficiency. It argues for, among others, the law to state that teenagers be made ineligible for welfare, "to discourage babies having babies," and further to pay a one-time bonus to welfare recipients who marry and go off the "dole." In Massachusetts, these statements augment Governor William Weld's 1993 welfare reform bill which "would limit the AFDC free-ride to 24 months: after two years, a recipient will either be working, studying for a job, or performing an assigned community service—or the checks will stop." Workfare, as it is called, has been proposed to limit the shellacking that taxpayers believe they have been taking, at the hands of welfare mothers since the "war on poverty" was declared in the 1960's. Statements such as the above illustrate the degree to which the government will go to control a woman's reproductive capability, likening her to chattel, the possession of man. What the article did not address was what to do about employing the black and Hispanic fathers who are responsible for all these children.

Some assume that a man will be alongside them, either in marriage or in a long-term relationship. But even when the image of the man participating in her life is gone, or not real, the woman still persists in the image of herself as a mother. Childbearing is one area over which all women should have some individual control, even though many young, poor women have little access to information on birth control:

"Childbearing and childrearing is central to women's image of growing up and to their conception of their on-going role as women." 36

When viewed in this context, many poor women are not aware of the choices they have about their lives.

Nancy Chodorow, author of Reproduction of Mothering, observes:

"Women's mothering is central to the sexual division of labor. Women's maternal role has profound effects on women's lives, on ideology about women, on the reproduction of masculinity and sexual inequality and on the particular forms of labor power." 39

Society's expectations that women will play the domestic role is exactly that which places them in a dependent, secondary position. 40
Welfare and Teenage Women

The group of women whose lives are most seriously affected by motherhood are teenagers, particularly those who haven’t completed high school. Early childbearing significantly increases the likelihood that the mother and her children will require AFDC. “Almost half of all AFDC expenditures go to women who bore their first child as a teenager.” The divorce rate is so high (60-72% after six years of marriage) that even if they marry, most teenagers will become single parents, eventually. Not all of the teenagers, however, come from poor families.

Some teens want to have a child, some discover they are pregnant and are reluctant to have an abortion because many belong to Fundamentalist religions which staunchly abhor abortion as a method of birth control. They are in a sense forced to have the child. Most do not foresee the complexities of having a child, and of supporting it. Many teens leave an abusive situation when they are pregnant, fearing for their unborn child more than themselves. Being battered is often a trade-off for economic security. When that security is threatened, mothers young and old, have no choice but to go on welfare.

Welfare has become the synonym for Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Though the word welfare means “the state or condition of doing well or being well; good fortune, happiness, or well-being...prosperity,” in the American welfare system— it to some it has come to mean demoralizing, humiliating and unlivable. Are we helping women and children or punishing them because they are poor?

The welfare experience

Without going into a compete history of the welfare system, it is relevant to mention that welfare was originally established in the Social Security Act of 1935, as Aid to Dependent Children (ADC), it provided funds only for children. In 1950, Congress added a caretaker grant which stipulated that mothers essential expenses be provided for. This came to be known as AFDC. It is administered at state and local levels. A characteristic of ADC and AFDC is the continued denial of aid to unemployed men, often called “man in the house” rules, which forced men out of the home so that women and children might receive aid.

Eligibility was calculated in different ways in different years. Federal assistance was withheld until a woman was in her sixth month of
pregnancy, whereas before a confirmed pregnancy yielded benefits,
limitations were placed on those collecting benefits between the
ages of 18 and 21. Sometimes food stamps and housing subsidies
counted in determining eligibility, sometimes requirements stipu-
lated that a job was a prerequisite.44

People who try to work their way off welfare are not exactly re-
warded. Although welfare benefits vary by state, in Massachusetts,
welfare benefits are reduced dollar for dollar with earnings. For
example, a woman working full-time at minimum wage, would only
have $2,400 more in disposable income than if she did not work
and collected welfare, which is the equivalent of working for $1.20
an hour. One half of the $2400 comes from the Earned Income Tax
Credit (EITC) she gets if she submits a tax return at the end of the
year. So she really works for $.60 an hour on a daily basis. Even if
she can work full-time for five dollars an hour she will make $3,400
and lose her Medicaid, which is worth several thousands of dollars,
depending on her health. So, unless women work for $6.00 an
hour or more, (this varies by state) with full medical benefits, and
low daycare costs, she is likely to go back on welfare. In fact, only
20-25% of women earn their way off welfare, mostly women with
higher education and skills that pay more. In short, work does not
pay.45

Tackling the welfare office involves mastery over a myriad of details
and a fairly confident demeanor. Few women ever do, and those
that manage to are subject to abuse at the hands of welfare work-
ners. Some working mothers would have been better off finan-
cially to go on welfare than to go on working at their menial jobs. At least with welfare, there was usually Medicaid. Receiv-
ing medical benefits for a sick child or for pre-natal visits is no small
incentive to a mother. It is precisely this “vice grip” that the govern-
ment has on peoples’ (mostly women’s) lives that forces them to
cheat the system, whether because they need medical benefits, or
because they want an unemployed husband or partner to live with
them.

Alternative support networks

Networks of kin, family and friends are often the sole support for
poor families, who turn to these networks when the money runs
out. In Maya Angelou’s autobiography, I Know Why the Caged Bird
Sings, she describes a system of mutual aid in the black community:

...although there was always generosity in the Negro neighbor-
hood, it was indulged on pain of sacrifice. Whatever was given by
Black people to other Blacks was most probably needed as des-
Facing a welfare system that does not provide enough money, families swap, share and trade to get by.

Does welfare promote chronic dependency? Some women, especially teenagers, become pregnant in order to qualify for AFDC and set up their own household. But the benefits of welfare are so minimal that one can hardly hope to get ahead and off the rolls. Some claim that being a welfare recipient is so stigmatizing and debilitating that recipients take on a sense of fatalism, of hopelessness and powerlessness that robs them of the ability to do anything else with their lives. Some believe that AFDC is a system of state paternalism that seeks to control women’s lives as familial paternalism once did. It means that the welfare system is the latest form of social control over single women with children, and that the inevitable result is dependency. But, studies show that at least half of all welfare recipients do not become chronically dependent on the system, but use it as a transition, and the other half use it to supplement income, a result which suggests raising wages.

What is remarkable is that these women and families do persist - women after being humiliated and degraded by a system that maintains them in poverty persevere through techniques of mutual aid and sharing and caring, which also provides social and emotional support as well as economic help. Programs designed to help teenage women educate themselves about their bodies, parenting skills, life skills, and educational and job opportunities are extremely important in breaking the cycle of poverty. If the welfare system will not help once someone is in it, let us target how to keep people off it. Teenage women are the ones at greatest risk.

**Early Intervention Philosophy**

Early twentieth century homes for unwed mothers incorporated a variety of health, educational and social services for residents. Neighborhood multi-service centers developed under the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act reflected the comprehensive services approach, as do current efforts on behalf of children with special needs, and victims of family violence.

Individuals, families, and their problems come in “wholes”, the professional interventions designed to help them are rife with holes. Often, if one age group is served, the next eldest age group will
have nothing. Coordination is a way of trying to join together fragmented services to address the complexities of human need. One such mechanism is the “comprehensive services model”. This model seeks to minimize depersonalization and conceptual fragmentation by agencies and workers by administratively linking services through referrals or integration of services at a single site. It can also utilize the case management system which facilitates the clients’ access to a disparate service bureaucracy.

Pregnant and parenting adolescents are widely acknowledged to need varying forms of assistance. A model that seeks to involve a number of health, educational and social services has a compelling logic. It is the matter of local program implementation that is difficult to imagine. The lack of resources for serving such a stigmatized population is the prime concern.

One fundamental assumption made by advocates and practitioners is that interventions proposed will be effective at achieving their goals. The programs, though, are based on the ill-conceived notion that “early parenthood is an affliction from which one recovers in time.” Service providers often assume that interventions during pregnancy will help each client make and implement an informed decision about how to resolve her pregnancy, deliver a healthy baby, learn about good nutrition and feed herself and her baby properly; continue and complete her education; prepare for adult roles as wife and career women, thus reducing her dependence on the welfare system, and avoid future unwanted pregnancies. These are extremely optimistic goals, and a short-term program has limited success for achieving them.

The ill-effects of lifelong poverty can be exacerbated by an adolescent pregnancy. Feeding a teenager will not erase years of nutritional deficits. Offering pre-natal care may not cure a pre-existing untreated illness. Providing vocational programs that terminate at delivery represent a questionable way to make up for prior academic failure or even disinterest. Because all these pre-existing problems exist, there is certainly a need for comprehensive services, but especially for those which last longer than the term of pregnancy. Short-term comprehensive programs are limited in their ability to resolve problems permanently. Viewed in this context, comprehensive services are not really comprehensive, but are a temporary fix.

Like any social welfare service that depends on public and volunteer resources, adolescent programs require a measure of public support or tolerance. They will be competing with funds for combating
hunger, homelessness and child abuse and special needs. Many adults, including powerful decision makers, stigmatize adolescent sexuality, pregnancy and parenthood. The stigma affects prospective clients, and the services and those providing them. Those lobbying for services to pregnant and parenting adolescents are generally those with a professional interest in the issues. The status of service providers as the sole advocacy for this population reflects in part the lack of a more general community of support.

In addition, neither the adolescents themselves, nor their families, function as an interest group, as do other populations - like homosexuals and the handicapped, for example. Pregnancy, as a temporary condition, provides less of a unifying bond than other statuses. Moreover, neither the adolescents nor their parents are likely to be comfortable increasing the attention paid to their situation. In fact, in Orchard Park, despite the availability of excellent pre-natal care on site, some teenage moms -to-be will not go to the clinic because it is housed in the same building as the teen center they do not want to be seen needing medical attention of any kind.

The gender-related division of labor with respect to services for pregnant and parenting adolescents both reflects and bears upon the lack of popular support. Almost without exception, the direct service workers are female - including teachers, nurses, social workers, day care workers, etc. The administrators, policy makers and funders are overwhelmingly male, including state and local agency officials, legislators, school superintendents, etc. Women may serve on these bodies but do not constitute a voting majority.

Women would likely be empathetic in their attitudes toward young mothers, because of early sex-role socialization, training in altruistic professions or their own experience as teenagers or mothers. Men would likely express condemnatory attitudes toward the mothers, but not express them as blatantly as in denying privileges to the young fathers. This suggests that the double standard is still alive and well.

Many programs do not initiate services prior to pregnancy. Few follow the participants more than briefly after delivery, which is the most severe crisis young mothers face. Most are only able to serve a small portion of the population in need. Comprehensive service delivery programs, most importantly, need to view the extent of their services as extending after delivery. That is to view pregnancy not as a short-term crisis, but as a transition to a new phase of a girl’s life, a phase when she needs the most support.
major improvements are unlikely. The defects of the comprehensive services model (that it is not really comprehensive) reflect the limits of the welfare system, which eliminates such services to begin with. State or agency funding is not enough. Services need to be tied to benefits, which in turn need to become more universal, but which is improbable in this era of scarce public resources.

In Sweden, allowances for children are combined with housing subsidies and a form of child support known as “advance maintenance.” Every child in Sweden under 18 receives an allowance regardless of family income. Furthermore, the state guarantees child support (at 40% of the Swedish reference wage) for single-parent families for each child under 18, regardless of whether paternity has been established. The amount is independent of the income of the custodial parent, and the program has no stigma attached to it. The family receives payment whether the absent parent pays his or her share or not. The Swedish system is as-of-right, whereas our system is means tested, serving only those with low incomes. Our system should seek to guarantee an adequate standard of living to all children.\(^5\)

PART III: SOCIO-SPATIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN PUBLIC HOUSING

This part of the chapter attempts to chronicle the history of public housing in order to arrive at a discussion of its current description as a “female ghetto.” It will briefly describe why it was built initially, and for whom, and how housing legislation led it to serve a different tenant than for whom it was intended. It will explain efforts by the National Commission of Severely Distressed Public Housing to define and label the most severely distressed housing nationally and will explain why Orchard Park is an example of such housing. Finally, it will briefly lay the foundation for a later discussion on redevelopment of Orchard Park in the feminist context this thesis wishes to examine it in.

The system and structures of public housing were initially developed for a stable working class population, which for the most part has abandoned
them for housing in the private sector, it was meant as a temporary housing solution and was a way station on the road to permanent housing. From the program’s formal legislative inception in 1937, it was never intended to serve the non-working poor, but the working poor and starter families. Senator Wagner of New York, principal author of the Housing Act of 1937 declared, “There are some whom we can not expect to serve... those who can not pay the rent.”

Rents originally covered all operating expenses except debt service. The principal and interest on bonds floated by local housing authorities to construct the buildings were paid by the federal government.

Early residents recall broad playgrounds, heat, hot water and basketball courts - pretty decent housing. By 1946, the amount of housing built had doubled from 175,000 units in 1942, to 370,000 units, in 1946. The increase in “permanent” housing was built in areas where war industry or military bases had created new demand for housing. Between 1944 and 1951, minorities occupied between 26% and 39% of public housing. After the war, recognizing pent-up demand for housing and fearing competition from public housing, the real estate industry, claiming public housing was an opening wedge for socialism, sabotaged the program by pressuring Congress to limiting it to the very poor.

With the passing of the 1949 Housing Act, public housing began its decline. Through provisions which gave priority to families displaced by the newly created urban renewal program, and which prohibited discrimination of those on public assistance, the Act ensured that public housing would come to serve an increasingly impoverished population. One could also say that The Act helped to target the neediest, which isn’t necessarily bad. The diminished quality of the housing was the primary issue. Many of the new tenants, poor black and welfare dependent, had little hope of ever leaving. By 1978, minorities occupied over 60% of public housing units and saw their incomes reduced from 64% of the national median income in 1950 to 37% of the national median in 1970. By 1988, the average income of public housing residents was $6539, one-fifth of the national average ($32,144).

Two qualities have marked public housing ever since its beginnings. First, because private interests (real estate industry) opposed it, they have forced the federal government to accept the principle that public housing must always be built below the “common understanding” of satisfactory open-market designs. Second, the supporters of public housing - social workers, architects, building unions, etc. hoped that federal projects would improve on the tenement situation that characterized the city’s slums. These appointees looked
to Europe, especially England and Germany, where after World War I, municipal authorities erected large clusters of housing with loads of open space around them.

Adapting these precedents, the Federal Housing Administration authorized “projects” not isolated buildings here and there. The unintended consequence has been the building of large, ugly and isolated building clusters that have contributed to the isolation and segregation of the minorities and the poor. The cheap look of public housing contributed to its isolation. The lower middle class began to look to the private market for its slice of the American Dream.

Participation in these projects was voluntary in every city and administration was local. Decisions about whether or where to build developments were left to local officials, often dominated by private real estate interests, and over-zealous politicians. Such was the case of the D Street development of public housing in South Boston. Irish politicians in the city and state government were measured by their success at getting affordable housing built for their lower middle class constituents. Other politicians gained popular support by keeping public housing out of their communities. Public housing wasn’t built in affluent areas. As public housing became the home of blacks and other minorities, local control by white politicians contributed to patterns of racial segregation.

Since the 1960’s, operating expenses have out-paced tenants’ incomes. As a result, local housing authorities have lacked income to do day-to-day maintenance, deferring repairs and capital improvements. Public housing had become unpopular politically, which led to a cycle of neglect and underfunding, which in turn, led to stigmatization, racial segregation and further concentration of the poor. Tolerance of incompetent and “paternalistic” public housing management by the government led to increased tenant dependence and an undermined community. Tenant management, as a remedy, entered the arena of debate in the 1960’s, but was never favored by government or local housing authorities.

Until the 1960’s, developments were places of excessive order. Project managers ruled with an iron hand. Residents were hand picked, according to their conformance with the managers’ values and standards of behavior. Harry Spence, court-appointed receiver of the Boston Housing Authority from 1979 to 1984, claimed:

"Until the late 1960’s public housing worked on the theories of despotism. The project manager was the despot. Long time..."
tenants will tell you there was a day when if my kid walked across the lawn, the manager came out and said you either stop that or you're out. That is now looked at rather nostalgically.  

For much of the community, that unrestrained power was being used to enforce community norms. But often it was abused, because there was a class gap between the manager and the tenants. "It was a highly personal and often vicious order."  

The managerial despotism was finally overturned on grounds of both civil rights and civil liberties. Until then public order was maintained through a series of fines, for littering, maintenance, etc. In the late 1960's, tenants protested to eliminate fines because of financial hardship and violation of civil rights, and to fight bad management. In 1967, HUD adopted rules that guaranteed due process in eviction, admission and other management practices. Spence, commenting how the new order was perceived, said:

...in effect the government responded by saying, if we can't do it the old way, we're not doing it at all. If we can't keep unrestrained authority and unrestrained segregation we had before, we won't do it at all. The courts have tied our hands. So screw this community. Wallow in your own misery.

Tenants were left with no mechanism for tougher screening of prospective tenants, no fines, no procedural safeguards to protect the law-abiding residents. Loss of control over the young adults was realized quickly. Tenants relinquished any sense of community responsibility and retreated behind closed doors. Once orderly projects became places of disorder and despair; relationships between management and residents became increasingly bitter. In Boston the worst developments were practically abandoned by the Authority. Enter
the court appointed receiver, Harry Spence charged with restoring order, not more adequate housing or social services. 59

Severely distressed public housing

Currently, there are 1.4 million units of public housing stock in the US, the majority of which are between 40 to 50 years old. In 1989, the National Affordable Housing Act called for a commission to identify the state of public housing in America. This commission, called the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH), which was charged with identifying the condition of and defining criteria for severe distress, conducting demographic analysis, and finally making an national action plan to redress these conditions by the Year 2000. It was also charged with reporting the innovative or appropriate solutions that public housing authorities employed in addressing the problems. The Commission, utilizing the case study method, reported on resident initiatives and support services, management and operations, capital improvement plans and physical conditions, assessing housing viability, regulatory and statutory barriers, evaluation and performance standards, and non-traditional strategies.

Key findings of the Commission included: statistics that reveal the residents are getting poorer, with over 80% below the poverty threshold; and in large cities, over 85% of households are headed by single females, some cities are as high as 95%; wholesale institutional abandonment by police; housing authorities with unfair, unenforced eviction policies; social service providers who are afraid to come on site; physical environments that are almost uninhabitable, no heat or hot water, escalating vacancy rates, lead paint and asbestos, mice and rats, etc.; severely distressed housing is in distressed neighborhoods evidenced by wholesale disinvestment and often crime. The Commission's recommendation to the federal government was that the physical and social distress is overwhelming enough to warrant systematic change in design, management and coordination of services delivery. 60

In its research which encompassed public hearings, discussions with residents and their leaders, and housing officials, the Commission
found three conditions common to most severely distressed developments:

- Residents living in despair and generally needing high levels of social and support services
- Physically deteriorated buildings
- Economically and socially distressed surrounding communities

The physical deterioration of the housing developments may have rapidly reached a point beyond which any attempt at reclaiming them will be economically feasible. The high costs of construction due to inflation and interest rates, and the massive budget cuts in Federal and state housing programs have combined to intensify the dilemma. The presence of criminal activity, obsolete building mechanical systems that require enormous amounts of capital to maintain, and high vacancy rates, coupled with a greater need for resident security, make developments that exhibit the above conditions very difficult to manage.

In order to eliminate severe distress the Commission recommended that a comprehensive treatment approach be adopted as soon as funds could be made available to local housing authorities. Piece-meal physical improvements, commonly known as "triage," have done little to ameliorate social distress. Equal and significant attention to both human and physical conditions, therefore, must be adopted.

Modernization funding has increased in recent years, but the developments that need it most, get the least. Housing authorities have been directing funding to developments where they can get the most "bang for the buck," and have left the worst developments hung out to dry. Coupling this trend with the facts that residents are plagued by lack of involvement in decision making in their communities, security services and building facilities that fail to protect themselves, lack of sufficient social and support services, and lack of economic development opportunities, one finds that residents are overwhelmed with despair and fear.

Local Solutions

Both the Boston and Cambridge housing authorities responded to these needs before the report came out, indeed before the Commission was appointed in 1989. Most of the solutions appear similar, all involve the radical redesign and restructuring of the buildings and sites targeted for redevelopment, which is the largest capital expenditure, and all similarly involve resident involvement opportu-
nities, improved social services, and often management initiatives as well. Currently, because funding for such improvements is underfunded by the government, often only one-third of the development is redesigned and rehabilitated while the other two-thirds is left to rot until adequate funding is obtained. This may change. While the specific design solutions and social ramifications of partial redevelopment will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four, using Orchard Park as a typical case study about to undergo redevelopment, the emphasis here will be on the political implications of redevelopment.

Political Aims for Redevelopment

It is worth noting that the authorities are trying to accomplish wholesale restructuring of peoples' behavior through the redesign of housing. This behavioral goal is to be achieved, theoretically, by replacing substandard housing, which residents feel ashamed to live in, with a more acceptable aesthetic that presumably residents will feel proud of. I would argue that resident involvement in these decisions is paramount to their success. After all, people who reside in private sector housing get to make some choices about their location, (in effect to choose their community) and also are allowed, to some degree, depending on whether or not they own their home, to personalize their environments to the degree to which they do not offend their neighbors or stringent historical regulations. So should public housing residents.

But the middle-class suburban aesthetic to which the housing authority ascribes is one to which public housing residents never fully belong. For along with iconographic symbols such as a gabled roof and detached garage, middle-class citizens are also allowed, if they are financially able to leverage funds, to own their property. Housing authorities, disciples of Oscar Newman's Defensible Space principles of planning, which encourage virtual ownership of spaces of all scales to either an individual or group, theoretically to discourage crime, expect residents to act as owners without the benefit of actual possession.

Virtual ownership is a slap to the face of Americans who believe that ownership, control over property, has a stabilizing effect on society. People who own property do not put graffiti on it or burn it down. It is hoped that people who feel good about their environment, will by extension, feel good about themselves. There is evidence that this will happen, as it would in any culture, with any type of housing. Meanwhile the housing authority buys a good capital investment in housing stock that needs to last for forty or more
years, and more importantly, buys credibility with residents who fear that the predatory practices of private land developers might win over the federal government. Are these investments equitable when, because of inadequate government funding, they yield partial redevelopment in one part of the site and substandard housing right next door? Investment dollars are a meaningful investment symbolically, and they appear to indicate investment in a community, but will these dollars contribute to the greater goal of self-sufficiency for its residents?

**Feminist Goals for Redevelopment**

The central question is will physical redevelopment be enough to actually empower residents, the majority of whom are women and children, to get involved in management and security initiatives, and eventually in delivery of services and economic development opportunities? Is this enough or should the object be for women to own their own property? Either option improves the range of options currently available to minority women, in general.

Jacqueline Leavitt and Susan Saegert, in their work on landlord-abandoned households in New York City and the “community household,” found that women played a crucial leadership role in all the housing cooperatives:

Their long-standing social ties, attachment to their homes and community, and skepticism about housing options, as well as skills, persistence and determination they had learned throughout their lifetimes provided the basis for both the cooperation and the struggle necessary to take over and rehabilitate their buildings.

Women knew that all tasks in organizing and operating (a coop) involved the maintenance and communication of special bonds” and “when men took over these positions they tended to see it as a job, replacing those from which they had retired.

They treated the responsibilities of running the building as part social club. In fact, the constant attention that was needed to do the job, of both a physical and social nature, was mundane, repetitive and had unending demands which had much in common with housework. Women were attached to their homes, which for them was not only their apartment, but their neighbors and buildings. As they had struggled to make homes for their households, they extended that struggle to saving their abandoned buildings.
There are important lessons to be gleamed here. Women are the majority of residents in public housing, and therefore should have the major say about what goes on in the development regarding redesign and restructuring management. In many cases, women head the tenant management associations. This is due in part to their interest in both the state of their housing as well as maintaining emotional ties with friends and to the greater community. Indeed, the leader of the Orchard Park Tenant Association has resided with her family in the development for over 50 years, and knows everyone and just about everything that takes place. But, in order for other women to take their rightful place in these leadership positions, a non-hierarchical (opposite of masculine) process for decision-making, must be established to take advantage of women’s innate ways of communicating that value human relationships, which can and do sustain distressed communities over time.

One way of defining empowerment is the:

\[
\text{process of using ones' own achievement of security and opportunity to enhance the community while benefiting from that improved community in the future.}^{165}
\]

There are other definitions. The housing authority has to reexamine its intentions for its public housing residents; will residents be politically empowered to such a degree that they work their way off welfare and out of the new public housing units in severely distressed urban neighborhoods? Is the goal to stabilize developments so residents have new apartments and crime can be managed? Or is it merely a symbolic goal of the authority in order to maintain the “paternalistic control” it has always exercised since its inception?

---

NOTES

Spatial Discrimination and Housing

North Carolina Press.

4 Chapman, p. 7.
6 Chapman, p. 7.
7 Ibid, p. 8.
8 Ibid, p. 6.
12 Ashcraft, pp. 118-120.
15 Ibid, p. 34.
17 Hayden, “What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like?...,” p. 234.
21 Ibid, p. 235.
30 Ibid, p. 16.
33 Sidel, pp. 14-19.
36 Ibid.
37 Sidel, p. 30.
38 Gilligan, et al., p. 29.
40 Sidel, p. 30.
41 Ibid, p. 35.
42 Ibid, p. 36.
43 Ibid, p. 83.
44 Ibid, pp. 88.
46 Angelou, Maya. I Know Why The Caged Bird Sings. New York: p. 43.
47 Sidel, p. 96.
48 Perlman, Sylva. (1986) “Limits of the Comprehensive Services Model: The
Spatial Discrimination and Housing


Perlman, p.330.


Dreier, Peter. (1992) "From "Projects" to Communities How To Redeem Public Housing" American Prospect, No.10, p. 4.


Dreier, 7.

Dreier, 6.

March, p.13.

NCSDPH


Leavitt, p.492.


Chapter III: A Feminist Framework

...housing which is responsive to women's needs would be linked with public transportation and community services, contain a variety of dwelling types, tenures, sizes and locations, be adaptable and flexible, and encourage co-operative, collective and supportive arrangements.

Wendy Sarkissian, *Housing For People*
This chapter consists of three parts:

- Part I: A Feminist Framework for Design
- Part II: The Design Initiative for Orchard Park
- Part III: Precedents for Design of Supportive Housing

PART I: A FEMINIST FRAMEWORK FOR DESIGN

Feminists argue that women’s biological capacity to reproduce was socially translated into a primary responsibility for child care. Some responsibility for reproduction of people was a consistent feature of women’s roles and structured their access to resources and participation in productive work. A Woman’s role is seen as a social construction, and its variation is largely a function of the way in which production and reproduction have been organized and related to one another.

A feminist response to a more appropriate solution for housing women and children can take various forms and attempt to achieve varied results. The words empowerment, cooperation and community control are often mentioned. A feminist response can be a self-management initiative where before only a patriarchal controlled one existed. Another feminist response could be to address the severe financial impediments women face in regard to housing and developing a housing cooperative, where individual limited financial resources are pooled for the common good. Another goal would be to empower the individual woman through participation in designing housing in order for her to realize the value of her input. There is no one correct answer. They are all appropriate. The suggestions made above are also the kinds of responses that are made outside the mainstream cultures of development, housing, and architecture.

Role of The Non-Profit Firm

There has been only one direction in which the feminist solutions have been realized, however. These designs typically come from the private sector - through non-profit corporations in conjunction with social service agencies and by community groups, often feminist groups, concerned with a local need. The notion that the public sector, the federal or state government, will support the specific aforementioned needs of minority women and children, by building appropriate housing for them is still far off in the future of the United States. While housing exists, supportive housing is rare.
Public housing authorities should consider entering into partnerships with non-profits because the non-profit sector has many roles to play in the development of supportive housing. For example, many non-profit service providers have the experience in not only providing services, but of designing and implementing such services.

Additionally, their demonstrated experience in provision of services combined with their reputations for raising funds through foundations and grants make non-profits a most palatable option for the public sector to enter into partnership with. The combination of public sector funding dollars for modernization of buildings with private foundation grants is superior to the current practice of redevelopment, which provides separate facilities for housing and services.

The non-profit sector can play a role in empowering residents as well. For example, there is money available for public housing residents through technical assistance grants, which enables the tenant association to contract a non-profit firm to train residents on how to manage their development. This money comes from modernization funds which are supplied to housing authorities through HUD. Many public housing residents do not realize that these monies are available to them. It might even be true that the housing authority does not inform residents of such opportunities because the authority would lose a measure of control over the development. Women are most likely to be the majority of participants in such leadership.

Finally, non-profit firms are frequently involved in developing community-based affordable housing. Affordable housing, which is in the same community as the public housing development which contains the supportive housing model, can be the next logical step. If Section 8 certificates were available to graduates of the supportive housing program, they may choose to live in affordable housing developed near their relatives and friends, instead of their own public housing unit. This increases the range of choices available to a young woman upon graduation from the program.

**Feminist Goals for Housing**

Despite alarming statistics that the majority of minority women are living below the poverty line, and raising children alone in abhorrent conditions, our patriarchal society clings to the notion of rehabilitation of what they see as aberrant family structure or behavior, toward the norm- the two-parent nuclear household. No one sector
of government is ready to admit that this has been false for nearly twenty years. So it is not a surprise that supportive housing isn’t built because there is no acknowledgment of the “client” profile to match. Unfortunately, the problem doesn’t go away, and so increasingly, children are sacrificed for the national lack-of-consciousness.

The feminist movement has only recently turned to face the issues of housing inequity for women - issues of racism, sexism and classism that characterize the patriarchal society exacerbate the problems women face in housing. Shelter is crucial and women do not have equal access to it. Their systematic marginalization in the housing market is caused by their low incomes, which reduces them to being renters, most often. They have little or no control over the choice of their housing. Landlords who exclude families with children are especially cruel. For many women it is this practice that renders them homeless and with no alternatives. The shelter movement cropped up because of the discrimination by landlords of women with children and because of the increasing instances of physical abuse perpetrated on them by husbands and boyfriends.

The needs of women who have escaped a violent domestic environment and the needs of single parents are similar in two ways: both are undergoing transitions and may require financial assistance and additional social support and services for a period of time. Thus “second stage” or “transitional” housing was born. In the US it is more commonly known as transitional housing, and has been generally regarded as temporary, hence the term. Some refer to it as “special needs” housing, implying extraordinary need for so-called nontraditional households. But, the need for longer-term housing, often associated with services, dramatically increases the survival rate for families still vulnerable from a short stay at a shelter. This second-stage housing helps families transition from survival to recovery. Because shelters were initially funded by the private sector and non-profit community groups, the transitional housing movement grew up out of the same. The public sector has lagged behind in accomplishing similar efforts.

The first question to ask is whether women have specific housing needs as women or whether the problems women face in the housing market are primarily a function of their lower incomes. A related question is whether women, if given the chance, would design their housing more in accord with their daily needs - and the demands of household and child care that are impediments to earning income outside the home. A third question would be what result is wished for - what role does housing play in women’s self-fulfillment and economic and political empowerment?
Rachel Bratt, in “Mutual Housing: Community-based Empowerment,” attempts to define empowerment and how the term has come to be known. She links early use of the word with advocates who claimed that community-based housing had a unique ability to promote a sense of control both for the individual and for the community. However, this housing can be contrasted with subsidized rental situations in which tenants are generally excluded from control and from participation in decision-making, such as public housing residents. Traditionally, to the extent that housing and empowerment can be thought of together, there has been an explicit assumption that empowerment could be maximized through home ownership. Only then could full control and autonomy be achieved and only then could security against unwanted displacement be provided, unless the home owner stopped making mortgage payments. There is an implicit link between being able to pay for something and then being rewarded by the control or possession of it. What can be achieved if residents, specifically women, cannot raise funds to own their housing?

Empowerment can also be defined as the control a people have over the course of their lives, or the amount of power a group has influencing its community. Often thought of in political terms, empowerment actually encompasses three interrelated dimensions:

- Psychological: people must possess the belief that they are capable of acquiring the skills to take control over situations. People have confidence in themselves, which allows them to take responsibility in their lives. People believe in their own self-worth and equality.

Psychological pride must be combined with action or political empowerment, which is decision-making authority. At the least, political empowerment involves the ability to determine the conditions of ones’ living or working environment, which, in turn, is both a cause and an effect of ones’ economic status. To the extent that a home is viewed as an extension of ones’ self, perceptions about the inadequacy of physical space is important. Political empowerment occurs when individuals organize into a strong group that can apply pressure and is recognized as a force in the community. The Orchard Park Tenant Association is a prime example of this kind of body.

Economic empowerment is defined as access to the institutions that provide the resources, goods and services needed or desired by all members of society. Usually people who earn higher wages have greater control of their work situation, in their employment options, as well as in their access to goods. The reverse is true for
those who work in non-professional, unskilled work settings, namely women and minorities, and more so for those individuals dependent on welfare. Not only does one's economic position determine ones' ability to obtain goods, but it also affects ones' self image and the perception that society-at-large has of the person. Ways to gauge this type of empowerment would be to measure participation in job training and educational programs, or whether financial security was better after moving into a mutual-based type of housing. In public housing, the desired goals of individuals are harder to pinpoint. The single most surprising notion I've learned about public housing is that while I expected that people would want to move out of public housing the first chance they got, they actually expressed little intention of ever wanting to leave, despite the deteriorated condition of their buildings, and the dangerous living conditions for themselves and their children. It seems their connection to the Orchard Park community was very strong, and in fact, outweighed their fears. So a goal for public housing tenants might be to be able to get off welfare, and to earn a decent living while still being eligible for public housing.

In Dolores Hayden's book *Redesigning the American Dream*, she chronicles the examples of housing design that feminists conceived of as a way of alleviating women's domestic work, often by creating opportunities for cooperative housekeeping. One criticism of this kind of housing, however, is that it concentrates solely on abdicating household work as a method of empowerment. Some feminists would argue that household work does not belong to women by virtue of having been born female, and so it is not their responsibility to abdicate the job. Little personal satisfaction can come of giving away responsibility that was not yours to begin with.
Nonetheless, Hayden also provides examples of housing designs for single parents and collective households that go beyond the needs of the isolated nuclear family in the single family house to include collective solutions for child care and mutual support. Feminist planner Jacqueline Leavitt has drawn up plans for the “New American house” (Figure 3.1) that include space for home-based businesses and various configurations of “family.” Architect Roy Strickland of the Hudson studio has designed workers housing that allows for a swing space in an apartment to be used flexibly, as business space or studio space.

Segregated land uses of the modern city and the growth of suburbia, as well as lower incomes, disadvantage women because women have more limited access than men to automobiles and are more dependent on public transportation. For women housing consumers, this means that location of housing and its convenience to jobs, child care, shopping and recreation take on added significance.

Examples of a housing type that provide services on-site from child care to job and family counseling and which cater specifically to the needs of a single parent are more rare, but do exist. The combination of affordable housing, convenient child care and a supportive community are most often mentioned in the same breath as “special-needs” housing. The inclusion of physical space for communal activities, especially meal preparation and dining, and/or flexible dwelling units that respond to a diversity of household types is important. Such examples are the Nina West homes in London, and the Single Mother’s Home in Amsterdam, designed by Aldo Van Eyck, which provides on-site child care and counseling.

There is a dearth of American examples in this arena. A project developed by the Women’s Institute for Housing and Economic Development in Boston incorporates space for women to develop businesses at home, which is also a key element of Leavitt and West’s design for the New American House competition, a prototype of which is being built in Minnesota. It is also central to the Strickland/Carson Associate Project in Manhattan.

The irony is that with the erosion of the nuclear family, the single-parent family has become the majority, and so further institutional or societal stigmatization of households headed by females by claiming that women and their families have special needs only reinforces the gender stereotypes. Two incomes are needed to escape poverty, in some cases. Efforts to portray the female-headed family as deviant are made in order to protect the primacy of the male-headed family. These needs aren’t “special” or “extra-ordinary,” but very ordinary,
and in fact are becoming pervasive in all cultures and so need to be recognized as belonging to the common majority.

**Designing With Women**

In the 1970’s both Canada and the US needed to reexamine their housing strategies. The United States turned to cash assistance for targeted households, but Canada expanded its non-profit and co-operative housing programs. Both strategies represented a shift from a centralized housing program to one that increased control at the local level. In 1973, Canadian federal legislation established the non-profit cooperative housing program. In 1978, amendments to the Canadian National Affordable Housing Act placed responsibility for actual development of housing projects in the hands of local community groups and municipalities.

The purpose of the non-profit cooperative housing program was to extend the social status benefits of quasi-home ownership to two groups: a moderate income group which could not afford to purchase a dwelling, and second, to low-income residents who received further assistance to reduce housing charges to a maximum of 30% of adjusted family income. It was intended that there would be an income mix, thereby reducing stigmatization and avoiding the ghettos of the poor which had plagued public housing. Single parents were attracted to the co-ops for two main reasons: one, because the mix of incomes did reduce the stigma and, second, because with their emphasis on equality, equity and mutual self-help, the housing co-ops did not appear to practice the discrimination against female heads of families practiced elsewhere.

Since women housing consumers are more likely to rent housing, they are also more likely to benefit from the positive aspects of collective ownership, such as greater housing security, and freedom from worries about eviction for housing conversions or demolition. In short, non-profit co-ops were described as being the housing of choice to which many women with children aspired.

Founders of many co-ops were active in the women’s movement and their goals were to provide a supportive community for women and opportunities for empowerment. Selection procedures sometimes gave preference to women who were members of the feminist movement. Other co-ops focused primarily on providing housing to single parents without a specific ideology or set of social objectives. Conscious of being called “exclusionary,” founders were very careful not to limit membership to specific politics, but instead strived to be inclusive.
Eight elements were identified to be critical in planning housing for single parents; the most important is affordability, two other non-physical elements are security of tenure, and procedures which ease the transition and the move in. The last five are physical elements: accessibility based on the location of housing, the provision of appropriate facilities for children; minimal household maintenance; the creation of opportunities for sharing and support among residents and privacy.

All of the women's housing cooperatives incorporated these elements to varying degrees, based on the relative importance of physical design, services, and participation in management and decision-making. Founding members had to define how women's needs translated into design, such as the inclusion of physical space for communal activities, especially meal preparation and dining, and/or flexible dwelling units that respond to a diversity of household types. The first priority is often to take control of the design and development process, to hire their own architect rather than let an outside resource group (consultant) decide. Often architects were chosen on the basis of their experience with participatory program processes and community design.

The Beguinage As A Model For Public Housing

For example, in Toronto a women's housing cooperative renovated a stately old building and called it the Beguinage, which was completed in 1984. The co-op explained its choice of name this way: During the 13th and 14th centuries, there were groups of women in European countries called "beguines". They lived in communal houses called "beguinages". (Figure 3.2)

The beguines were sole support women who purchased their own homes and shared their lives with other women. The co-op which was to be purchased by women, renovated, where possible, by women, maintained and sustained by women carries the name "Beguinage" in honor and memory of the early Beguines.
Daphne Spain discusses the beguinage as a model for public housing in her article, “Public Housing: Poorhouse or Beguinage?” She makes the case that because the Dutch model acknowledged the potential for “work” and various leadership roles among its residents, it is a useful model for public housing redevelopment. The Dutch beguines engaged in craft work. Spain postulates that public housing policy which aims to enable tenants to purchase their unit reinforces the cultural stereotype that home owners are responsible citizens.

It houses 28 stacked townhouse units, and is located in downtown near a large public housing project. (Figures 3.3 and 3.4) Although the location did not seem ideal for security purposes, it was deemed optimal because of proximity to social services and to public transportation. It was important to the founders to create diverse unit sizes. Living areas are on different floors to facilitate individuals to maintain different social lives at the same time.

There are many degrees of privacy within the dwellings. Different layouts were created, alternating one, two and three bedroom units within the context of a simple form of stacking, which facilitates servicing. The one bedrooms were in mid-block, the three bedrooms are in row houses at the end. The board insisted on same-
size bedrooms rather than the conventional “master” and “junior” bedrooms because they assumed that some women would be sharing units in order to afford the rent. Secondly, they objected to the term “master” which has a paternalistic connotation. This modification was quite a big deal and required persuasiveness by founders to the mortgage company itself. Another “big deal” was putting entrances to the units through the kitchen. The women thought it eminently sensible, (because it has a floor that could withstand dirty children with wet boots), but the men couldn’t understand why. Special attention was paid to sound and energy conservation. Walls and floors were treated for extra sound insulation and extra insulation and sealing was used to keep heat costs down.11

Arguments with the mortgage company regarding communal space, which departed from a conventional apartment building were common. Members wanted an extra room on each floor to be used as a community space or overnight room, but the financiers thought it economically infeasible. At the Beguinage there is a small meeting room, a coordinator’s office and one laundry room for the entire project. Co-op groups often expressed frustration with the financier’s guidelines which did not allow funding for meeting space essential to transacting normal co-op business or developing supportive community. The lack of communal space, it seems, is more in accord with the home ownership ethic of private zones, and not the ethic of sharing. Outdoor areas are private and attached to ground floor units. Childcare and exchanges of services are arranged informally because the government did not initially pay for the children’s daycare.12

The advantages of women’s housing projects that emphasize participation in management cannot be underestimated and is a fundamental tenet of feminist goals. Management is seen as a learning experience where women learn from one another and where they develop new models of decision making. Questions of participation and hierarchy are stressed. For some residents this may be seen as equally important as the dwelling itself. It is an opportunity to develop financial, maintenance, and leadership skills.

In his book Housing By People, John Turner outlines how participation in management can empower residents:

When dwellers control the major decisions and are free to make their own contribution to the design, construction or management of their housing, both the process and the environment produces stimulate the individual and social well-being. When people have no control over, nor responsibility for key decisions in the housing
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process, on the other hand, dwelling environments may instead become barriers to personal fulfillment and a burden to the economy.

Women's co-ops need more than housing in a good location to be successful, however. Residents seek, and in some cases need, supportive community; they value the opportunities that co-ops provide for participation in decision-making and learning new skills.

But to the disappointment of many Canadian feminists, the co-ops have no distinctly feminist design solutions. Their most striking accomplishment is that they continue to be built. Their innovation beyond the physical environment, an environment constrained by bureaucratic hurdles, has been in the realm of social innovation. The feminist approach has gone beyond housing and shelter, using delivery of essential services, the creation of community, and the idea of an economic base supporting on-site jobs for the community. Using housing as a base for local economic development runs through feminist literature. But, the very existence of housing developed, controlled and managed by women, provides an alternative paradigm to the market experiences of women who are marginalized housing consumers.¹³

PART II: THE DESIGN INITIATIVE FOR ORCHARD PARK

American Women Residing In Public Housing

The residents of public housing find that their lives are strictly regulated by both the power of their public landlord (the federal government) and the architecture that has come to be intended for their rehabilitation, but was not built for this purpose. Moreover, to the American public, the reputation of such housing is that it warehouses “broken families” of poor people. In a society that

Figures 3.5 and 3.6: Public housing brochure illustrations
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equates poverty, divorce and the need for social assistance with personal failure and flaws in one’s character, such housing would logically be scorned. Clients of public housing, fearful of public housing policies of racism, ghettoization and management brutality, have no where else to go. Women with children have even fewer options. Brochures written to help them are condescending in their portrayal of women’s roles. (Figures 3.5 and 3.6) This brochure portrays a 1950’s era, white housewife, kerchief on head, hanging out clothes to dry in front of her public housing unit. The facing picture portrays a young white woman, an elderly white woman, and a black woman conversing in front of a public housing building. Surely, this depiction does not pertain to the majority of developments in Boston, where the majority of women are minorities.

Long dark hallways are feared and yet, by necessity, made into playgrounds because mothers were even more fearful of sending children outside. Strict rules which govern the keeping of pets, having guests and hours to use washing machines are all evidence of despotic management styles. The other “laws” that affect public housing residents are the laws of the street. Gang violence and rampant drug dealing inside common hallways, in apartments and outside buildings as well as in basements and on roofs make women and their children prisoners. The majority of these families, headed by women, feel outraged, frightened, depressed and powerless.

Despite the fact that publicly subsidized housing has become a debased social environment through its design and management, some successes at “reclaiming” the private and public territory back from drug dealers have been realized over the last ten years. Fear and anger have been turned into empowering catalysts for self-help. Community surveillance of hallways, and self management by a tenant organization are aimed at replicating suburban neighborhood crime prevention strategies which have been shown to be successful. Despite the lack of capital to buy the apartment, people do feel a commitment to the extent that people can “own the space they live in, around and close to by taking care of it. It is the sense of ownership that has been denied residents of public housing that has proven to facilitate the destruction of ‘someone else’s property.” People deserve to be in control of their own community. The net effect is a revitalized, humanized environment despite the stereotypes that poor, uneducated people are incapable of self-management of their own environment. Tenant management organizations aid housing authorities by identifying and setting standards for residents, having strong leadership and support by residents and reeducating residents toward fostering self-esteem and self-efficacy. Women by vir-
tue of their majority status, and their personal investment in family, have proven to be leaders in tenant management organizations in public housing projects all over the country.¹⁴

**A Feminist Initiative in Boston**

In 1992, a group of women representing the professions of community-based services, housing development, planning, real estate law, and the Mass. Dept. of Public Health decided to propose a solution to the problem of combating the highest infant mortality rate in Boston. They believed that for communities of color, linguistic minorities and low income women, the problems of impending or actual homelessness, lack of information and support and other barriers to access to care were the root causes of infant mortality. They applied for and received a grant from Boston Healthy Start Initiative to do a housing and human services needs assessments of 30 low-income mothers in the neighborhoods of Roxbury, Dorchester and Mattapan (Boston’s most economically distressed neighborhoods, to determine whether there was a need for supportive housing, which they suspected there was, and to determine what the programmatic needs were for such a housing design. Roxbury itself is home to a culturally diverse population of African-Americans, Hispanics, Cape Verdians, Haitians, and other minority groups.

This group called itself the *Young Mothers Housing Consortium*. The consortium brought together two experienced non-profit organizations, the Women’s Institute for Housing and Economic Development (WIHED) and the Traditional Childbearing Group (TCBG). The setting for the project was focused in the community - a critical feature, because as young women normally leave their neighborhood to access services and support, their connections with informal networks of support are ruptured. They travel out of the neighborhood because the service providers are often afraid to come into the community, despite their claims to funding sources that they are doing so. The program’s philosophy is to “support and implement existing family and community support, thus strengthening the entire neighborhood rather than the individual woman in need.”¹⁵ Accordingly, the focus of the program is on empowerment and self-help in order to sustain community.

The Consortium consulted with the Public Facilities Department, which administers property owned by the City of Boston, and began to identify sites in Roxbury, the most impacted neighborhood of the survey, for two such projects. These two projects were thought of as models or demonstration projects for which there was no existing reference. The Consortium further enlisted support from the City of Boston Department of Health and Hospitals, which do-
nated funds, the Mass. Maternity Foundation, City of Boston Maternal Health Commission, the Mass. Dept. of Public Welfare, shelters and social service agencies that provide job training, GED classes and other services. In addition, the Consortium interviewed the program directors of Re-Vision House, Brookview House, St. Margarets, Crittendon Hastings House as well as shelters serving battered and abused women. Valuable input from the health care and service providers was incorporated into the program summary presented to the City of Boston.\(^1\)

One site was to be donated by the city of Boston, and the other was hoped to be a joint planning effort with the Boston Housing Authority (BHA) and the Orchard Park Tenant Association (OPTA) and thus built in the Orchard Park Development. It should be noted that there are no existing models for transitional housing on public housing authority property. Both projects were intended to be transitional supportive housing programs that provided services on site for young mothers.

In addition, the Young Mothers Consortium was to prepare a financial feasibility plan of the projects, and identify funding sources, both public and private, which would supply capital funds for building and funding for services. A public site designation process which enlists community support would be initiated for the off-site project. For the residence at Orchard Park, major support would have to come from first, the tenant task force, and second, from the community initiatives and planning departments of the BHA.

The needs assessment revealed a critical need for a residential program for young women, who were either pregnant or parenting, which included individual case management, childbirth education, peer support and access to primary health care, and incorporates the supportive empowerment philosophy and methods of TCBG. This philosophy is similar to the Canadian's Women's cooperatives mentioned earlier. The comprehensive health services will be realized through collaboration with numerous health and human services agencies in Boston.\(^2\)

Funding for these two projects was targeted to McKinney Transitional Housing Program, whose Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) had been recently issued and could provide funds for securing program, acquisition and rehabilitation funds for five years. In order to match the McKinney funds, if awarded, the Consortium was going to target private sources, such as foundations, for the rest of the funds necessary to ensure long-term viability. Once the program was operating, the Consortium would serve as advisors to the project
and assist in evaluating it for replication. TCBG will continue to co-
ordinate services for the duration of the program.¹⁸

The model to be built in the public housing development at Or-
chard Park is a different proposition from the one proposed in the
Roxbury community in general. Sources of funding required for
acquisition of the site, for example, are unnecessary. The city of
Boston, through the support of the federal government, owns the
property. Therefore, funds to rehabilitate a building address in a
public housing development would stem from the public sector and
not from the mixture of private foundation and McKinney funds
that the other project would combine. In essence, the Consortium
was asking the BHA to rehabilitate a building or portion of a larger
building with modernization funds that were coming down the pipe-
line any minute, and then let them borrow the building entry in
order for a privately funded social service provider to manage the
residential program, which would serve the same constituency as
the newly developed public housing units.

The need had been established, the verbal support from area hu-
man and social service agencies had been enlisted, and the Consor-
tium had a planning grant to begin programming of the residences.
The Public Facility Department was being very helpful in identifying
sites which, with a mind-boggling suffusion of funds, would be able
to be rehabilitated. The last battle to be fought was in forming a
management partnership with the Boston Housing Authority.

David Cortiella, administrator of the BHA, wrote a letter of
support to the Women’s Institute for the Young Mothers Hous-
ing Consortium. The letter stated that the BHA “was pleased to
support the efforts of the Women’s Institute and the Consortium in
developing supportive residences for ‘their’ pregnant and parenting
mothers.” Furthermore, the BHA agreed ”that there is a critical
need to provide integrated health, educational and social services,
in supervised small-scale residences to low-income mothers,” many
of whom, they acknowledge,” reside in our public housing develop-
ments or are applicants on our waiting list.”

The letter also indicated that the BHA agrees that the Consortium’s
philosophy of early intervention with comprehensive services sub-
stantially increases rates for healthy infants and the attainment of
basic education and gainful employment by the young mother.” The
letter ended with a pledge of support to work with the Consortium
over the next 8-12 months to create “opportunities to create
residences in existing BHA developments where tenant groups have
identified a need and an interest, or providing access to the pro-
gram based on Section 8 certificates for the development of new residences."

This letter seems to indicate, at the very least, a willingness on the part of the housing authority to explore possibilities if a tenant organization had already exhibited an interest in accommodating such a program on-site. The Orchard Park Tenant Association voted unanimously to work with the Consortium to develop a transitional program for mothers at Orchard Park. It appears that the BHA was aware of the critical need for such a program, and were confident that Orchard Park residents could benefit greatly from it. Furthermore, there were eight boarded-up buildings waiting for redevelopment funds, ready to begin the process of rebuilding, and vacant buildings are much easier to plan around than are occupied ones. The relocation process that had to be undertaken to move the families which resided in those eight buildings took over a year. So, on the surface it would seem that with a buy-in from the tenant task force, and the absence of any structural impediments, that the BHA and the Consortium could collaborate on this residential model at Orchard Park. This is not the case, however, and the reasons why the model is not being developed are really the core of the original thesis research.

Structure of the supportive model at Orchard Park

The overall structure of the supportive housing model at Orchard Park is a hybrid, pieces of it are taken from existing supportive housing models for pregnant and parenting teens, for persons recovering from drug abuse, and from formerly homeless families. These pre-existing models are (in order), the Vision House in Yarmouth, MA, the Miracle Village in Cleveland, Ohio, and the Homelife Management Center in Wilmington, Delaware. These programs are profiled in detail at the end of this chapter.

The Orchard Park model is being designed for 10 pregnant and parenting teenage women from the ages of 16.5 on up through their twenties. The women may have one child and be pregnant with their second child upon acceptance to the program, although the emphasis will be to try to reach women before their second pregnancy. The housing model is a transitional residence, that is to say that it will accommodate its residents up to 24 months after they enter the program. Fulfillment of the program goals, which are based on the attainment of life skills, generally takes between 18 and 24 months. At a certain point, the woman will be promoted from Step One accommodations, which are congregate bedrooms, shared by mother and baby, to Step Two accommodations, which are
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independent apartments. Along with the attainment of certain goals, then, is the award of certain measures of privacy and responsibility which have a distinct architectural form. Women residing in congregate bedrooms have access to shared kitchen, dining and living facilities. Women in independent apartments have their own kitchen and living areas. The program directors decide whether a mother has reached her goals, and promote her through the steps of the model (literally) and then on to graduation.

Only women who are currently residing in, or are eligible for public housing, can be considered eligible for this supportive housing model. This housing model is being developed by tenant leaders at Orchard Park, who know firsthand that there is a number of young women, first at Orchard Park, and second, at other BHA developments, who are currently residing in dysfunctional home situations, and whom need to be removed from such an environment. The peer pressure exerted on teenagers from parents and others in the community is intense, and more importantly, often contains incorrect, and possibly harmful information. A central tenet of the model is that it is necessary to remove the young woman and her baby (or child and unborn baby) from such environments for an 18 to 24 month period. It is only then that the young woman may be able to concentrate on learning how to take care of her children and herself in a quiet, safe, healthy environment.

The teenager will be surrounded by role models who help her identify her educational goals, her parenting skills and goals, and then help her reach them. The process is one of guidance, not of dictating the same rules to everyone. Each woman will be assessed as an individual, and individual goal statements will reflect that diversity. Program managers are there to keep the girls on their individual tracks, but also to enforce the house rules regarding sharing of communal facilities, curfews, etc. Program managers also enforce such rules as attendance at high school every day, or participation in job-training programs. They may help coordinate doctor's appointments, and transportation. The program managers may be the only adults in the housing model, and so it is necessary that the model be staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It will be more likely that the majority of participants will be under eighteen, but that some residents will indeed be over eighteen. At this point it is impossible to know precisely what the ages of the participants would be, but it is hoped by the Consortium and the OPTA, that the BHA will accept minors into the program. This could be accomplished if the teen had someone to co-sign her program lease.
The younger teens are more at risk of having a repeat pregnancy than are women who have their first child when they are eighteen or twenty. The young, pregnant, teens usually drop out of school, and find that they have to get welfare to support their child. Older women who have finished high school, have more options, because they could find a job. The younger women develop a fatalistic attitude, and seldom return to school. They leave their children with friends or relatives and try to relive their missed teen years. All of this behavior is extremely damaging to the babies, and the women never learn how to parent. The teenager’s own mothers may not have been good parents to them, and so they have bad role models for parenting their babies.

The BHA believes that it is possible to offer services to at-risk tenancies either on the site of family developments, as in Orchard Park, or to teenage residents in their homes, that will better enable residents to conduct their lives, than the proposed comprehensive supportive program will. The BHA solution, is a combination of case management offered to individuals in their homes with the development of a one-stop social, health and educational service center is available to meet the needs of all residents. The Consortium, likewise, believes in case management, but believes it must be offered in a structured residential setting which removes the girl from the problem, and teaches her how to manage her own life. The Consortium fails to see how the housing authority could actually make the claim that they could deliver individual services, because such a mechanism does not exist at the present time.

The BHA likens the Consortium’s proposal to “boutique housing.” One significant problem is that we know the area service providers are claiming to serve Orchard Park in their funding proposals, and then failing to do outreach at Orchard Park. Furthermore, the MIT report revealed that there is no guarantee that the housing authority will sanction a “family investment center” at Orchard Park from which these comprehensive services will be delivered. Further, it reported that, despite an on-site health center at Orchard Park, the majority of young women who are pregnant or parenting will not access the facilities because they lack the privacy they seek to deal with these issues. They would rather travel by bus or train to another neighborhood, where no one knows them, to access health care. Therefore, a proposal that claims to deliver services to these teenagers’ doors is sure to be unpopular with the teenage women. It is doomed to fail.

It is only by providing a strong incentive for an independent apartment away from their mothers’ supervision, and the help of case
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managers who provide an extensive referral system, and by eliminating the stigmatization that the young women apparently already feel, that this program will be a success. The role that the residential program and the design of the building which houses it plays a crucial role in convincing these women that this is the place to be. It is true that the housing will be different from the other units, but the difference will be in spirit and in privileges earned through participation, and the reward is empowerment and independence.

The issues that are described here are not insurmountable problems. While it is true that there is no specific reference for this model in public housing, there are models which engendered the same kinds of criticism from housing authorities, but which were overcome through collaborative effort between service providers and the authority. The Boston Housing Authority is aware of the operating procedures and unfortunately chooses to ignore the obvious lessons that can be learned from them. This indicates, to the Consortium, an unwillingness for the Community Initiatives Department to be responsible for an “initiative” that could be replicated nationally, and for which the housing authority would get good publicity. This impasse indicates the state of public housing policy with regard to unique housing models. This thesis seeks to establish new foundations for public housing policy which instead accommodate such unique and beneficial housing prototypes. The policy analysis in this chapter, influenced by the context of redevelopment and the application through design, concludes in the final chapter with a new proposal for public housing policy.

PART III: PRECEDENTS FOR DESIGN OF SUPPORTIVE HOUSING IN PUBLIC HOUSING

Vision House-Yarmouth, MA

There are three relevant models to pay specific attention to. One is called Vision House and is located in Yarmouth, Massachusetts. It is managed by the Yarmouth Housing Authority, in a residential setting of its own, across the street from Yarmouth High School. It is not part of an urban public housing project like Orchard Park is. But the funds which rehabilitated it, subsidize it, and maintain it, come from the housing authority and the Department of Social Services. It houses eight young women who are required to attend high school while residing in the program. The girls are pregnant when they enter the program and are not allowed to have a repeat pregnancy while in the program. An outside vendor, Cape Cod Community
Services, provides services to residents who are also charged a fee of 30% of income for rent, payable to the housing authority. Women also pay some food costs.

The program is structured as four congregate units which share bathroom, kitchen, dining and living areas, and four independent units which have their own cooking and bathing facilities.

(Figures 3.7 through 3.10)

Once a girl has passed a series of checkpoints that are determined by the director, she is eligible to graduate to her own apartment on site. Some skills that are pre-
requisites for passing are parenting skills, budgeting skills, emotional well-being of mother and child, etc. These independent units are separated architecturally and have their own entrances and egress stairs, but are visible from the director’s office.

The girls sign a lease that binds them to maintaining the rules of the program and to regular contact with a case manager from the Department of Social Services. Eviction policies are spelled out, and the girl’s family members, who may or may not reside in public housing in Yarmouth or New Bedford, where many of the girls come from, are held accountable for them. If evicted, the girl is turned over to the Department of Public Welfare, who assists them in finding an apartment. There have been very few problems of this nature, due to the consistent contact between the girl and the case manager. Usually the trouble can be headed off and corrected before eviction becomes a reality. Such could be the case at Orchard Park.

Daycare is an issue because although the girls would be eligible for protective day care slots from DSS, the pool is limited on the Cape and many leave their babies to the care of the house director, who has her hands full during the day while the girls attend school. When they finish the program the girls are given “priority slots” on the waiting list for public housing and move out on their own. They are still able, and often depend on, verbal contact with Vision House staff, and even drop in to visit after they’ve moved on. Some come back on holidays to have dinner and visit.

Miracle Village - Cleveland, Ohio

The second relevant example is very different from Vision House, which is in a rather suburban setting. This program is called Miracle Village and is located in Outhwaite Homes Estate, a public housing development of 1500 units in Cleveland, Ohio. It is managed by the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority. This program serves essentially the same clientele as in Yarmouth, but is targeted at providing supportive housing for families who are at risk because a mother has been using drugs. It provides a safe, sober haven for women to recover from drug abuse and not have to worry that their children will be taken from them.

Needless to say, the legal ramifications of this project were much more challenging than the Consortium’s proposal. The client is infinitely more vulnerable to slipping back over the edge of recovery into destructive, illegal behavior. Nevertheless, the director of the Housing Authority, Claire Freeman, recognized the need for families
to stay together, and was sure the role that providing housing played was crucial. She was a former social worker, and knew that services by themselves were ineffective in bringing about life changes of this proportion. She knew firsthand that the state of crisis that plagues many women, constantly living on the edge of homelessness, and with the fear of children being taken away, was neither conducive to recovery nor empowerment.

Like Orchard Park, the Outhwaite Homes Estate development was fortunate to have a health clinic on-site, already in place. This clinic is tied to the Metrohealth Medical Center and to St. Vincent's hospital. In partnership with the health clinic, the housing authority decided to offer a supportive housing program for women who had undergone a pre-treatment program which proved they were not using any drugs. From there they signed a “treatment lease” committing them to a 24 month residential program, which required periodic physicals, interaction with a case manager, and the responsibility to pay rent to the housing authority, for which they would receive the program services for free. Services were funded by federal drug rehabilitation money. Children were guaranteed slots in DSS-sponsored day care, and after-school and summer programs.

The rules for this program are very strict, and in order to ensure sober housing for families, any drug use is punishable by eviction. There are no second chances. If the woman and her family are evicted from the particular residential program, it is not necessarily from the larger public housing development they are evicted as well. If she were evicted from public housing, the Department of Social Services is responsible for finding replacement housing for her family.

The Estate is comprised of 40 residential buildings, a physical plant, a community building, a junior high school, an elementary school and a recreation center. At the very heart of the development, at the edge of a city-owned playground, is the location of the two buildings which house "Miracle Village." See Figure 3.11. These two buildings house 26 units, on the two upper floors, and shared communal and program space on the ground floors. There are plans to build a “secure” entry point that links the two buildings next year.

The placement of buildings for such a vulnerable client population parallels the chosen location for a supportive housing model at Orchard Park. (Figure 3.12) The heart of the development is symbolic, and it seeks to integrate the population of the so called “special needs” housing with the rest of the community; but, it also
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places it in the palm of the development as a protective gesture to the outside neighborhood. Finally, a "drug-free zone" has been enacted in Cleveland in selective locations, prohibiting sale and use of drugs within 20 feet of places such as recreation centers, and schools. The director of Miracle Village says "the drug dealers have moved away from the Village, at least as far as down the street away from the women and children, out of respect for the program."

mentioned that this project was undertaken by the housing author.

Figure 3.11: Miracle Village site plan (buildings in black)

Figure 3.12: Selected location of supportive housing model, Dearborn et al. are dotted.

Home Life Management Center

This program was developed jointly by the Wilmington, Delaware Housing Authority, the YWCA and a state housing finance agency. It was aimed at providing housing for persons who had failed regular screenings for public housing, i.e. persons under 18, those coming out of penal facilities, etc.

The design program consisted of rehabilitating eight rowhouses for
16 families, converting the upper two floors as congregate bedrooms with shared bathrooms and kitchens, and punching through the ground floor walls to unify the grade level for program space for service providers. An addition was put on the back which expanded the available program space and connected the bedrooms on the upper floors by a common hallway. The rowhouse facades were saved, which lent the project the look of a typical residential development for that area. The only atypical element was a communal entry that was wider than surrounding entries.

The YWCA, as the service provider, was responsible for minor repairs and maintenance in the building, including painting, rubbish disposal, and landscaping, which was also done by residents. The housing authority funded the capital costs of the project, using the allowable amount of modernization funds available (for an off-site project). The YWCA paid all the operating expenses for services and 24-hour daycare. The YWCA also raised the funds to accomplish this through the United Way, the McKinney Act funding for homeless families, through city and county CDBG monies (Community Development Block Grant), and through a Community Service Block Grant (CSBG). The state financing agency gave an outright grant to cover extra costs and a deferred payment mortgage with no-penalty extensions.

What is most unusual about this project, in addition to the fact that the housing authority was a willing partner, is that all three parties—the PHA, the YWCA, and the state funding agency—came to conditional agreements before they signed the deals. For example, the state signed a conditional deal until the YWCA’s private funding came through. The YWCA took the initiative and went to the PHA with a contract for service provision in hand, asking the PHA for appropriate facilities. The PHA promised to modernize a building for the YWCA to run its program in, and to pay for utilities. Because all the pieces are seldom in place before a venture like this is realized, this is a very important precedent.

The role of the non-profit YWCA, its reputation for service provision, and fundraising ability, is of crucial importance to the success of the project. The willingness of the housing authority to undertake a venture for persons who were financially eligible, but not recommended, is also critical. It should be mentioned that this project was undertaken by the housing authority only after it came under the direction of a woman.
As long as all the residents were public housing eligible, the PHA did not have a problem with collecting rent. The residents had to sign an amended lease agreement with the PHA, which mandated that they participate in the service programs while residing in the housing. All other tenant-landlord rules were standard to the PHA lease. Occupancy depended on eligibility, and on continued participation. Participants are granted a transfer into the public housing system after the transitional program at Homelife ends, which means there is no wait between the two accommodations.

Program directors do not want residents to remain in public housing. Although some have disabilities due to physical impairment or to abuse of alcohol and drugs and might want to remain in public housing, for others, especially women with children, higher education is stressed. It is hoped that these women, given the choice of: another transitional household which is larger and more private; Section 8 certificates which are either tied to private construction projects or which allow mobility; or, to public housing, will not choose the latter.

By establishing a licensed daycare near the program, but not on-site, the YWCA hopes to educate women about how to use the social service transfer systems available to them. The YWCA helps its residents to get into state jobs programs which have subsidized daycare. The notion of relying on welfare for DSS daycare slots is a last resort, and not encouraged. Empowerment is the goal for HomeLife Management Center residents.

**Summary of the Implications of the Precedents**

In summary, the legal issues regarding eligibility, occupancy, lease arrangements, services on-site, case management, rental income, etc., are the same if not similar at Miracle Village Vision House and the Homelife Management Center, as they are with the Boston Housing Authority at Orchard Park. Additionally, the Boston Housing Authority is not only aware of these programs, but has physical evidence of lease arrangements, and program rules that these programs made available for this thesis research. The Yarmouth example comes closer to replicating the exact two-step program model that is intended for Orchard Park, but the Ohio and Delaware example demonstrate how teamwork and a shared vision can overcome legal obstacles to yield innovative solutions for women and children. Accordingly, these projects are envisioned by women in decision-making positions in the public housing authorities, and then implemented by consensus building.
Design Issues

Again, all three examples are relevant. First, Vision House is unique because it combines both congregate and independent living under the same roof, but has managed to separate the access for these units architecturally, reinforcing personal responsibility. Other transitional housing programs that seek to combine both of these housing models tend to require all the women to enter and exit from the same point, which diminishes the privacy the girls wish to maintain after earning the privilege of some independence of program restrictions. Yet, there is a physical connection, a doorway which connects both kinds of units internally, so that the girls living in independent units, mostly on floors above the congregate space, will feel encouraged to join the group for occasional meals and socializing, without having to go outside the building. The separation/connection design strategy was possible because the building was gutted and completely rehabilitated, and could be brought up to code for handicap accessibility also.

Miracle Village, on the other hand, was accomplished by the housing authority donating two building entries and their units for housing and common space. The second and third floors of the buildings, which are the typical brick three story walk-up with shared entry, were simply used as shared apartments. Communal space was retro-fit into the first floor as best it could, without much financial expense. Plans for the renovation, which include the security entrance that links the two buildings, also include a new rehabilitation of the first floor space to better accommodate the sizes of rooms for their activities, and for specific social needs.

The HomeLife Management Center took six rowhouses and excavated behind them and between them to combine all the units together into a complex which is indistinguishable from the outside. This attention to residential scale and detail helps residents who may be feeling stigmatized by living in such a program. Once they realize that other neighbors do not know their home from the next, they will appreciate its sameness, and the equality it fosters.

The Orchard Park Model

The plan for Orchard Park is to take advantage of the funds allocated for comprehensive modernization, and complete a gut rehabilitation of buildings in Phase One of redevelopment (the eight mothballed buildings), one of which will be the supportive housing model. In this way, there will be no difference between rehabilitating one building or the next as far as the authority is concerned, except that
the model’s units will be smaller compared to the new trendy 4 and 5 bedroom vertical breakthroughs that are being designed.

What differs is the amount of rent subsidy that the authority could get from that one building if the units were developed generically. The difference is 7 units of generic housing with 17 bedrooms, as opposed to the model which will contain 10 units, 5 congregate bedrooms, and 5 independent units, 2 of which are handicap accessible. The number of bedrooms will be anywhere between 10 and 20 bedrooms. Setting the rent subsidy according to number of bedrooms would have to be reconfigured for the model because infants and mothers are sharing bedrooms, but small children will have a bedroom of their own. An appropriate subsidy would have to be figured, not to exceed 30% of the mother’s income. It is unknown whether a service provider would pay the authority to lease service space on the first floor.
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Chapter IV: Case Study, Orchard Park

"The modernization programs that are funded are for what HUD calls basic, nonextravagant housing, but what is wrong with improving the outside appearance of a building so that it does not look like every other project in America? Why can’t we have different styles of entrances, roof design, privacy fencing, central air, and other minor improvements that would make our homes a little more pleasant in which to live? Doesn’t HUD know that by allowing such small things to be done to our homes, that will help add improvement to our self-esteem as well?"

Diane Sheffield, President, Cuney Homes Resident Council, Houston Texas, as quoted in the Final Report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing.
ENGENDERING DESIGN

Case Study, Orchard Park
This chapter is organized in three parts:

- Part I: Modernization vs. Redevelopment
- Part II: The Redevelopment Plan for Orchard Park
- Part III: Design Analysis for Supportive Housing in the Context of Redevelopment

PART I: MODERNIZATION VS. REDEVELOPMENT

The politics of redevelopment; its policies, design ideologies and implicit messages are important to examine in the context of today's social climate. The federal government is spending millions of dollars to redevelop its public housing stock. Some see this as an opportunity to redress the design ills that plagued the housing since its inception. Encoded in the original assumptions which led to the design were implicit messages about government extending a hand down to the occupants, which life-styles were socially acceptable and which norm everyone was supposed to aspire to. Now, none of these assumptions even remotely applies to the intention for the housing, the selection process it engenders, and the cultural stereotypes that characterize its occupants. It is useless to reexamine the policy in a current context, without having an adequate understanding of whom it was built for in the first place. This chapter describes the current politics and design methodology of redevelopment of public housing for Orchard Park.

The National Commission for Severely Distressed Public Housing, convened in 1991 at the behest of the federal government, was assigned the task of assessing the state of public housing in America. As was mentioned earlier, the results of their finding generated a definition of the housing that was most "at risk" and postulated an opinion on how the population was managing living in such housing and was thus most "at risk." Criteria for severe distress are all met at Orchard Park.

Orchard Park, a 720-unit development located in the heart of one of the most deteriorated neighborhoods in Boston, known
as Lower Roxbury, is one of the oldest and most distressed properties in the Boston Housing Authority's housing portfolio. Currently only 390 units are occupied, with 320 units vacant, mostly due to Phase One reconstruction. The ethnic breakdown of Orchard Park is as follows: Afro-Americans make up 74%, Hispanics make up 23%, Whites, 2% and "others" make up 1%. The population is dominated (244 of 390) by single female-headed households between the ages of 24 and 50. There are only 11 households listed as being between the ages of 18-23, which means that the younger women are having children and staying at home in their mothers apartment, rather than getting their own unit. Of the 474 women over the age of 18, 354 report receiving either AFDC, SSI or Social Security benefits, 71 reported employment as their primary source of income.1

A huge infusion of money for capital improvements is needed to rehabilitate Orchard Park. Its heating systems are obsolete, its density is much too high, and the individual units are in atrocious condition. In Figure 4.1, OPTA member Nancy Green stands in a typical hallway at Orchard Park. Recently, the Inspectional Services made headlines when it threatened publicly to sue the BHA for its:

...continual failure to correct dangerous living conditions at OP, some of which include exposed asbestos on tile and pipes, lead paint and insect and rodent infestation. 2

In addition to horrific living conditions, the increasingly persistent poverty that plagues blacks and Hispanics living in Boston is being exacerbated by an ever-rising rate of unemployment, as well as a high crime rate.

The Poor-Fit Ideology

It has been said that there is a poor-fit between the needs of the current residents of public housing and the units they live in. The circumstances which precipitated this resulting lack-of-fit are as follows: dramatic demographic shifts have led to unanticipated population densities in public housing developments; the buildings, some dating back to the 1940’s, were often built to inferior construction standards; ill-chosen sites for these developments were acquired through wholesale clearance and involved demolition of existing housing stock that conformed to the urban context in which it was built; residents became physically segregated from the existing community and increasingly had lower incomes than their neighbors, and were becoming likely to rely on public assistance; and finally, constraints on personal mobility due to lack of in-
come, lack of day care and inconvenient public transportation created ghettos of residents who are physically and socially isolated from the greater neighborhood.

The housing units themselves have resulted in a poor fit between the needs of residents and the actual environment. Families can be larger now, and so often units contain inter-generational living situations, which exacerbates over-crowding and frustration among people who cannot afford to live anywhere else than in a doubling-up situation. Modern conveniences such as washers and dryers had no place in apartments built in the 1940’s and point out the need for modernized designs which accommodates today’s standard of living. Also, lack of storage space is a problem because today’s residents tend to be more permanent tenants, whereas the initial residents were temporary residents, and therefore were thought to have little belongings that needed to be stored.

**Modernization vs. Redevelopment**

While it may seem that mere modernization of public housing is the answer, the trend has been to redevelop public housing as a more comprehensive solution. Modernization is like “triage” - it puts a band-aid on a wound that is too serious to be treated topically.

That is to say, the housing is not the only problem - economic instability, teenage pregnancy, high crime rates and drug abuse all beg for services to be added on or nearby public housing sites to enable residents to begin to attain the goal of self-sufficiency. The physical environment is the stage for these activities to occur, be they illicit or exemplary, and the role housing plays should not be underestimated.

**Role of the Community in Redevelopment**

The role the community plays in managing their environment in the presence of management institutions has to expand in order for people to engage in meaningful discussions about their futures. The presence of strong leadership roles in the form of tenant management organizations are a testimony to the capacity of lower-income people to effectively manage their communities with limited resources. So, the trend to redevelop public housing as a revitalizing strategy emerged from the acknowledgment of the inadequacy of merely modernizing housing. In 1993, redevelopment means engaging teams of professionals, service agencies, and sometimes community development corporations, and most importantly residents, in sessions where strategy and goals are defined and designed.
The process of redevelopment is highly politically charged. It is an empowerment opportunity for residents in and of itself. The residents themselves learn how to articulate their concerns and to see those concerns addressed in design and policy terms. They learn to build consensus and to make difficult decisions for other residents who are not at the table. They understand firsthand the dilemma of having to speak for people who are not involved in the process. They see their priorities addressed in comprehensive strategies that involve innovations in management. They are empowered to express their opinions through designs which have a physical effect on the abutting community. The process is educational and inspirational for a resident, and often leads to a very real sense of responsibility for the outcome of the decisions, the schedule, and other matters. Furthermore, if the larger community feels that consensus has been achieved in a place like Orchard Park, then they will feel a diminished sense of tension due to a higher degree of internal control with regard to the development. This in turn can lead to better relations between the public housing development and its neighbors.

Redevelopment is much more expensive than modernization. Although neither is cheap, given the generally debilitated condition of public housing, redevelopment plans call for management initiatives such as community policing, augmented maintenance staff, and on-site multi-service centers just to stem the tide of drugs, vandalism and gang violence. This is much more than just “bricks and mortar.”

Redevelopment plans involve a comprehensive planning and design approach. Understanding the complex social and economic factors that caused the deterioration need to be understood before design begins. The logistics of relocating tenants to other apartments on-site, while new units are under construction, is very complicated and time-consuming. This necessitates the need for phased construction. Indeed, one benefit of redevelopment is that by relocating residents, there is an opportunity to evict or relocate problem tenants.

The process of physical rehabilitation has been described as “one of the most effective wholesale methods of clearing a building of drug-trafficking. Comprehensive modernization means buildings are ‘gut-rehabilitated,’ and so have to be vacant.” A tenant’s right to return is predicated in some sense on his/her desirability as a tenant, or at least provides the opportunity to review the tenant’s records and observe a tenant’s behavior. Tenants are given the option of relocating off-site temporarily while their unit is being rebuilt.
(which often takes one year), or can get a Section 8 certificate and move elsewhere permanently. Some people opt for the latter, which further assists the housing authority in reducing density and minimizes the need for building replacement housing, which is now federally mandated on a one-to-one ratio. Relocation is one of the reasons a redevelopment process must be carefully defined and managed.

**Design Guidelines for Redevelopment**

In Massachusetts, the Executive Office of Communities and Development commissioned a procedural handbook for its Bureau of Modernization and Redevelopment. It was developed as a tool to guide the revitalization efforts of redeveloped public housing. It sets out design guidelines for the planning process of similar efforts in Massachusetts, by using case studies as a method of illustrating how planning processes and design solutions differ across sites, but “resonate with the same clear intentions.” The goals for a successful revitalization include a three-pronged approach: a viable resident community (an empowered community); physical changes (which reinforce family interaction); and, management improvements (redefining policy and methodology).

The Redevelopment Handbook lays out five planning principles to guide the redevelopment process:

- **Cooperative effort:** A shared vision of the outcome is crucial to success.

- **Longevity and Cost Effectiveness:** Limited future resources for capital improvements necessitate that redeveloped housing not only last, but be financially feasible to operate.

- **Appropriate Family Housing:** Public housing is not temporary anymore and should provide family amenities to serve the long-term residential needs of families.

- **Efficient maintenance and management:** Management must decide whether current staff have necessary skills to maintain grounds and/or new systems for mechanical or landscaping improvements.

- **Improved Image:** Physical changes quickly impact imageability through the site.

Additionally, the collaboration of seemingly disparate groups of people are crucial to the success of a redevelopment effort. The local housing authority plays the major part, for it leads the technical and planning efforts. The housing authority should
invite all participants to the table and ensure equal representation; it may have state-of-the-art knowledge of federal regulations that designers will not be aware of. The housing authority knows what its capital expenditures can be.

Residents themselves are the most crucial piece of the puzzle. The more residents feel responsibility to and ownership of a process that leads to a successful product, the easier it will be for the housing authority to maintain. Residents must understand that their involvement does not end with the completion of construction. They should be willing and able to participate in management and tenant selection processes, as well as participate on committees for their tenure as residents.

The redevelopment design guidelines focus on changes to the physical environment that can lead to a successful revitalization effort. There is no one set of answers; that is, there is not a set of guidelines that can be applied to each development generically. Different management capabilities exist in each development, for example. Some developments have extremely active resident organizations that already manage a multi-service center, or daycare or a teen center. West Broadway, seen in Figure 4.2, is an example of a redevelopment in which tenants manage some facilities on site. Inset in the photo is a picture of West Broadway before redevelopment. Some developments do not have a pre-existing tenant organization from which to draw experienced representatives. Some developments should not be managed by the housing authority after they are rehabilitated. At Commonwealth, formerly Fidelis Way, the combination of tenant management with a private management company have combined to make it the most successful revitalized development in Massachusetts.
The handbook does postulate questions that can be asked of each development which will determine the range of solutions that are appropriate for that specific place. While the questions are recommended to be asked specifically at each development, the design solutions are remarkably similar. This would signal to me that the housing authority is not in the business of innovation or very specifically tuned design responses, but in distributing a standard of housing among its chosen candidate sites. These questions include:

**What are the problems at this site and how severe are they?**
**What changes can be made to solve these problems?**
**Which changes are best suited for the development given its design, management capabilities, and resident needs?**
**What is required to manage and maintain these changes over time?**

**Criteria for Successful Redevelopment**

Minimally speaking, from the housing authority's point of view, the goals are to identify the issues, prioritize the problems and then find the most cost-effective solution that, at the same time, is successful over the long-term. Success can also be defined by the degree to which management is improved, whether public or private, and concomitantly, whether the community is strengthened both in terms of social and emotional health.

**Specific Design Goals Which Have Social Impetus (Drugs and Design)**

Designing for successful elimination of problems that plague public housing tenants can be evidenced two-fold. For example, if the specific problem is the elimination of drug use, then there are a range of design responses for such a social and emotional goal. Residents generally identify elimination of drug abuse and traffic from the developments as their number one priority in conjunction with the rehabilitation of housing. The drug problems at most of these developments alone suggest a range of design solutions that seek to eliminate the activity and to treat victims of its addiction.

For example, the original design of public housing accommodates illegal drug activity. The common hallways which are shared by every family in a building have become the offices of dealers and abusers and trespassers. The police have lots of problems when chasing suspects that flee into buildings and run up onto roofs which are enabled by direct access through these hallways. These doors
are often left wide open to allow anyone in. Figure 4.3 is a typical condition at Orchard Park. Residents do not shut them because dealers will open them again. This means strangers are wandering hallways and are often armed and dangerous. In fact, in one hallway I was escorted into by BHA managers, the drug dealers had painted the hallway dark brown, over the off-white shade favored by BHA. This dark color made them appear less visible from the outside (to police or residents). The manager described such a hallway as "one that we cannot control."

The fact that no one owns any patch of the entirely paved land or feels comfortable in appropriating space contributes to the dealers feeling powerful enough to take over. In fact, people are held hostage in their own apartments afraid to go out after dark, and sometimes even during the day. Children must be kept inside, and it is easy to see how the concepts of imprisonment lead to deteriorating physical conditions of housing. One could make the claim, thus, that the presence of drug activity accelerates both deteriorating physical conditions and emotional distress which causes feelings of despair to be taken out on those people love. Residents usually point to the elimination of shared hallways and stairs as their first priority in reclaiming their homes back from drugs.

External improvements such as lighting, private entries at grade and gated public space between buildings gives residents much greater control than they have ever known. Some people will have to share a common stair but it should be minimized to perhaps two families. The space, hence, becomes "defensible." The area in and around an apartment is to be communicated, and it's the individual's responsibility to monitor, while the housing authority will maintain it and the infrastructure that surrounds the space. Drug dealers could not operate in such a monitored space. Exterior stairs have been built.
to allow access from the street up to second-level apartments. Such is the case at Washington Elms in Cambridge, seen before and after redevelopment in Figure 4.4. Presently, exterior stairs when built are required by federal law to be covered. The expense for such a construction element should not be minimized, however, because it brings back security to residents and gives them a place to sit and talk to one another, as if on a front stoop.

Orchard Park: Context and Attributes

Orchard Park is a family development that currently houses 1143 people, 613 adults and 530 children under the age of eighteen. Originally built in the early 1940's, as a 720-unit family development, it currently houses multi-generations of persons living in overcrowded apartments which have numerous code violations. Figure 4.5 depicts still-occupied buildings at Orchard Park. Since the early 1980's, there has been talk of a five-
year phased plan of redevelopment, which would cost anywhere from $35 to $50 million. To date, only $14 million has been earmarked through state and federal sources, which means only a partial rehabilitation is possible. The 27 residential buildings languish in limbo as they continue to deteriorate.

Incorporated in 1982, the tenant organization, despite the apparent lack of commitment, has persevered in its efforts to make Orchard Park a more livable place for those awaiting redevelopment. Edna Bynoe, a resident who has resided there for over 50 years, is the chairperson of the task force and the development’s matriarch. She refers to the efforts of the task force as necessary for “her kids, especially the girls who have a harder time in a place like this.” Their hard work has resulted in raising funds for the redevelopment of one residential building for space that holds the tenant organization’s office and conference rooms, a teen center, and a health center run by Roxbury Comprehensive Multi-Health Center.

**Teen Center**

The teen center is the life blood of the community. An after-school program, pictured in Figure 4.6, a summer program, and an evening program is run out of the second and third floor space. It is also open on weekends. Geoff Bynoe, Edna’s son, is the coordinator of all the teen center’s activities, and he is joined by another Bynoe, Sounja, who runs the task force office during the day when her mother works full-time.

Orchard Park, to a large degree, is a family affair - not only because of its “first family”, but also because of the preponderance of children under eighteen. Many of the Task Force members grew up in the original development, raised their families here, and continued
to build on their sense of community through establishment of intense networks of informal support. The dedication of many adults stems from the memories of Orchard Park in an earlier era, and a desire to rekindle the quality of community life that was in evidence there.

Community Facilities

Community facilities that have since been abandoned and mothballed are a recreational center, or a gym as it was called, which is owned by the Public Facilities Department, and two schools- the Palmer School, which was adjacent to the proposed supportive housing model, but had been torn down, and the Dearborn School and its Annex, which comprise 70,000 square feet of wasted opportunity. The School, seen in Figure 4.7, and the Annex sit smack dab in the heart of the development, and preside over the large open space for which the development is named - Orchard Park. Currently, there are plans to renovate the gym for use in 1995. Because it is owned by the city, and therefore is subject to lengthy bid and contractual procedures, it has taken a long time to realize.

Family Investment Center

The tenant association, sometimes called the Task Force, has been granted development rights for the tentative purpose of developing the Dearborn Facilities as a "Family Investment Center," which they hope will be re-named the "Orchard Gardens Community Center." A Family Investment Center is similar in concept to a multi-service center, except that its explicitly stated goal is one of enabling residents to attain self-sufficiency by facilitating access to comprehensive health and social services, educational and job training opportunities, and economic development initiatives under one roof. Job training is especially important to residents of Orchard Park.
Surrounded by the blighted areas of Dudley Square, opportunities for employment are few. Of the 613 adults, only 65 work full-time, and 33 are employed part-time or seasonally. The inclusion of daycare facilities (for infants, children and elderly), cultural enrichment programs, outpatient substance abuse treatment and prevention programs, commercial space, and the use of the auditorium for a community performance center were also identified by tenants. Community outreach has been mobilized in the way of letters of support pledging interest in obtaining low-cost office space for area service providers.

In the Spring of 1993, a graduate class of students from the Department of Urban Studies and Planning undertook a research practicum aimed at getting missing information that would provide the residents with the details they needed to apply for funding when the Notice of Funding Availability came out. Included in that student research was architectural programming for a range of alternatives that explored phasing of construction, and funding levels, as well as a long-term occupancy strategy.

Discussions are now underway about what to do with these buildings, because the housing authority believes their cost of rehabilitation will be so astronomical it will be infeasible. The funding for such a center is through Family Investment Center funds, which is a $25 million pot of money that will be distributed and competed for nationally. Because the Dearborn School itself is roughly estimated to cost $5-6 million to renovate, it is believed that the chances of convincing the federal government to award Orchard Park $8 or $9 million for both buildings are slim to none. Despite this possibility, the residents believe that the symbolic meaning of the Dearborn School, which many residents attended as children, is central to its rebirth as a comprehensive service center. The fact that it sits in the heart of the development, and will have both redeveloped and deteriorated buildings all around it, is a shame.

The key to successfully revitalizing the Orchard Park housing development lies in the renovation of those two buildings.

PART II: THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR ORCHARD PARK

Figure 4.8 depicts the complete site development plan, Phase One is outlined in black. Adjacent to Phase One boundaries are the Dearborn School, the gym and the Annex. The tenants
decided to redevelop the middle of the development first, in the hope that the outer edges would be such a blight when compared to the new interior, that it would spur local officials into making additional funding available to complete the rehabilitation of the housing project. This is a common trend. While you could make the argument that one should redevelop the exterior buildings first, the
residents of Orchard Park first unanimously voted a fear that the "heart" would rot until the end of time, although the outside looked fine. The drug lords would have literally be able to exert control over the development where the teen center and health center are.

Elements of the Plan

The current plan for Orchard Park contains a plan for reduction of density, creation of new through-streets that will facilitate integration into the community, and the creation of zones ranging from private units, and backyards for ground floor units, to semi-private spaces which it is hoped will encourage exemplary behavior. It includes implementation of a community policing plan—a partnership between residents, management, and the Boston Police department. Orchard Park was once the location of a development-based criminal enterprise, headed by Daryl Whiting, who has since been convicted. Orchard Park residents do not want to lose any more young people to drugs or violence.

The acquisition of large tracts of land on which to build did not mean that designers were necessarily thinking of the neighborhood context. They tended to design these super-projects as if they were in isolation. For example, at Orchard Park in Roxbury, the once prevalent Victorian housing stock was razed for the new publicly subsidized units which were crammed into buildings the length of a city block and built diagonal to the street grid. See Figure 4.9
for a comparison of the Victorian stock to the 1941 development plan. The concept of designing these sites as superblocks virtually assured, future isolation from the neighborhood context into which they were dropped. Figures 4.10 and 4.11 show the difference in the block patterns between 1940 and 1993. Through streets emanating from the existing street grid were discontinued and made policing much more difficult. The housing agency had to take on the job of community policing because the “streets” in the new developments were not city property, but private BHA property.

**Deteriorating conditions**

The buildings which were built originally for working class families came to house families that were, by majority, headed by one parent. Inadequate parental supervision exacerbated by the dearth of safe public open space, increased density and family size contributed to the rapid deterioration of buildings that were not in the first place built to private sector standards. Housing authorities, facing federal and state budget cuts, attempted to patch things up where needed, but weren’t able to keep up with the decline of the building
stock. If management can’t control the site, and residents can’t get maintenance to attend to their units, then the deterioration begins to be felt in the more public areas, where people are forced to congregate because of the lack of quality of personal space (Figures 4.12 and 4.13.)

Soon you have physical decline all over the site, landscaping becomes downtrodden, asphalt replaces parks and cars occupy all the asphalt. There is no outdoor space for children to play, so mothers keep their kids inside, which accelerates the deterioration of the apartments themselves. When management gives up trying, it sends a clear message to residents that their environment is not “salvageable,” which leads to less hope and more despair. It is a vicious, mutually-reinforcing cycle of decline that is being felt by nearly all metropolitan housing authorities all over the country, and certainly has been felt in Orchard Park.

When public housing was initially built in the 1940’s and 1950’s, the land it was built upon was aggregated into one huge site. The availability of a large tract of land led planners to design masterplans as if they were not surrounded by city neighborhoods, but as if they were enclaves unto themselves. This resulted in geometric patterns (which were in favor at the time). In order to maximize light and air, the buildings were placed in geometric patterns and built out of cost effective materials—concrete block and brick. There was little thought given to adding through streets because the buildings were supposed to be buffers and all activity was supposed to take place inside the building enclosures, and not have a vehicular connection that was reminiscent of city streets. Cars were restricted to the perimeter in order to have play space on the interior. In the 1960’s, what land was landscaped was paved in order to facilitate maintenance. Unfortunately, the client for public housing was still families, and now they had no where to go for recreation.
except out on the street.

Streets

When a person has a street address they are able to find their apartment, and so can delivery men, friends, and others. When all the buildings look exactly alike, because of similar materials and identical design, it is disorienting. People want to park their cars outside their doors for security and convenience. Police will not patrol non-city owned streets within a development because it is not their legal obligation to do so. Streets that do not bisect a development become safe havens for drug dealers because they stymie security officers from pursuing them in cars. At Orchard Park, two new streets are featured in Phase One of redevelopment, which comprises only 9 of the 27 buildings. This is shown in Figure 4.14. Three more new through streets would be undertaken if rehabilitation of the site was complete, for a total of five.

However, when streets are made safer and more convenient for residents they may also be more convenient for people living outside the development. There should be a balance between the two, one which encourages safe pedestrian traffic, but one which discourages vehicular traffic from outside from using the development streets as a racetrack. The goals should be safer, accessible streets which encourage resident socialization, but which are also active play spaces for children, and which by virtue of their active use discourage drug traffic.

Figure 4.14: Boundaries of Phase 1 redevelopment plan
Fronts and backs

Additionally, streets can enhance access by delineating which is the front and which is the back of the buildings. Because the redevelopment process often involves the use of designating private backyard space, and therefore streets belong to the public front space, they can help in reinforcing the notion of public and private. A code will be established when entries are no longer shared, but are entered from the street edge. Figures 4.15 and 4.16 illustrate current plans for facade treatment; the first is the front elevation which has porches and pediments, the second is the rear elevation which is considerably plainer. The backs remain institutional-looking.

Private Entries

Private entries at grade are the first design response. A front yard area, when possible, is a good idea if site conditions permit. At Orchard Park, there are places where a stoop can be created which provides a front porch of sorts, and ameliorates the sloping grade. Refer again to Figures 4.15 and 4.16. If entries cannot be at grade, but must be accessed by an interior stair, there should be a buffer so that first floor residents aren’t bothered by upper floor residents. Housing authorities are often responsible for these public areas and should be consulted about specific maintenance problems that might arise, such as width of snow removal equipment.

Private yards

Private yards should be small because they will be maintained by residents who may not have equipment to maintain a larger yard. Equipment for yard maintenance at Orchard Park is being proposed to be located at a borrowing shed in the Family Invest-
ment Center. In the meantime, the BHA will probably lend things to residents. Back yards should be fenced in to keep children safe while playing. Some residents may wish to have a combination of paved and unpaved space in the back yard for planting a garden. At Orchard Park, the design organization is for two buildings to have adjacent backyard space with a small paved path in between, if space permits. Looking at Figure 4.17, you can see that the buildings are built fairly close together, so backyards are not expansive.

Figure 4.17: Landscape plan of Buildings 11, 12 and 13.
Buildings

Three-story brick walk-ups are the most popular building model for public housing, and are in evidence at Orchard Park. The 4 units per floor were clustered around a shared stair to minimize circulation. This means that 12 units shared an entry, which could be anywhere from 30-40 residents. Over the years this model, typified by Figure 4.18, has become recognizable as the institutionalized model for public housing. In Boston, however, there are other connotations for a three story brick walk up building. The Victorian architecture, made prevalent in the Back Bay and Beacon Hill as well as the South End, are essentially similar, except that the top floor is differentiated by a wood-frame roof which often had dormers and was fashioned after the mansard roof in France. So in Boston, where brick is a prevalent building material, these developments could have been designed bearing context in mind, but they were not.

Common entries and stairways are the major problem in Orchard Park, as well as in other developments, as mentioned before. They encourage drug and alcohol use, littering, graffiti and all sorts of inappropriate behavior. Drug dealers have been successful in appropriating hallways as their territory, in effect imprisoning residents and their children inside. Stairways that lead onto roofs are an easy means of escape from police. The amount of foot traffic per building alone, 30-40 residents, coupled with outsiders, is very heavy. New steel doors are replaced constantly, and are damaged just as quickly. Nor are the doors left locked, because children need to get in and out quickly and can't be trusted with keys. There is a virtual "open door" policy. In order to eliminate shared entries, the buildings must be reordered to provide single private entries at grade. The act of designing larger apartments, often through vertical breakthroughs means an immediate reduction in traffic. New stoops must be built, and existing stairways must be eliminated in the floor slabs. This means the interiors must be completely gutted and exterior stairs must be built. This is extremely costly, but very effective. At Orchard Park, the varying grades call for a raised terrace area to transition from ground to first floor. These can be developed as defensible personal space or a gathering spot for entertaining
Image

The image of public housing as the “housing of last resort for broken families” causes a mutually-reinforcing cycle. People on the waiting list will not want to move there and current residents will have no mechanism to turn the development around without a huge infusion of federal dollars. People interested in illegal activity may take advantage of the vulnerability of the development and move in and take over.

The stigma of living in public housing can take many forms. Added to this is the fact that police do not patrol the premises interior to the development, and that mail is not delivered to an individual, but to a collection room at the management office, and people do not feel as if they are being treated humanely, but are being denied some basic rights.

In order to change image, residents themselves must feel they want to change. Pride in their community generates this change. Sometimes a name change will do this. For example, the residents of Fidelis Way changed their name to Commonwealth. Orchard Park residents like the name of Orchard Gardens, presumably because of the preponderance of existing green space on the site. Image changes may be physical, such as different materials on the exteriors of buildings. If the prevalent style in the neighborhood is wood-framed Victorians, residents may want stucco or surfaces which can be painted. Architects for Orchard Park recommend a combination of re-pointed brick and stuccoed surfaces as a way to enliven the facades of the buildings.

Often the symbol of the “pitched roof” which connotes the American Dream house can be employed. This can either be done by building an entire roof or by making a fake pediment that appears as a pitched roof from a distance. The rendering in Figure 4.19 was one of the first sketches to the OPTA. Generally, even if the roofs are pitched, this does not mean that the space underneath them is occupiable. It does however create a crawl space that enhances heat performance. Furthermore, it eliminates the problem of roof access. At a recent redevelopment

![Figure 4.19 Preliminary sketch of facade treatment](image-url)
meeting at Orchard Park, tenants expressed a wish for a roof with a pitch, a whole roof, not a pediment. They said they wanted what "everyone else has." They further expressed a disappointment with early renderings which displayed a distinctively Back Bay architectural connotation. Residents angrily decried the "new look" as South End and Back Bay stuff, and exclaimed that they (Orchard Park) deserved their own distinctive architecture. They were not Back Bay, but Roxbury, and felt that because there was not a "Roxbury-style," the architects should make an "Orchard Park-style" that Roxbury could aspire to. Architects came back with subsequent renderings that explores the use of bays, porches, stoops and pitched roofs that differentiate the buildings, but which unite them in a common style language.

The addition of architectural elements which serve to de-institutionalize the buildings' appearance is a good idea. These could be bays which are window projections or porches or stoops. Any new community buildings should be built to new standards, and reflect community diversity. New construction is not accommodated on the sites except where replacement housing is built.

Space for Service Providers

Redevelopment of public housing is not just about housing, it is about helping people gain responsibility for private spaces and public areas to become self-sufficient. Through community services people are encouraged to participate in the governance of their community, to become advocates for their own needs, to gain experience in job training programs and educational training programs and to become better neighbors to one another by socializing together. The commitment to community is stressed by the opportunity to participate.

Day-care

A primary goal is to enable people to become more "employable". To that end day-care is an essential ingredient in the equation. To enable men and women to participate, their competing needs must be addressed. Without day-care, women are not able to participate. Many task force organizations find that day-care is an excellent management opportunity for them to learn how to become community managers. The results of the MIT study for Orchard Park was that more stable day-care was provided by resident initiatives, as opposed to outside or-
ganizations. The funding for such a venture can come from private foundations, but should be managed and can be staffed by residents of the community, which then addresses the need for affordable day-care and the opportunity for job skills training under one roof. I believe that many services offered in these multi-service centers should become job-training opportunities for residents. Design of a day-care center, however, is governed by specific regulatory requirements which must be adhered to. Any design response would have to take these into careful consideration, especially when children from outside the development might be able to be accommodated under one roof on public housing property.

**Services For Whom**

In 1992, the federal government began sponsoring legislation for “family investment centers,” which are “one-stop shopping” for services for residents. A narrow reading of the legislation could interpret the legislation to be targeting services only for residents of the public housing development. A broader interpretation could mean that through resident initiatives the community becomes more engaged with the development and re-integration of the public housing development will be facilitated.

At Orchard Park, there was a controversy over the interpretation of the law. The housing authority believes that the services offered to residents of public housing in an on-site multi-service center should be closed to the general public. Residents feel that this is segregating them unnecessarily, and want an opportunity to enter into public/private partnerships that draw funding sources from the outside and enable Orchard Park residents to give something back to Roxbury and the Dudley Square neighborhood.

Economic development initiatives which could be sponsored by residents, for example, targeting non-profit agencies that need low-cost rental space, but which serve the greater community as well, would not be able to be accommodated under the housing authority’s narrow interpretation. Nevertheless, the tenants association at Orchard Park is not free to make their own application for funding for a family investment center; it must be done on their behalf by the housing authority. Therefore, consensus must be reached.

The pressures being brought to bear upon the residents by the authority, from their needing new space in order to save money for bringing their other administration building into compliance, to their notion that tearing down both the Dearborn School and Annex and
building a new smaller facility would be more financially feasible, have built up and angered the residents of Orchard Park. The residents feel as if the housing authority is serving their own purposes and using the residents as a pawn. The housing authority does not want to submit an application for a family investment center for $9 million and have it rejected out of hand, which they feel would damage their credibility with HUD in future funding rounds for all developments in Boston. This may be true; unfortunately the residents need the authority to make any application, they can not do it on their own.

Funding for Redevelopment

Funding sources for revitalization efforts vary as do the methods employed to undertake redevelopment. For example, if funding is insufficient to rehabilitate all of the development's buildings, which is usually the case, phased construction is probable. This involves relocation of residents and is very disruptive and time-consuming. However, it facilitates gut rehabilitation of buildings. Residents are supposed to sign a relocation agreement saying that they have the first right of refusal in deciding whether or not to return. They can elect to be transferred to another housing development.

There are several types of funding available for modernization efforts. The first fund, Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program (CIAP), funded public housing modernization on a competitive basis, but is no longer in effect for PHA's with over 250 units of housing. CIAP was replaced by Comprehensive Grant Program (CGP), a federal program for modernization based on a formula rather than on a competition, CGP intends to put more responsibility in the hands of local housing authorities, and it also allows funding limits to 90% of total development costs (TDC). This threshold is higher than the 62.5% of TDC that is allowed under CIAP. It allows the housing authority more flexibility in determining what the funds will be used for. CGP is generally thought to be insufficient to meet the funding requirements of comprehensive modernization of distressed housing, because it does not adequately factor in "soft costs" associated with large scale redevelopment.

Major Reconstruction of Obsolete Projects (MROP) which is modernization funding available for large scale redevelopment. A development has to qualify as obsolete, which means the vacancy rate must be above 25%, and estimated reconstruction costs are at least 70-90% of public housing development cost limits for that area. Developments that meet MROP criteria, such as Orchard Park.
Park, are the most severely distressed. MROP can not be used for management improvements, and can't be mixed with CIAP in the same building or unit. The problem is that many severely distressed developments require funding that equals or surpasses 100% of total costs. These developments will never have adequate funding as such. At Orchard Park for example, all three funding sources have been pooled in order to complete a Phase One renovation. In order to replace footprints lost through demolition, or to add habitable area to existing units, there would have to be HUD new development funds, MROP can not be used. If MROP would cover the costs of services and either the rehabilitation of existing or replacement housing, it would be a more viable program. The levels of funding necessitate a lengthy effort, which drains the community support and causes problems between the people that have newly redeveloped units and those that do not.  

PART III: DESIGN ANALYSIS FOR SUPPORTIVE HOUSING IN THE CONTEXT OF REDEVELOPMENT

The notion of post-occupancy review of redeveloped public housing is new. There are a few public housing developments that have been partially redeveloped in Boston, like Bromley Heath, Franklin Field and Commonwealth Washington Elms in Cambridge is another example. I have no data which proves that the tension caused by partial redevelopment exists, but I have asked Orchard Park tenants how they feel about the issue. Of course, they are facing the beginning of redevelopment, and so are eager to get anything new, but they have thought about the implications I outlined above. They responded by saying that they expect that people will be jealous of their neighbors who come back to new apartments.

Many of the residents in Orchard Park have lived there for 20, 30, 40 years. They are veterans in a sense, and feel that they should be rewarded equally. However, if tenure were a criteria for selection for who would get a new apartment, then there would be spotty relocations all over the development. It is not as if the buildings are populated according to length of tenure.
The housing authority needs to vacate the residents of entire buildings, despite length of tenure. What they can do is to work with the tenant on which location or building they will move back to, many tenants re-request their former location. Because the apartments are larger, not everyone’s request can be honored. Indeed, many residents have already been relocated on-site because of growing families and the need for a larger apartment. They are used to moving around. Their solution to dealing with problems of the have and the have-nots is to get enough money to do the “whole damn thing at once, like they should have done in the first place.” It is ironic that the act of redevelopment, which is supposed to enrich the community interaction, may be the mechanism which seeks to divide it further.

Lack of comprehensive funding sources is a clear signal that the federal government is not wholly enamored with saving their housing stock, or its people. The recommendations that the National Commission for Severely Distressed Public Housing made to HUD clearly state that MROP, and other funding sources must be fully funded by the government, and that severely distressed developments should be prioritized so that those who need it most, get it fastest, are right on target.

I would argue that it is not the best solution for everyone, especially the single female headed households. What women need most is equal access to services which enable them to train, seek and get jobs that enable them to support a family. Unless day care is fully funded and easily accessible by foot, or public transportation this will never happen. Training programs that guarantee menial, entry level jobs virtually assure a woman that she will make less money (or equal amounts) than welfare will pay her for her children’s support. The fact that Medicaid is tied to welfare benefits complements this. Women need education’s that enable them to get a real job with benefits.

Because the pressures of living in the inner city are so great, housing is crowded and substandard; jobs for minority males are scarce and low-paying; personal health suffers; because cultural stereotypes demand that men gain access to manhood through fatherhood etc. all these factors contribute to the almost constant state of crisis for women who are stuck bearing the brunt of responsibility, often at a time when they are too young to deal with it. A program, which is comprehensive in the sense that it relieves that state of crisis in a woman’s life, and teaches her how to deal with impending problems in a calm, responsible, healthy way, is much more humane than simply giving her a backyard and a new
apartment and expecting her to all of a sudden behave like a middle class suburbanite.

It has already been established that many women lack the basic life skills that are necessary to parent, to run a household, and to take care of themselves. Programs that take women away from the intense peer pressure that sways them, and channels the pain of growing into a positive experience are a much better idea. Supportive housing does this- it seeks to break the chain of poverty by teaching women to rely on themselves and others, their families, friends, it introduces role models for mothering, and teaching, and it stresses the importance of self-respect. Redevelopment of public housing accomplishes none of these- it merely gives the problem a better place to hide.

**Issues for Supportive Housing**

If a public housing authority were to decide to develop supportive housing for pregnant and parenting teenagers, what are the issues it would have to face? Assuming there would be an experienced service provider to contract for the implementation of services in the housing model, then the issues would fall into two primary categories - policy/regulatory and site design/programming. The policy issues were discussed in Chapter 3. The design analysis follows.

**Design Analysis**

The housing authority should apply criteria for selecting a building appropriate for supportive housing, when considering its housing stock. In the case of redevelopment, the phasing of construction should be considered. For example, at Orchard Park, if the supportive model is considered to be part of the context of redevelopment, then the number of buildings that would be available for consideration would be limited.

**Criteria for selection of building to house the model:**

- Creating a safe, secure environment for women and children by building security and protected open space.
- Access to services and public transportation
- Visual accessibility and permeability

Addressing the first criterion, should the model be surrounded by other buildings, be part of a building or be in a separate building
which has a single entry unto itself? Should the model occupy an edge condition? What effect does the existing context have on the viability of supportive housing?

Addressing the second criterion- location is very important, for the convenience of its residents, but such issues are often mutually exclusive, for example, for residents, the greatest access means siting the model in a vulnerable location at the fringe of the development. While this is most convenient, one gets the feeling that one is safer when one is standing in the middle of the development rather than on the edges. Residents will concur with this. The edges are fraught with abandoned buildings, vacant lots, and drug dens.

Addressing the third issue of visual accessibility/permeability- how important is it to the residents of the housing? To children? How accessible should the model be to services located in the development? Should this model be integrated with the architecture of redevelopment, or with the little remaining residential fabric in the neighborhood? Does a distinctively innovative solution call for architecture that calls attention to itself or which blends in with either redevelopment schemes or with existing fabric?

Development of Design Options

Based on these criteria, I have developed three design options for Orchard Park. The design options have a wider audience than just the BHA, and they may be applied by other PHA’s to their public housing developments because much of the stock is identical. I am sure that in many cities, the areas surrounding public housing developments are the sites of major disinvestment and urban blight, as it is at Orchard Park. In Figure 4.21, you can see that the dark areas are zoned commercial or industrial, and the lighter shaded areas are zoned residential. Orchard Park is surrounded by empty lots, and the backs of industrial or commercial property. The few houses that remain are on Zeigler St., but these have fallen into disrepair. Figure 4.20 illustrates what the other condition around Orchard Park is- the abandonment of homes first, and then the re-occupation by drug dealers.
Figures 4.21: Zoning diagram
Option One:

Designate a single building, a single entry can be made secure. See Figure 4.22.

Inventory: Building 5, and building 13, both in Phase One construction.

Advantages: Small buildings can hold ten families plus program space. Particular buildings are located in open spaces which can be captured and dedicated to the model exclusively. Single entry can be made secure.

Disadvantages: Residents are isolated spatially from their neighbors. Location of these buildings is on particularly busy street, which may be dangerous. Building 5 is surrounded by abandoned open space, which may increase the vulnerability of its residents, particularly if Phase Two or Phase Three isn't accomplished quickly.
Option Two:

Designate a portion (one-half to one-third) of a building for supportive housing model.

Inventory: See Figure 4.23
Phase One-buildings 10, 12, 27, 26 & 24 are suitable. Phase Two- Building 16 is suitable.
Final Phase - Buildings 1, 2, 4, 8 & 18 are suitable.

Advantages: Residents are living adjacent to other residents in same building. Locations tend to be edge conditions along streets, facilitating access.

Disadvantages: More difficult to secure model because of integration with generic units. More difficult to capture open space for model without marginalizing open space for other residents. Architecturally, one would probably want to make both parts of the same building look similar, which discourages creative expression (due to cost constraints).
Option Three:

Designate the model as infill and build it with funds for new construction on an adjacent or nearby lot to service public housing residents.

Inventory: See Figure 4.24

Orchard Park is surrounded by vacant lots which are bordered by vacant lots or abandoned buildings at their backs. There are many to choose from. Presumably, you would want the model to face the street for security reasons.

Advantages: No public housing units are lost, none, therefore, need to be replaced.

Disadvantages: Vulnerable locations of open lots may be less suitable for the model than even the worst buildings in the development. At Orchard Park, housing for young women and children who need a secure environment should not be used to plug in the holes of the tattered urban fabric. Despite the dangers in Orchard Park, being on the fringe is more dangerous. Also, other funding sources would have to be sought.
Selected alternative:

I decided to reject Option Three as a viable option and to explore Options One and Two. Therefore I designed a supportive housing model for building 5, and then loosely applied the design to building 24, which represents a choice for Option Two. See Figure 4.25.

My choice of Building 5 hinged on the fact that it had the most open space surrounding it, which could be dedicated to the program, and that it was visually linked to the present teen center, health center and administration building. It is located on Eustis Street, which has a high level of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. I would argue that crime occurs more frequently in the more obscure locations at Orchard Park. The location of the school bus stops is along Eustis Street. The majority of residents use Eustis Street as their main path to Dudley Square and the MBTA station.
The selection of building 24 as an example of Option Two- integrating the model with generic units- was made primarily because of location. If you look at Figure 4.26, you will see that the configuration of open space surrounding building 24 and between buildings 25 and 26 will accommodate an area of private open space without marginalizing other residents' right to a backyard too much. Refer to Figure 4.27. Building 24 is also located across the street from the remaining residential fabric that used to cover the site of the development before it was built in the 1940's.

To conclude, the selection of sites for the supportive housing model were dependent on a central location with access to public transportation and to existing community facilities, such as the teen center and the health center. The sites were also dependent on Buildings 5 and 24 being included in Phase One.
of redevelopment for which there are modernization funds. Although other buildings could be chosen by the housing authority, it seems more reasonable at this time, that the supportive housing model be built with funds that are allotted for redevelopment, instead of waiting for future funding streams to materialize. This chapter explained which modernization improvements will take place in a portion of Orchard Park. The supportive housing model will be built in this redevelopment context. The next chapter details the program and design for the model, itself.

NOTES

5. EOCD, p. 4.
6. EOCD, p. 4.
8. NCSDPH, pp.5.15-5.16.
Chapter V: Supportive Housing Model

"Public housing is becoming the housing of last resort for low-income families and very low-income families, families that need the most support services to become part of the community."

Sister Jensen, Director, Community Development and Housing, St. Alphonsus Rock Church, St. Louis, Missouri as quoted in the Final Report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing
This chapter is organized in four parts:

- Part I: Housing for Pregnant and Parenting Teens
- Part II: Specific Problems Teenage Mothers Face
- Part III: Personal Interview
- Part IV: The Orchard Park Model: Program Goals and Design

PART I: HOUSING FOR PREGNANT AND PARENTING TEENS

Housing For Single Parents

The terms transitional, special-needs, and non-traditional, are all applied to the kinds of housing women and children occupy. The preponderance of these specific terms helps to distinguish these kinds of housing, but also infers that these types of housing are different from the norm, and are perhaps inferior. Because of this, I have chosen to call my project a "supportive housing" model in an effort to demarginalize the housing label.

Transitional vs. Special Needs Housing

The difference between transitional housing and "special needs" housing is that transitional housing is often thought of as relatively temporary, providing a transition between homelessness and permanent housing, for example. The temporary stay can be anywhere from weeks to two years. Increasingly, though, women have such a hard time finding permanent housing after a transitional stay that they need to stay in transitional houses for longer and longer periods of time. Transitional housing often includes services on-site such as child care and is offered as a place to stay to get time to restructure your life.

Architecturally speaking, there may be little difference between the design of transitional housing and permanent housing, because both are concerned with networks of support and connections to the community outside the housing. One difference could be that women in transitional types of housing may be recovering from an abusive situation, and require extra security to protect them, or they may be emotionally unable to make any connection to the outside because they are not facile at these kinds of relationships for whatever reason.
For these reasons, the scale of the housing may be very important. The notion of a small close-knit community is much more acceptable to these women, than the idea of being an anonymous face in a huge project of 100 units. The housing needs to be a place where they can relearn relationship-making and test themselves before they try it out in the larger society.

**De-marginalizing Housing Labels**

While the term "special needs" housing has been coined by others, it is the central tenet of this thesis that alternative types of housing is not "special" or extra ordinary, but fundamentally specific to the needs of single parent households headed by females. Architects who believe that the goal of every design project should be to accommodate the specific need of their client should be especially aware of branding this type of housing, because it marginalizes its clients to label it "special needs" housing. Everybody has particular needs.

**Non-Traditional Housing**

The moniker "non-traditional" as well, is a label that likens this housing relative to the supposed heterogeneous housing that mainstream America lives in. None of this comparison accommodates cultural diversity. To compare housing for single mothers and their children to what the white middle class in America aspires to as their dream, sets these families up to be labeled as deviant, when in fact they are beginning to dominate every economic sector in every state, as the norm. Of course, it would also be correct to say that not all single mothers need the kind of supportive housing that I propose for Orchard Park in Chapter Three. Private housing may be more than adequate for many women and their children. Even public housing units which are redeveloped as townhouses, and which have private backyards, and totlots, etc. are adequate for many women and their children. The current state of public housing at Orchard Park, I believe I have demonstrated, is not fit for human habitation in many cases, much less for children. Moreover, whether some of the public housing units at Orchard Park are redeveloped or not, they still may not best accommodate the particular housing needs of pregnant and parenting teenagers in public housing. However, housing is housing. We do not all look the same, neither should our houses. I believe it is simply good architectural practice to pay attention to the specific needs of every client, whether they be a two-parent family needing housing or two non-related adults combining households for financial reasons.
Interestingly, there are many excellent designs for supportive housing, and so-called "special needs" housing. Architects have responded with creative flair. It is public policy which lags behind, and which makes these types of housing so difficult to accept. If single parent households are becoming a majority in America, it seems logical that the problem of funding such projects, for example, would soon be moot.

Housing For Special Interests

We know that the elderly population in this country is growing rapidly and we are busy thinking of innovative ways to combine their housing with medical services that they will eventually require; but, we also add in recreational and community space so that they will enjoy their lives to the fullest. These are facilities that enable the elderly to "age in place." The idea of cohousing is acceptable to most people, even though it conjures up images of the 1960's commune. A group of like-minded people come together and develop housing for their own community, as shown in Figure 5.1. It is most likely that the presence of men in this group makes it socially acceptable. After all, these are nuclear families expressing an interest to live together in a fashion for mutual support. It is pervasive in Scandinavia and all over Europe.

Everyone, from government to the individual taxpayer, blames the single, often welfare mothers for having more babies, and therefore draining the system. I would argue that the notion of controlling a woman's reproductive freedom is central to the idea of denying her adequate housing. The punishment for having more children with-
out the benefit of marriage is the reason for denial of adequate accommodations. The accepted practice of considering single women bad financial risks for personal loans and mortgages supports this and ensures the marginalization of women in the housing market. Children are the unfortunate, innocent bystanders of the systematic marginalization of women.

**Goals For Supportive Housing for Women**

One fundamental goal of supportive housing is that it is housing designed to meet the needs of particular kinds of households, while accommodating diversity, and allowing for a level of exchange and support that benefits all residents. Another goal allows for the integration of social services with the housing, usually child care and space for job training, counseling, etc. A third goal is that residents are encouraged to participate in planning, design, and management and sometimes maintenance of the housing. They may even participate in constructing it.

**Privacy and Sharing**

A pervasive theme is the accommodation and balance of privacy and sharing, which is more of a concern in transitional housing than in traditional housing. Sharing can mean many things; it can be the mere presence of another, it can mean wordlessly occupying the same space as another, or it can mean open acknowledgment of sharing space. The presence of another human being in times of crisis can be a great source of comfort, even though you may not explicitly ask them for help.

Sharing can mean sharing chores and meals, which saves everyone time and resources, as well as provides a communal spirit. The act of sharing information in order to help someone else is invaluable. There is, however, a delicate balance between personal privacy and sharing demands that needs to be accommodated in the same building. In this way transitional housing and housing for single mothers is very much alike, with the exception of tenure.

**Supportive Housing For Parenting Teens**

There are appreciable differences in the way housing designed for single women with children contrasts with housing designed for young women, often teenagers, who are pregnant or parenting. Women, in transitional housing are more accustomed to sharing space, because they have shared a home with a spouse or boyfriend or relatives. They are probably older, and more emotionally mature. They
have more experience with skills required to run a household, and are probably more in touch with their own needs for privacy and support.

Teenage women on the other hand, have more complex problems to design for. When they become pregnant, they have nine months to assume an adult role. At the same time they are supposed to be finishing a basic junior high thru high school education, while exploring a relationship with the father of the child. They need to become accustomed to independence and nurturing far earlier than they expected, and may be ready for. They may have no positive role model for parenting.

Questions that should be asked of designers of housing for teenage women and children are:

How do you develop space where a structured program and personal privacy can take place? What role does supervision play in the design and what effect does it have on the spirit of independent life that is desired for the women? How do you provide special nurturing space for babies and mothers at the same time, without compromising or severing connection to networks of support outside the housing?

Precedents For Design

To try to illustrate the differing housing needs of adult women versus teenage women, I include two examples of housing. The first is the Lee Goodwin House in the Bronx, New York. It is a brick apartment house of shared transitional and permanent housing for mothers and their children, built by a non-profit corporation and developed under New York's Development's Capital Bud-

Figure 5.2: Lee Goodwin House, typical residential floor
get Homeless Housing program. Women in Need is the social service program provider. The Human Resource Administration and the Department of Social Services of New York provided social service funding. The combination of housing with commercial space was chosen because of need and of the possibility of combined rental income, as in Figure 5.2.

A dentist, a pharmacy, a beauty salon, a florist, and other neighborhood businesses occupy the commercial space on the ground floor. They provide a service to tenants as well as economic stability for the project. Services on-site include child care in the basement, training in computer(secretarial) skills, and cooking instruction in the training kitchen, which is adjacent to a community room that can be rented for parties, and is a link with the outside community. There are separate entrances for transitional residents, who enter past an office which is a resource and support center, and the permanent residents who have their own separate shared entrance. The transitional units are completely furnished.

A unique feature of the transitional units is the swing bedroom, which can be flexibly incorporated into either of the connected apartments. The adjacent apartments can open their swing door to accommodate shared baby-sitting in the shared room. The swing room works for adjusting space needs as the household sizes expand or decrease. The units themselves are shared between two families, which means that each family has a bedroom and bathroom suite, with a separate kitchen and shares living space. There is no designation of a “master suite” which infers a bedroom for a mother and a smaller one for the child, similar to the Beguine. There is individual private space because each person has a separate bedroom, but there are opportunities for coming together and socializing within the apartments themselves, and also on each floor where swing rooms provide the extra space to help one another.

In this particular project, there were many women of Caribbean descent expected, so the color scheme of tropical limes and turquoises was used to reflect a sense of home. Places for personal expression were encouraged, and individual doorways were expressed in different treatments to further augment the sense of identity with each apartment. Custom-made decorative tiles embellish the hallways, which were treated with wainscoting and soft indirect lighting. The attention to residential-scale detail was integral, "the emphasis on aesthetics, dignity and self-respect " was a priority.
This program reflects deliberately planned interaction with the neighborhood and larger community. Women were trained on-site, and their parenting responsibilities were accommodated so that they could attend classes. Their needs for shops for essentials were met, and the public was invited in to use the community room, which helped subsidize the costs of operating the building. Economic development for the residents and the community was a key component.

**Accommodating Work in the Home**

Similarly, economic development is the focus of a project in Harlem, New York, designed by Carson/Strickland Associates (see Figure 5.3). Here the concept of a swing space is utilized for personal work space in order to maintain the notion of "cottage industry," or work done from the home. The swing space or "x" space in this example is not enclosed, but is space allotted to work in. One presumes that in order to actually capture this space for one's own, partitions may be needed to separate it from the living space adjacent to it. However, these types of work arrangements often benefit women who have conflicting responsibilities, from nurturing their children to the financial responsibilities of maintaining a household. However, the mere idea of having dedicated space to work in the home does not mean a woman can get anything done, especially with infants and toddlers at home. The presence of on-site daycare and after school programs greatly help women to concentrate on work.
Pragmatically speaking, the notion of a swing space is one of the best ideas for keeping space flexible enough to accommodate future needs. While we design for the profile of the family we know of right now, there is no prototype family, obviously. Besides, depending on what type of work one is doing, a separate room may not be the best way to accommodate work activity. To further plan these spaces with sliding screens, or flexible partitions, means that virtually every need for that space can be met.

The Single Mother's Home

Contrast the previous two examples with housing designed specifically for young women. The Single Mothers Home, Hubertus Vereniging, in Amsterdam, designed by Aldo Van Eyck, is the most famous example (Figure 5.4 and 5.5). What is most notable about this housing is that while it deliberately sought to provide a safe haven for young women and their children that had no place to turn, it did not interpret that need for security by insulating the building from the community, which is often done.

The idea of materials like concrete and brick communicating stability and protection from nature, are often projected in the minds of many people to be the materials of choice for security. The opposite of these
would be glass or metal and sometimes wood, which are generally used as screens or infill between the heavier load bearing structure. Van Eyck opened the building to the street by using lots of glass, and he even lowered the sill heights for children’s eyes to peer from. He countered the permeability of the facade with the inward-focusing programmatic elements, such as kitchen as hearth, and the children’s quarters in the back.

**Architectural Elements**

**Materials**
The net effect is that the building looks out to the street, but faces inward to the children, and thus mimics the prioritization of the women’s relationships in her world as seen in Figure 5.6. The acknowledgment of the importance of the simultaneous processes of melding oneself back into a compassionate society with the need for an enclosure which stimulates its occupants, and from which derives its stimulus partially from the outside, is the central tenet, and is buttressed by design decisions which reinforce it.

**Use of Color**
Color is used extensively, especially transparent colors, because they permit stimulus from outside. There is an acknowledgment of the importance for individual expression, while considering the needs of children. Each of the 16 residents has her own room, and some additionally have cribs. The children are accommodated in a wing that is separate but not visually distinct from the parents bedrooms. There is a communal living room and dining room. The space for offices and counselors buffers the private quarters from the street.

**The Kitchen**
The kitchen (detailed in Figure 5.7) plays an integral role in the interaction of the residents and staff. Stairs lead from the playrooms to a corridor to the kitchen and snack bar, and parents and children wander in and out. There is an outdoor terrace adjacent to the
dining area which overlooks the indoor and outdoor childrens’ spaces. All of these activities are accommodated between two structures, one old and one new, which allow parents to integrate themselves back into the community. The architecture supports the integration process by giving residents a familiar architectural environment in the organization of the old building as well as a transitional experience through the new building out into the street and community.

Parental support is provided on a 24-hour basis with child care, and night staff who comfort children and mothers by their watchful, unobtrusive presence. Like many programs for young mothers, it is a place where women come back to, for information and referrals and for social interaction. The intention of providing an emotional link after a resident has moved on is a common thread that runs through these programs. Some provide the only real “family support” a woman has ever known.

**Alternative Structures**

Because the scale of a housing projects for young women is so important, supportive housing is often built in houses rehabilitated for that purpose. Houses often have the strongest image and feeling of home, but the least connection to an architecture of sharing. Zoning restrictions often negate the presence of childcare in the home, because of their business function. Zoning ordinances may be obtained, but the community process that engenders these can often spawn objections to the need for housing for teenage women or women who are recovering from substance abuse.

Some of these kinds of projects meet the needs of women through off-site childcare and support services. Others link structures, or add an addition and obtain ordinances to run programs on-site. An example of the latter would be the Vision Teen Parent Home in Yarmouth, MA, which did substantial rehabilitation, and an addition, to fulfill its program needs.

**Casa Myrna Vasquez**

An interesting example of a program built as a house is the Casa Myrna Vasquez in Boston (Figures 5.8 and 5.9). It is located in a turn-of-the-century brick rowhouse, and functions as a transitional residence for victims of domestic violence. Casa Myrna was started by a group of concerned residents bothered by violence against
Hispanic women. It began as an emergency shelter and was tragically razed by a fire in 1985. Seriously committed to keeping the location of the building a secret for security reasons, they bought another building and began a shelter, with the hope of building transitional housing. The architect invited staff and residents of the shelter to discuss issues of privacy and security, as well as architectural finishes and materials.

The building was set up for bedroom spaces, because it was a shelter. Because it had no hearth, no space where the community could come together, it was decided that the dining room would be such a space, and was united with the kitchen. Private rooms for two-single mother households and a single woman were provided on each floor. Community space includes a living room, counseling space, and terraces. Next to the kitchen is the community dining room, and the kids usually sit at a special low counter in the kitchen where they have their own space to be away from adults, yet visually linked for supervision purposes. The dining room is used for child care and playroom space. Unfortunately, there was no room for separate play space for the kids.

The project was funded by the state rent subsidy program, McKinney funds for transitional housing, private loans from Boston banks and grants from corporations and foundations. It was developed by the Women's Institute for Housing and Economic Development, the same corporation that is trying to develop housing for pregnant teens at Orchard Park. Casa Myrna Vasquez is managed by an ex-
Executive director who wishes that she had more program office space, but must make do with what she has because the building was originally built for a single family.

**Vision House**

The most relevant example for relating the special concerns of housing for teenage women is the Vision House in Yarmouth. It is designed specifically for pregnant and parenting teenagers and it is part of the housing managed and funded by the Yarmouth Housing Authority. The rest of these projects, while good references for program assumptions, economic development opportunities, and as an alternative for structures that can house families headed by women, are all funded privately with McKinney grant funds, private loans, and donations. They are all developed by either non-profit developers and have private management of social services separate from the development entity.

The Vision House is developed by the Yarmouth Housing Authority, and services are provided by an outside provider, which operates on-site. The legal ramifications of providing separate housing for women who are not technically old enough to get their own apartments in public housing are especially complex and present the most challenging aspects of developing such housing. The design methodology for public and private housing, transitional or not, is similar.

What differs is the client and her needs as a teenager, confronted with imminent adult responsibilities, while living in the extremely paternalistically controlled setting of public housing. Because the teenager has no limited financial resources until she has the child and is eligible to go on welfare, she is at the mercy of the system, which is not concerned with the quality of the environment she parents in, only the fact that she is not old enough to deserve her own apartment.

**PART II: SPECIFIC PROBLEMS TEENAGE MOTHERS FACE**

**Children Having Children**

Young women, upon becoming mothers, are subject to numerous voices, each representing a different point of view. There is the voice of the child as represented by "the literature," and the voices
of friends, relatives and institutions that the women are involved with, like the welfare department. Women are informed about what is good for the baby and what is good for the relationship, but young women who are mothers of young children do not necessarily know what is good for them - being at home with their children or going to work. In the midst of many voices, the young woman may not know how to listen for her own voice.4

For some older women, their own voice is clear as they make decisions about mothering and about life. For others, the cultural scripts, and voices which convey them, drown out the mother's own voice, leaving her vulnerable to the conflicts which are inherent in our culture's mixed messages about how to mother. A script only works well when clear cultural expectations are supported by social structures that make it possible for people to carry out their roles in accord with the culture's expectations. Often, the scripts carry inherent contradictions. For example, in Sweden the general availability of day care means that the existence of a cultural script that calls for employment on the part of mothers is supported by the means for carrying out that role.5

In America, there are many cultural scripts, and the range of choice offers opportunities, but for some it can mean confusion, especially when the script is not tied to the reality of the women's life, because supportive social structures have yet to be developed. The cultural scripts for mothering in this culture are increasingly divergent from the realities of the lives of women who mother. It is a fact that women not only exist in relation to their child, but they also have other complex social relationships to maintain simultaneous to their relationship to their child or children.6

Most of the literature on mothering in America tends to make the woman and the mother the same person, a denial of self. This is buttressed by the pervasive cultural notion that a maternal role is often seen to be selfless. This notion would seem to place care of self and care of others in opposition.

Mothering, which brings with it the necessity to make choices that involve the well-being of one's self and others, provides an opportunity to redefine one's understanding of the place of self in such decisions. Mothering presents the opportunity to experience care of others as self-enhancing, and need not cast care of self and care of others in opposition.7

Role Models For Teenagers
Studies have shown that mothers and teachers are centrally impor-
Economical and psychological support for mothers and teachers may be essential to the success of efforts to promote adolescent development.

**Attachment vs. Detachment**

Women often have trouble including themselves when relating their responsibilities about whom to care for. So, young girls are confused about how to stay in touch with the world, with others, and with themselves. They are trying to figure out the signs that distinguish true relationships from false ones. They are trying to assess the risk of remaining connected to some people in their lives and in becoming detached from others. They need to understand what the risks are in resisting detachment. They are trying to understand responsibility to others because of their attachment or detachment.

**The Crisis of Teenage Pregnancy**

Pregnancy signifies a connection of the greatest magnitude in terms of responsibility. The issues of responsibility and care derive from the fact of relationship. When relationships are under stress, a young women's development through exposure of crisis can often be the times when personal growth can occur. Most young women in crisis over a pregnancy shift their concern from survival to goodness (this concern emanates from placing concern for the unborn child over their own welfare). The potential of the crisis of pregnancy is that it can break a cycle of repetition and suggest that crisis itself may signal a return to missed opportunity for growth.

A young woman may be being pressured by a boyfriend to have intimate relations, and feeling helpless because she/he may not have had the money to buy contraception, nor someone to go to for advice or money. She believes he will break up with her if she
refuses, and she gives in. When she becomes pregnant she blames him, and he is responsible for her crisis. She believed that giving in to him would make things better, but now she feels abandoned as she is about to give birth and face survival in a world that she sees as threatening and exploitative. But then she sees herself as a mother who would take care of a child. She begins to think of giving her child what she did not have. In thinking about the baby, she comes to think of herself in a new way, to realize through the connection of pregnancy that caring for the baby means caring for herself.

Thinking about the baby and the self in relation can be substantial motivation for a mother to go back to school to complete the education that was interrupted so that the child will have better things and a mother who has some skills. However, thinking about a child in terms of a punishment for bad behavior, or that having a child, once pregnant, also can seem to be selfish. In other words, bringing a child into the world to assuage guilt are common attitudes of young women. Having a child and facing an inviable relationship with the baby's father are difficult crises to handle simultaneously.

Many young women, when confronted with abandonment by the baby's father, will focus on the baby's well-being and eventually their own, in his absence. Sometimes a woman will force the issue of commitment with a test, impending birth, only to find out the outcome she feared had come true.

Therefore, there is a potential in crisis for developmental transition and the recognition of defeat can signal a new way toward defining self-identity. Identity, for women, is defined, thus, in a context of relationship, and judged by a responsibility and care. For men, in contrast, identity is separate from context of relationship.

The connection this discussion of adolescent development of young women has to the early intervention philosophy, as discussed in Chapter #2, and for housing designed to meet the needs of pregnant teenagers is this: that it is a fact that "women stay with, build on, and develop in a context of attachment and affiliation with others," and that women's sense of self becomes very much organized around being able to make, and then maintain, affiliations and friendships and that eventuality for many women, especially young women, the threat of disruption of an affiliation is perceived not just as loss of a relationship, but as something closer to a total loss of self.

This "psychic" starting point contains the possibilities for an entirely
different (and more advanced) approach to living and functioning in
which affiliation is valued as highly as, or more highly than, self-
enhancement.\textsuperscript{13}

The Connection Between Housing and Self

How does housing accommodate the personal and psycholo-
gical inventory a woman goes through when she is in crisis?

"The physical environment conveys what is expected, what is nor-
mative, what is acceptable and what is taboo, defining in the end
the individual's sense of self and competence as well as how the
individual is conceived by others\textsuperscript{14}"

Unspoken messages are conveyed by buildings. But Carol Gilligan's
more recent research, conducted in urban settings with minority
teenage women, seems to indicate that the struggle to maintain self
is much more difficult than in merely complying with the environ-
mental clues one is given.

Housing does not shape us, but it accommodates our transitions
between childhood and adulthood. It is true that the image of a
home, however, carries special meaning. How one home is com-
pared to another, like houses on a street or in a particular neighbor-
hood, give us a basis for calculating same-ness or different-ness,
which is often misconstrued as deviant-ness. Because the symbol of

the single family detached home is such a powerful cultural icon,
connoting personal value, equity and territory, transitional and other
kinds of non-traditional housing often mimic its qualities that are
most easily recognizable in the hope of fostering connections to the
images of self-worth they foster.\textsuperscript{15} Some of these might be scale,
portals and architectural details, such as a front porch or a gabled
roof. For people who reside in apartments, the image of home can
only be exhibited on the exterior of the building. Ensuring that the
buildings resemble one another

Figure 5.10: Marie's ideal home is another way of making
people fit in.

Inside the housing there are opportunities for maintaining personal identity by the act of being given private space which can be decorated as one likes. When an individual personalizes a space, she has reinforced the self and then the space becomes personal territory which will most likely be defended because of the personal connection that has been made. This notion of territoriality is similar to Oscar Newman's concepts of "Defensible Space," which designers are employing in the redevelopment of Orchard Park and similar public housing projects in Boston and elsewhere. Territorial behavior supports the self, the absence of personal territory undercuts the notion of self-worth.

Ms. magazine in 1984 conducted a study which asked women to describe their ideal home and neighborhood. In Figure 5.10, "Marie's Space" depicts a home for a single parent which includes "a permeable dome with 'a totally changeable skin' that, like a polaroid lens, responds to the sensory conditions of sunlight and temperature. Demands and noise 'bounce off' while love and breezes enter freely."

**Supportive Housing and Self**

Supportive housing offers women the opportunity for the reinforcement of identity through territorial and personal relationships. A community of single mothers with children represents the network closest to the individual mother, and is buttressed by a network of case managers and counselors who may enter the territory with permission. Likewise, children develop and maintain self-identity through expanding degrees of separateness, both physical and psychological. It is therefore important for babies to establish physical landmarks that provide the basis for spatial orientation.

**Environmental Clues**

Any detail which helps orient children to a place and gives clues to which territory is theirs and which belongs to someone else is important (see Figure 5.11). For example, if the doors to individual family suites are accessed off a main hallway, and each doorway was painted a different color and each portal given a distinct identity.
Children will easily use these clues in way-finding.

**Responsibility and Sharing Space**

Teenager women have little or no experience with responsibility for maintaining space before becoming mothers. As new parents they are thrust into independence, sharing space and having the tremendous responsibility of having children. Group cooking, house cleaning and dining are part of their learning experience and provide benefits from close peer support and sharing.

Sharing can be part of a staged program like the one in Yarmouth, the Vision Teen Parent Home. Four young women have private bedrooms and share communal facilities in the first phase, and "graduate" to an independent living situation after demonstrating competence in "life skills," such as good parenting, budgeting, etc. When girls enter the second phase, they learn that the relationships they formed in the first phase continue to sustain them in terms of emotional support. The connection between sharing and being on your own is the "transition".

The combination of congregate and independent apartments in one setting linked by on-site services mimics the environment the girl and her baby will have to encounter when they are done with the program. To this end, it is important that the girls have some experience with living somewhat independently (alone) so that the inevitable feelings of depression they will eventually encounter will not be surprising or debilitating. The girl will be able to cope with being on her own and with the responsibilities she has to her child, as well as with being a friend, and daughter, and relative in her other relationships.

Residents of public housing, who often reside in extended family households, already know something about sharing. They also know something about overcrowding and what that condition does to cause stress in familial relationships. They need to unlearn some of these lessons, which may be very selfishly motivated in order to learn how to properly care for a child and to trust other people to respect their rights to privacy. There may never have been a parent in the household who was listening to their children, or who had an idea of what good nutrition was, or who may never have learned how to shop for the proper food, or how to live on a budget.

All of these cycles can be broken by relearning basic skills in a supportive atmosphere where fear of hurting your mothers feelings because a young mother decided to parent differently is not a fac-
tor. A separate setting is important, but a program which effectively builds a woman's self-esteem by encouraging interdependence on informal networks while establishing autonomy goes hand in hand with the architectural environment. One should mutually reinforce the other.

PART III: PERSONAL INTERVIEW

I had an opportunity to conduct a personal interview with a teenager at Orchard Park, who representatives of the Task Force felt was at great risk in her present home situation, and who, therefore, was a woman in need of this precise type of supportive housing. The young woman is typical of many who live in Orchard Park, and lacks environmental supports — her mother was a young mother, and her father has never lived in the house with them. It is for reasons even more serious than these that young women living in urban public housing projects do indeed need to be removed from the home in order to relearn life skills that will enable them to parent their babies, and take care of themselves.

Home Situation
The woman, who I'll call "Denise," is sixteen years old and is the mother of a six month-old baby. Her mother is allegedly using drugs in the home, and after applying for her daughter's welfare, has begun to steal the checks from her daughter, leaving Denise with no visible means of support except WIC food stamps. This information came from the tenant association, not Denise. Denise has an eighteen year old sister, who doesn't live at home, who got pregnant at the same time Denise did. Denise now lives with her Mom and twelve year old sister. Denise has been taken off the lease by her mother, because she can no longer be counted as a dependent. She also has a brother who just left a drug rehabilitation clinic and is shuttling between friends' homes.

Denise's Relationship to Father of Baby
Denise does not have a relationship with the baby's father anymore, because he is in jail. They lived together briefly during the early months of her pregnancy, before he was incarcerated. The baby's father has three children, all by different women residing in Orchard Park. The women have recently begun talking to one another because he is in jail, and for the sake of their children, who they feel should get to know their biological half-brothers and sisters.

Denise's parents do not live together now, and never have. She speaks to her father almost daily by phone. He warned her "not to get pregnant by that boy," but was supportive once she told him of
her pregnancy. Her mother threw her out of the house after a quarrel about the pregnancy, which coincided with her sister’s pregnancy, and Denise went to live with her grandmother until the birth.

After the birth, she moved back in with her mother. Her mother applied for welfare for Denise while she was pregnant, and the welfare check was mailed to Orchard Park. The check seldom got into Denise’s hands though, because it was often stolen by her mother. Denise had to make arrangements with the welfare office to have the check sent to her grandmother’s house across town. The penalty for this was to be taken off the welfare roll for two months.

The welfare office in the meantime is trying to sue the baby’s father for child support, even though he is in jail. Denise thinks he should stay in jail because “he’ll never make enough money to pay child support for four kids and have any money left over to live on.” She believes that he would like to see the baby, but that he has problems with gangs in Orchard Park, and must carefully sneak in to see the babies. She believes that the baby should know her father, because she is starting to say Da Da when she sees Denise’s friends, but doesn’t know her own daddy.

**Denise’s Pregnancy**

Denise’s pregnancy was a surprise. She had considered getting pregnant before that point, but her relationship had deteriorated with the father, at the time she got pregnant. She says that she loves kids and that she “wanted a baby to love [her] and to be able to teach a baby how to love people.” She had no intention of deliberately getting pregnant for a welfare check. She knows some women who use this reason, and who believe that getting pregnant will trap a man into staying with the woman. She never considered abortion, because she believed that it was her mistake to get pregnant and so it was her responsibility to carry it to term. She thought she’d make a good mother because she’s not a “partying person who leaves her kids for days with strangers like some women do.” She stays home with the baby and invites friends over to keep her company.

**Employment History**

Prior to getting pregnant, Denise was a Peer Leader at Orchard Park. Peer leaders are youths who are trained to guide the younger children in the development toward productive goals. She says that “pregnancy was not in my job title,” and that she’s very aware of disappointing people who thought she was smarter than she was. They objected to her choice of partner more than to her condition. It is because of her prior position, which is one of esteem, that she
is so aware of other people's opinions of her. She knows that people who see her on the street brand her as an unwed, young mother who quit school. Furthermore, she identifies herself as an Orchard Park resident, as "one who lives in the projects." She says even if she moves away that identity will stay with her.

She feels like she would like to go back to school to prove to everyone that they were wrong about her, and to prove to herself and her baby that she can do it. Before she got pregnant she had aspirations of attending college, but now she realizes that getting her GED will be very difficult.

**Education**

The school system alternated between hassling her and supporting her. When she was pregnant, and having to go for pre-natal visits every two weeks, the teachers would mark her absent even though she had appointment cards from the doctors for her brief visits. According to Denise, her teachers "practically forced" her out of school. After she had the baby, they offered to help her find daycare for her, but it was tied into a welfare-sponsored state jobs program. She would have to work, and not necessarily be able to attend school for her GED. She is trying to get more information about the program, but her social worker at the welfare office is hard to reach, and so she sits at home and waits. "I ask myself every morning what am I going to do, what am I doing?"

**Critique of Housing Model at Orchard Park**

When discussing house rules for the proposed supportive housing model, Denise became very animated. She said that it didn't matter to her that the rules may be more strict than she was used to. She thinks she'd like it if someone told her what she had to do, and when it had to be done, and what time to be home, etc. She said her mother laughs at her if she tells her where she was going, because her Mother doesn't really care. For example, she said her mother volunteered to watch the baby late at night so Denise could sleep, but that her mother takes the baby in bed with her, and then passes out for the night. So Denise gets some sleep, and the baby gets sleep, but at what price?

She said most girls who live at home after having a baby have a hard time because it's overcrowded, and because the young mothers get too much advice from everyone on how to parent, dress the baby, etc. She says "sometimes you can't hear yourself think in all the commotion." She offsets this by inviting friends over to visit, which gives her a break, because they sing to or play with the baby. Other girls she knows at Orchard Park leave their babies with their moth-
Design of the Model

When she looks at the plans, Denise remarks that there are a lot of rooms downstairs where she can talk to friends, and where they can hang out. Although she'd prefer to entertain in her congregate bedroom, she understands that would probably not be possible. The living room, play room, kitchen and front porches look like the best places to her for socializing. She thinks the fenced in backyard is a great idea, so the kids can run around without fear. The idea of sharing a kitchen and bathroom do not bother her because she does that at home, sometimes with people she doesn't know that well (guests). She did ask if all of the young women would be from Orchard Park, and I replied that they would get first priority, and that other women in public housing would come next.

Building Support Networks

She liked the idea of living with other teen mothers and babies, because they could help one another by talking about how to do things for the babies, and how to deal with their own issues such as hormones and moods, and depression. She thinks that there should be a car for the housing model so that women can learn to drive, and then can go out together and "not be held prisoner at Orchard Park."

2-Step Program

The idea of a two-step program really appeals to her because she knows women who have babies, and when they turn eighteen get their own apartment, only to find that they have no money for food, or rent. She realizes that the structure of the program and the classes in building life skills are the elements that make having your own apartment a viable option. She says she would not want to have her own apartment until she had a job, because it's too much responsibility and expense until that point. She doesn't want to sit around and wait for welfare.

She believes that the incentive to women at Orchard Park to enter this program will be the notion that they can be declared heads of household when they graduate after 18-24 months, and are therefore eligible for their own unit. She says that incentive alone will override the possible dissatisfaction with strict house rules etc.
**Future Plans**

Finally, we talked about her future plans. She had wanted to attend college before she got pregnant, and says when she was pregnant, her desire to go to college became stronger, despite the impediment she now faced. Now she feels that her fear of going to college should be outweighed by concern for her life and her baby's welfare.

"The baby shouldn't be an excuse for me not to finish school, but it's hard when you're all by yourself, fighting the welfare people, who put you on the defensive for naming the baby's father, and the school people who won't let you get a bathroom pass, even though you're pregnant....People are looking at you like you're pregnant and you quit school, you're nothin....I want to prove to myself that they're wrong about me, I'm not like all those other girls, who have more babies for another fifty bucks a month in welfare...But I wonder what they (school officials) will say and do to me if I go back....that shouldn't stop me though."

**Summary**

Denise is the voice of many young girls at Orchard Park, especially those who lack any environmental supports that may be constructive. They seek discipline and companionship and role models to guide them through a difficult time. What is different about Orchard Park residents is that while these young women live in the supportive housing model, their relatives and friends will live nearby. They are not banished from their community, but are marginalized in peer circles for what is seen as stupid behavior. One gets the sense that it is not teen pregnancy that is frowned on, but the choice of partner.

Denise was a peer leader, and so sees herself as having fallen down from a higher pedestal than other women may put themselves on. I explained to her, that her viewpoint now, is just as pertinent as it was then. In fact, if she finishes high school, she will be an exemplary role model of someone who didn't let a mistake get her down. It is obvious that this supportive housing program would greatly benefit women like Denise and her daughter, who are living in a dangerous, dysfunctional situation with few options.
PART IV: ORCHARD PARK MODEL: PROGRAM
GOALS AND DESIGN
Based on Vision House-Yarmouth Program-- Epp Associates

• a place where independence is encouraged through learning parenting skills, household management skills and how to engage in community support

• a place where the mother learns how to prioritize goals in favor of education and job training, and learning how to access day care to permit this.

• provide a healthy environment for mother baby and family, where the woman can learn how to examine her previous mistakes and begin to learn about real nurturing.

• acquaint the woman with the importance of health care for herself and her baby and establish a routine health service program and teach the woman how to access area services.

• prevent unplanned pregnancies in the future by encouraging the fulfillment of personal goals and dissemination of information.

• promoting personal growth and independence through responsibility and a heightened awareness to community

The central organization is that a group of service providers and counselors act as the role models these women may have never had, both as mothers and teachers. The girls in turn will grow up under their tutelage in a shared environment, learn how to become good parents, and acquire the independent living skills, attain the educational and job goals they set, and the network will aid them in finding permanent housing in their own when they graduate.

There are specific ways that the programmatic elements can be accommodated and reinforced through design. For example, the model that has been chosen at Orchard Park is a two step program, it combines shared congregate living with independent living under one roof, but separated architecturally to reinforce the privilege of responsibility. This kind of model, the Consortium feels, would be much more beneficial than purely congregate living in shared apartments. The Consortium felt, and was informed by the Orchard
Park Task Force that the shared apartment model was redundant, because the girls did not need to learn how to share, they were living in doubled-up situations already.

**Zones Within The Model**

There should be specific zoning of activities from the extremely public to the private. Public activities such as classes where outsiders may be able to attend, are more public than the office for example. Public housing poses an interesting constraint on this model. The residents currently living in public housing are used to the entrance doors staying open at all times, and seeing strangers in the hallways. In the model, no trespassing activity will be allowed, and it will be important to teach women how to make their spaces secure. Everyone will have to uphold a commitment that security is of great concern.

But how far does one carry out that concern? Does it only extend to the ground floor where the entrances are? Does it extend to locking the fence around the back of the building? What about the women living in independent apartments that have their own egress stair? What role does supervision of the director play in all of this? Furthermore, are drive-by shootings a concern for this population?

The design implications for some of these questions should be careful consideration, with limitation of entry points to as few as possible. Figure 5.12 illustrates the public zones of the model in dark gray, and the communal, semi-private space in light gray. The concept of zoning within the house means that the more public functions could be in the front, near the street, providing a natural buffer between the girls and babies and the traffic outside.

Flexibility is another important theme. Because the client population will always be changing, the interior space have to support ac-
tivities which will need to be changed and adapt over time. Spaces might have dual functions, for seemingly dual activities, such as rooms which support individual privacy yet are home to group activities or counseling spaces that can become part of an activity space. There may be ways to use flexible partitions that enable large space to be broken up into smaller spaces for activities that require less space. Women will probably feel as if their privacy is violated more in a large anonymous space than in a smaller space, mostly because they have become conditioned to think of niches as cozy. Thus, opting for less is more.

Designing for babies is another theme. Babies and children will always be a presence, and so making sure surfaces are safe and edges are softened are a good idea. Climbing carpeted stairs will be a primary goal for a toddler; babies in high chairs will not respect the limited eating surface they have in front of them. Strong sturdy materials should be used. Scaling down elements so that at the children's height, the environment appears built for them will minimize the curiosity they have about the adult things (Figure 5.13). Low counters, lower sill heights, and interesting floor finishes will pique their curiosity.

**Architectural Program of Supportive Housing at Orchard Park**

**Site**
The site of the building is on the corner of Eustis St. and Cluny Court, a new street (Figure 5.14 below). The back of the building faces an open space, that will be redeveloped as public park for the residents who live in the buildings adjacent to it. The new building, because of its diagonal orientation to the street,
also has a facade, known as a side facade, that will face an abandoned lot, the site of the former Palmer School.

Buildings adjacent to this lot will not be redeveloped any time in the near future. They may be maintained more carefully, but that should not be assumed. In any case, it is safe to say that the best views from the building are up and down Eustis Street, and out the back window which will face the new park (Figures 5.15 and 5.16). The presence of much vehicular traffic and a large volume of pedestrian traffic on Eustis St. make it an important focus for the building. The street and the public spaces along the street have traditionally been the place for people to sit outside with children and one another. The presence of that many cars makes it a little dangerous for children unless they are contained in a place where low walls surround them and prevent them from rolling out into the street on a bike, for instance. The grade slopes down toward Eustis Street gradually, which facilitates this movement.

The new street is intended to give everyone an address on a street, which also accomplishes two things. It will be a city street, which means police are obligated to patrol it, and it is being treated by architects as a zone which replicates front yards and stoops and entries for each apartment. Traditionally, public housing buildings were entered through the shared front and back entries at the knuckle of the buildings. These doors led to the shared stairways which became the drug dens. The hope for the new front doors oriented to the street is that people will take responsibility for the territory surrounding their own front door as well as the space surrounding it, and report any suspicious activity.

**Central Entrance**

The supportive housing however, benefits from the old model of central entrance, because of the need for a central security point through which one can enter. This is needed for the manager to screen visitors, and to supervise the comings and goings of resi-
students and children. There will be a shared stair inside the entrance, however, it will be interior to the building, not exterior to the apartments as it was initially. The stairs represent the threshold between public, semi-public and private spaces. They lead to private spaces, and open onto semi-private spaces.

In order for the transitional building to fit in with its new context, I believe the new entrance should be along the new street, even though it is singular in nature. Perhaps the presence of space along Cluny Court for resident activities will reference the new front yard and stoops. What is important is that residents get to know who lives next to them or along their street. As long as the entrance to the transitional housing is along the new street, rather than on Eustis Street, its residents will be engaged in the feeling of community that will come to exist along the street.

In the back of the building, there should be a secured space for the young children to play in. It should be fenced in and buffered with trees and shrubs, so that the kids do not feel as if they are in a cage. The adjacent park can be accessed through a gate on the side of the building. Space for a community garden, and drying lines should be included, near the laundry where the spigots are. Rather than simply using the wrought-iron fencing that the other buildings will be surrounded by, it may be necessary to berm the earth behind the fence and use a low-brick wall. This would make a hill for the kids to climb, and be a more solid buffer from the street.

The Building
The major design constraint for the building is the source of funds for capital improvements. MROP funds, as you will remember, necessitate the replacement on a one-to-one basis for habitable area that is lost through demolition. Such habitable area may be replaced either on-site or nearby. This greatly diminishes the probability that the housing authority will demolish any part of the building for fear of losing habitable area that will necessitate replacement. In fact, in order for the housing authority to add habitable area to a building, it would have to receive a waiver, which is nearly impossible to get. This is why the building footprints always remain the same after the redevelopment of public housing. There is no doubt that a more “creative” architectural project could be had with funds for demolition and new construction. Perhaps that will become a viable option in future funding sources. Now it is not, and so it is the central challenge for the design of this thesis to contain a design that could realistically be built within current constraints. In Chapter #6, however, I include a discussion on which architectural innovation would be possible.
The design of the model does push the envelope of current funding restraints as far as they would go. For example, the notion of reusing every window opening as a new window opening, and orienting every room to accommodate the windows is absurd. Selective demolition of openings for larger expanses of glass, and small additions on the ground floor to accommodate program space are considered reasonable options by the author, as long as the amount of space usable for units is not compromised.

In fact, the Consortium initially thought only eight women could be accommodated in the building, but a more careful analysis revealed sufficient space for ten women and their babies and other children, rather than eight. So, it was decided that ten families were to be the new clients.

The architectural program was derived through discussion with the Orchard Park Task Force, and modeled after the similar Yarmouth program. What is different at Orchard Park is the inclusion of more program space, because other women can come in and participate, and it also allows for other families to participate and to visit; the inclusion of more space for management of services, which was mentioned in Yarmouth as a real necessity; and the expansion of communal space for residents who will number anywhere from ten pregnant women to ten women with up to 20 children, as opposed to 16 people total in Yarmouth.

Based upon the program done by Epp Associates for Vision House in Yarmouth, and amended to suit Orchard Park residents, as per discussion with Task Force members, the program for Orchard Park is as follows:

**Step One will be group living**, which occurs primarily in private bedrooms, for the relative privacy of each woman and baby, and possibly one child, as well as the use of a large shared bathroom and communal areas, including living and dining rooms, kitchen, playroom, laundry and storage and program spaces.

**Step Two is independent living**, which occurs in separate apartments, and is linked to the main facility. This will consist of either one or two bedroom units with a private kitchen and bath. Shared facilities include laundry and playroom and living room, and to some degree, when desired, dining and kitchen. Program spaces are always shared.
The specific spatial program is as follows:

**PUBLIC AREAS**

**AREA: Living Room**

**ACTIVITIES:** Gatherings are for mothers, visitors, extension of playroom if needed, informal meeting space for teaching skills classes, place for TV, stereo.

**DESIGN IMPLICATION:** Separate room, linked to kitchen, dining and playrooms, but able to be separated acoustically, has to accommodate 12-15 people minimum, needs comfortable furniture and shelves for storage, tables with lamps, no fluorescent overhead lights.

**SQUARE FOOTAGE:** 180-220

**AREA: Kitchen**

**ACTIVITIES:** Central food preparation area, place for meal preparation training class, pantry necessary for bulk food storage, and individual food storage.

**DESIGN IMPLICATIONS:** Large enough for 4-5 women working at the same time, group meals, including girls in independent units 2-3 times a week. Should have large island countertop with seating, central food storage. Equipment includes 2 refrigerators, 4-burner cooktop, microwave, dishwasher.

**SQUARE FOOTAGE:** 120-150 s.f.

**AREA: Dining (Eating) Area**

**ACTIVITIES:** Eating informal meals during day, and accommodate large group at night, women, babies, staff. Informal hanging out area near kitchen, play area for kids while moms cook, used by staff for meal preparation.

**DESIGN IMPLICATIONS:** Design as extension of kitchen so moms can supervise children while cooking. Furniture: 2-3 rectangular tables that can be put together for large meals. Provide high chairs for babies and toddlers.

**SQUARE FOOTAGE:** 180-200 s.f.

**AREA: Playroom and Study Nook (Under Stairs)**

**ACTIVITIES:** Playroom area separate from living room, used for infants and toddlers at play indoors, sitting room for moms watching kids playing outside, storage area for toys, can become area for daycare, needs direct access to outdoors. Study nook is a private reading room where
girls can study, do homework or just read quietly.

DESIGN IMPLICATIONS: divide playroom spatially, not visually from living room, dining spaces, by adding glass partitions, pocket doors, etc. Study is completely enclosed for privacy and quiet.

SQUARE FOOTAGE: 300 s.f.

AREA: Laundry

ACTIVITIES: Part of household duty to do own laundry, need area for laundering, folding, ironing clothes, can function as mudroom for kids to enter through after playing outside.

DESIGN IMPLICATIONS: Separate room to minimize odors, noise. Needs overhead shelving for supplies, tabletops to sort and fold clothes, and irons and ironing boards. Should have separate sink. Equipment: 3 washers and dryers (coin-operated), direct access to outdoor clothesline.

SQUARE FOOTAGE: 80-90 s.f.

AREA: Storage Spaces

ACTIVITIES: Storage of cribs, strollers, car seats, coat closet for women, staff, visitors, and outdoor storage for bikes, toys, BBQ, etc.

DESIGN IMPLICATIONS: Large walk-in closet near public zone for equipment, coat closet to be near main door, shed to accommodate outdoor storage.

SQUARE FOOTAGE: 160-210 s.f. total

AREA: Public Bathroom

ACTIVITIES: Provide accessible facilities for women, visitors, full bath for accessible bedroom on first floor.

DESIGN IMPLICATIONS: Can include changing table for babies for women on first floor. Separate lockable area for accessible bedroom with tub/shower.

SQUARE FOOTAGE: 60-80 s.f.

AREA: Outdoor Play Space

ACTIVITIES: to be developed as activity area, needs direct access via back door(s), should contain sitting places, picnic table, sand box, hard and soft surfaces, sunny garden area.

DESIGN IMPLICATIONS: provide access through mudroom (laundry room) as well as through play room, have public bathroom nearby, secure play area with fence, earth berm, landscape buffer.
AREA: Staff Office
ACTIVITIES: Used by program manager, counselors, may be location of telephone area, can be joined to space of similar size to add up to a conference room, class room, etc.
DESIGN IMPLICATIONS: create inner-office areas, needs lockable office equipment, reception area.
SQUARE FOOTAGE: 280-300, max.

AREA: Staff Bath
ACTIVITIES: Bath used only by staff-separate facility needed to maintain authority.
DESIGN IMPLICATION: Must be full bath for overnight staff.
SQUARE FOOTAGE: 60-80 s.f.

PRIVATE AREAS

AREA: Bedrooms (5 total, I HP accessible)
ACTIVITIES: Private areas for mothers, infants and children, used for sleeping, feeding infants, doing homework, listening to music, playing with children; newborn shares space with mother; toddler needs own alcove with door; area needed for changing table; space to store personal belongings.
DESIGN IMPLICATION: Adequate sized room for two-three to include areas for furniture and play, large enough for resident to feel at ease; adequate soundproofing between rooms to minimize disruption of crying babies; needs to be above common areas for mothers to monitor sleeping infants, night feedings; furniture should include: 2 single beds, night stands, crib, desk, sink with built in changing table on countertop, lockable closet, open ad built-in shelving.
SQUARE FOOTAGE: 180-200 s.f.

AREA: Shared Bathroom (for four families)
ACTIVITIES: shared toilet and bathing, includes sinks for personal hygiene and bathing babies, bathtubs for kids, showers for adults.
DESIGN IMPLICATION: Design for shared use, keep as normative as possible, compartmentalize facilities to make shared use easier and more private - separate toilets from sinks, etc.
SQUARE FOOTAGE: 80-90 s.f.
**Supportive Housing Model**

**AREA:** Independent living units (5 total, 1 HP accessible)

**ACTIVITIES:** Residents in Step Two who move into “own” apartment and have passed household, parenting skills tests. Will have private kitchen, but may join in group meals. Will have private residential sized bath. Should have separate sleeping areas for mother, baby and child.

**DESIGN IMPLICATION:** Separate entrance from group living, with interior link to common spaces via stairs. Furniture includes table with chairs, high chair, beds, crib, night stands, dressers, tables with lamps, couch may be used for sleeping.

**SQUARE FOOTAGE:** 500-550 s.f.

**Management and Services**

The housing will be managed by the service provider, which in this case will be staff from the Traditional Childbearing Group. They will work in overnight shifts, so that 24 hour coverage will be provided for the women and children. The staff will provide links with Boston Healthy Start Initiative, for prenatal case management, Roxbury Comprehensive Health Center for WIC, family planning, basic health education, substance and physical abuse services. On-site services will include: case management services, childbirth education, breast feeding support, health education and information, GED classes, language lessons, parenting skills, household management, food preparation training, day care training and provision, etc.

To the degree that some of these services may be one day be provided in the Family Investment Center, the young women, may be required to walk across the street for some of the less personal services, but in the meantime they will be offered on the ground floor of their home. Counseling sessions, both individual and in groups, will be conducted by the Program manager and invited guest participants. These can be accommodated in a range of spaces that are more formal such as the conference room, or less formal, such as the living room.

Visitors can see the women and their babies at specified times during the day and may be allowed to spend the night on a couch if necessary. Boyfriends and fathers of babies will be encouraged to visit, and may spend the night as a visitor, but not as a guest of the individual woman. In addition, fathers will be strongly encouraged to attend counseling sessions with the women to try to work on relationships that benefit mother, father and children. Residents in independent apartments may not have male guests overnight, de-
Despite their status as individuals who have earned privacy. One of the central goals of the program is to prevent repeat unwanted pregnancies, so rules that may appear strict are made in order to protect the young mothers from taking on too much responsibility than they are able, as well as to protect them from too much outside peer pressure before they are ready to handle such pressure.

To repeat, these rules are spelled out in the lease each woman signs before starting the program. Program managers in Yarmouth have found that the older the women are, they may bristle at the rules at first, but generally come to appreciate the importance of a disciplined routine for themselves and the baby. Teenagers rarely like structure and discipline, but recognize that it is done out of concern for them and their welfare and in retrospect appreciate the notion that someone cared about them enough to impose restrictions on the behavior that landed them in crisis in the first place.

The daily routine for each mother would likely include waking up, bathing and dressing children and themselves, completing chores, preparing breakfast, and seeing children off to school, or infant daycare, and attending school or GED classes themselves. If they are remaining at home during the day, they do chores, then prepare lunch, which they may share with other women. Afternoons are generally reserved for programs, with an afternoon snack break. TV is restricted to certain late afternoon hours. The older children come home from school, the women prepare supper and eat together with staff. There will be a quiet hour for homework preparation or recreation, perhaps a visiting hour or so, and an early bedtime for every participant. Weekend schedules are modified for more visiting hours, less structure and more private time with one’s self and children.

**Design**

As I mentioned in Chapter Four, there is only one "design" for the supportive housing model. In the thesis, the design for building 5, the small building along Eustis St, is easily deployed to other locations around the site. The main criteria was to take the design for Building 5, which is a combination of public uses on the ground floor that buffer the private congregate residential uses from the street, and to see where the diagram fit best. I chose to use Buildings 5 and 24 in my site design discussion, in Chapter Four-Case Study, because of their relevance to the kinds of decisions that other housing authorities might have to make. The
majority of buildings in public housing developments are three story brick walk-ups. Most buildings are designed as a discrete "s" or "z" shaped module, which is doubled or reversed all across the site. It is therefore probable if one designed an alternative for one building, that there would be many circumstances where it could be replicated on the same site.

Looking closely at Figure 5.17, you can see that the model is surrounded by a fence, which should be mounted on a brick pier foundation. The low brick wall gives a sense of enclosure, and the fence protects them from intruders. The entrances are in the front, one is near the ramp, the others are the main gate, and the gate adjacent to the parking area. All are visually linked to the manager's office, which is in the projecting bay next to the front door.

The back yard area contains a shed for tool and equipment storage (located off the rear path), a bicycle rack for the children, a grassed area which has a tot lot, a sitting area with benches for mothers to supervise their children at play, and garden plots so each participant and her family can learn how to grow their own food and flowers. Inside the back fence is a paved track for the kids to ride their bikes or skates on. The paving material should be
made of material that would not be too slippery, but which is smooth enough to ride on. So there are a number of kinds of surfaces for the kids to play on, and a range of places where their mothers can sit and watch them play, or to just join in the play. The backyard is located next to a larger park. See Figure 5.17 again.

The brick pier wall is made into a sitting area in the back yard. The depth of the wall is sufficient to provide an area which can be used to sit on or to place objects on.

In Figure 5.18, the supportive housing model is depicted in the context of Orchard Park's redevelopment plans. Although, it is different from the other buildings, it is characteristic of its neighbors, and shares the same spirit. Building 5, the model, is particularly exuberant, but rightfully so. I attended the community meetings in which the residents expressed ideas about how pitched roofs were their idea of the "American Dream," and that small bay windows were evident of South End architecture. Residents want their own style. For this reason, I pushed the envelope a bit more to partially demolish exterior walls to allow projections of a usable dimension. These are not bay windows, they are dining room sized, or office sized and help to break up the monotony of the facade.

I believe that there is room for a more creative interpretation than current housing regulations stipulate. The architectural elements that were cut, due to budget constraints, from the architect's portfolio at Orchard Park were many, and unnecessary. Architects had initially shown residents porches, stoops and overhangs, and projecting bays. Most of these were cut, in favor of fake pediments or pitched roofs that are not occupiable space, but look residential. One advantage to using building 5 is that it is surrounded on both sides by open space, which now is uninhabited, but soon may be the site of a passive park or (across Cluny Street) of community gardens.

It is interesting that there are no outdoor terraces at Orchard Park. Of course these would be expensive to add, but on the ends of some buildings where the third floor is removed, a terrace could be created for the residents who live adjacent to it. The absence of terraces, especially roof terraces, is an example of the institutional prejudice that brands all public housing residents as irresponsible. Because gangs flee the police by running up onto roofs, all residents must be untrustworthy, right? Nevertheless, while the inclusion of terraces might be the wishful ruminations of an architecture student, I believe there is still ample prejudice aimed at public
Figure 5.18: Axonometric
housing residents that should be examined more closely. No one learns how to assume responsibility unless they are first given the chance to do so.

See Figure 5.19, the ground floor plan. The ground floor accommodates all program space, office space, and congregate spaces such as the kitchen, playroom, study, living room and laundry. A public bathroom serves program participants, children running in from play, and visitors, as well as the occupant of the handicapped accessible congregate bedroom on the first floor. A private exterior stair leads to the independent unit on the second floor, and there is an interior fire stair for egress. Gated entries to the grounds in the front of the building prevent anyone from entering without the management noticing. It is probable that these gates will use a key system.

The program space on the ground floor is really the heart of the model. The central stair which is open, is the visual link between the semi-private areas above, and the communal spaces below. If a mother puts her baby down for a nap and leaves her bedroom door open, she will easily be able to hear it cry if she is downstairs. This is an important
feature, because while babies are napping or sleeping, the women can get to know one another. They will not necessarily be shut up in their rooms, unless they want complete privacy.

The ground floor is meant to be the hub of activities. A typical scenario might feature parenting classes in the living room, and occurring simultaneously, a cooking class in the kitchen, and a budgeting class in the conference room. While all of this is going on, toddlers may be playing outside, and house managers are having coffee at the dining room table. Fortunately, the architecture supports these events by linking the rooms visually, through glass partitions, and allows certain rooms to be closed off with pocket doors, etc. to allow for simultaneous use.

Another important feature is the study nook. It is a small room, with built-in shelves, tucked under the stairs above. During the time I spent at Orchard Park, I listened to many stories about how difficult it was for children who lived in public housing to compete with other children in school. The kids at Orchard Park often had no quiet place to study, and few role models who taught them proper study habits. The tenant leaders incorporated the idea of a study hall into the teen center concept. After school, kids can go there to do their homework. It may not be solitary, but it is extremely supportive. Likewise, the presence of a study area in the supportive housing model is necessary. The teen mothers can not leave their kids and go to the teen center. They need a place for quiet refuge as well.

The backyard is completely fenced in, and is accessed through the exterior stair which is also locked from the inside. A gate linking the backyard to the park adjacent to the building is lockable, and children will be encouraged to stay within the confines of the site, although they will be able to see the park through the fence. Outdoor decks are provided for the handicapped accessible independent unit on the first floor, for the classroom space in the front, outside the front door, and adjacent to the playroom and kitchen/dining rooms so mothers can supervise children at play.

Looking at Figure 5.20, you can see that the second floor is home to the majority of congregate bedrooms. There are four congregate bedrooms which share a generously-sized bathroom, designed for multiple occupancy. Each bedroom has room for a mother and infant, at a minimum, and some have an alcove room which can be used for a small child- with this room there is less of a chance that the small child will be disturbed by an infant waking during the night. Since it is impossible to know how exactly how many children the women will have, it is best to plan for a variety of accommodations.
The women are only allowed to have one other child in addition to their unborn child. During the baby's first year, it is thought best by many social service providers, if the mother resides in the same room with the baby. This facilitates mother-baby bonding. The mother always has help though, because the house managers are just a flight of stairs away.

The service provider will match each family to the appropriate room. All of the congregate bedroom dwellers are each other's peers, and will help each other through out the steps of the program. The stair, which is naturally lit from above and is partially open to the first floor below, serves as the central gathering place, around which all entries are organized. Each bedroom is meant to be the private area for mothers and children to learn how to bond with one another. Furnishings in these rooms include beds and tables and lamps. Some storage is built in, so the room does not appear unnecessarily cluttered. Once a woman opens her bedroom door she re-enters the communal world of the model. Although the second floor will be much more private than the ground floor. Two independent units are located at each end of the building; the location of these units is meant to be a step away from the group living, and ensures its occupants a little more privacy. All congregate bedrooms and independent units have their own terrace.
Finally the third floor houses the final two independent units. See Figure 5.21. In Step Two, independent living, is meant to simulate living in an apartment. The spaces are generously sized. Again, they may house mother, baby and/or children. Mothers and babies still share a bedroom, but toddlers get a separate alcove. There is a private kitchen, living room and bathroom in each unit. This second phase of the program is meant to give the woman a chance to use her new household skills, but in an environment which is still physically and socially linked to the service provider. The physical separation is intended to serve as a quasi-transition between congregate living and graduating from the program. The transition makes the move less abrupt. Private terraces augment the indoor private space, and there is plenty of storage space, because this is the time when a woman might begin to acquire things to take to her next apartment.

Looking at the section taken through the middle of the model lengthwise, Figure 5.22, you see the pitched roof in the middle of the building. The central stair continues on up to the third floor and is bathed by natural light through skylights in the pitched roof overhead. Adding a pitched roof was a gesture to integrate the architectural language of the supportive housing model with the rest of the redeveloped buildings. The building might have accommodated one more apartment on the third floor, but the proposed
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Figure 5.21: Third Floor Plan
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Figure 5.22: Section through the Middle of the Model Lengthwise
design allows for the ends of the buildings to be scaled down and the middle of the buildings to rise above and be bathed in light. There are no buildings casting a shadow on Building 5, and so it gets sun all day long either in the front or back. I believe the presence of many new windows, as compared to what existed before, and the central stair which creates a bright, warm focal point, significantly helps to organize the space, and is important in creating a lively and hopeful atmosphere for the mothers and children.

The final design challenge would be how to integrate this supportive housing model with the surrounding buildings, some of which will be redeveloped soon, and some of which may never be redeveloped. What is the appropriate architectural reference for the model? In the absence of actual redevelopment, but with construction due to start soon, it is reasonable to try to integrate this with the rest of the buildings. For one reason, most of the residents of the building do not want to appear more needy, or more different. One obvious way to conceal the differences between the program of the supportive model as compared to other residential buildings would be to make them all look similar.

While the design of a supportive housing model at Orchard Park seems fraught with rules and regulations which minimize the technical or creative innovation that might be realized, the design of the model to manage the housing is much more intricate. As I said earlier, there have been many good architectural solutions to these
housing challenges, but what lags behind is institutional support and funding which is endemic to the institutions, such as HUD. Since funding is a constraint, it may be useful to look more at the design and administrative issues that can be addressed without the benefit of financial support.

The next and last chapter postulates a management scenario which would allow teenage women who are under age and living in public housing to both participate in the program, and also to graduate into a housing system with rewards. It lays out a policy strategy which counters the issues that the housing authority find most difficult to overcome, and, finally, it discusses what kind of architectural innovations might be realized if the funding weren't tied to renovation of existing buildings.

NOTES

2 Ibid, pp. 105-108.
3 Ibid, pp. 70-72.
5 Ibid
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Chapter VI: Rewriting Policy For Design

What experience and history teach is that people and governments never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it.

G. W. F. Hegel
This chapter consists of two parts:

- Part I: Rewriting Policy
- Part II: Eliminating Impediments to Innovative Design

PART I: REWRITING POLICY

Why does policy need to be rewritten in order to accommodate supportive housing for young women in public housing? Because the regulatory barriers to the implementation of such a project are so numerous, and are so firmly entrenched in bureaucracy, that it is extremely difficult for any housing authority to envision how to pull this off. Even if they were inclined to do so, it is difficult, and requires tremendous cooperation between departments in the housing authority, which may not be used to working collaboratively. Added to this are the other bureaucracies that are involved - the service providers who have to raise funds from private foundations and public community block grants, and others such as financing agencies who may help secure the mortgages for such ventures. All of these processes occur simultaneously, and are continuously evolving, yet few of the parties will ever commit to cooperation unless every piece is in place.

The HomeLife Management Center is the most relevant example presented in the thesis of how a housing authority, which was inclined to do the project, was wooed by a service provider, eventually becoming a partner with the service provider in establishing housing for homeless families on public housing property. The goals for the program, to empower homeless families, who were mainly headed by women, was shared by the director of the housing authority, who clearly was aware of the demographic profile in her public housing developments. She expressed a willingness to designate some units which were badly in need of repair, and for which funding was available, in order to build this innovative program. The service provider had ample experience in fund-raising and delivery of services, and a state financing agency helped out. All of these parties agreed to suspend disbelief and walk down the road together until all of their conditional agreements could be turned into final agreements.

The willingness of the housing authority to designate buildings and to commit modernization funds cannot be underestimated. In Boston, regarding the proposal for supportive housing at Orchard Park, those in decision-making positions are afraid to address the rather complicated regulatory issues, because they have enough on their plates just dealing with relocations for redevelopment. However, if
they really believed that there was a need for this type of housing for the pregnant and parenting teenagers in all of their developments, they would find a way to work it out. After all, regulations that pertain to public housing units and funding sources are similar in most states. The Wilmington Housing Authority, in Delaware, did not have fewer regulations to deal with, but their leadership did believe that efforts to create a new kind of public/private partnership was worth their extra work.

Of the 15 housing authorities that received Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD) Grants in the first round of funding, 6 received full funding for total redevelopment. The total amount of these fully funded grants ranged from $33.9 to $50 million. Although applicants for the URD were encouraged to plan for and develop unique housing, many did not touch this because they got caught up in the complexities of how to program their generic units for redevelopment. Concepts of defensible space and adding streets, and "fronts and backs" were much more prevalent in their designs. At a recent BHA/HUD-sponsored conference in Boston, there was a panel discussion titled "Unique Housing Models - for the elderly, handicapped, and pregnant and parenting teens." It was well attended by directors of housing authorities, but few had any notion of how to do supportive housing for teenage women. Discussions focused mainly on providing off-site alternatives rather than on-site integration. It was clear that drudging through the regulatory barriers was overwhelming, despite the fact that there's a substantial portion of the grant dedicated to service provision on site for the residents of public housing. This means that the recipients of such grants can not only modernize the buildings, but also help to subsidize the services which can be accommodated within them. At Orchard Park, the only funds that are available are for modernization and management improvements, such as security initiatives.

The following section details the specific areas of concern, pertaining to policy, that the Boston Housing Authority had with the supportive housing model proposed by the Young Mothers Housing Consortium (YMC). The Authority's concerns are very likely similar to the issues that any large public housing authority might have with a similar kind of project.

Primary Issues of Concern

Tenant Selection

The Housing authority has insisted that they maintain responsibility for the selection of those eligible for housing, the ad-
ministering of housing assignments, and the enforcement of lease provisions, which has historically been their responsibility. The Consortium, advocating a new model of collaborative management between the service provider, the authority, with the Traditional Childbearing Group overseeing the services, questioned the Authority's need for control over tenant selection. Orchard Park Tenant Association representatives feel that so many of Orchard Park teenagers will be eligible for this housing that the BHA will not have to look outside. Furthermore, they feel that the only criteria for selection be residency in Orchard Park, and being pregnant and at least sixteen and a half years of age.

This age coincides with the Massachusetts law which provides for a status called "emancipated minor". In Massachusetts, a person who is sixteen and a half can be declared an emancipated minor if they are not on their parent's lease. Young teens would need a co-signer, however, before they were able to sign their own lease. This is similar to the welfare restrictions which allow a girl's mother to sign her up for welfare when the girl gets pregnant before she is eighteen. Not until persons are eighteen are they able to get their own unit, in public housing. Coincidental with this award, they must be designated a head of household.

The question of age is very tricky. The promoters of the supportive housing model, as well as the OPTA, know for a fact, that the needs assessment dictates that this model would best serve a young population, because the younger girls are most at risk of repeat pregnancies, and of quitting school. However, the Authority, makes the case that if the proposed age limit of the model were raised from sixteen and a half to eighteen, the Authority would find it more palatable. No doubt, the presence of minors, who require co-signers before they are able to participate, creates more administrative work. More importantly, their presence adds a layer of complexity, and liability to the project that would have to be assumed jointly by the YMC and the Authority. Understandably, the Authority is leery of assuming this responsibility. However, the case management system and the support network endemic to the supportive housing model are designed to prevent these issues of liability from becoming a burden to the Authority.

Eligibility
All clients for the new supportive housing program will be women who are eligible for public housing and already reside in either Orchard Park or another housing development. Therefore, the rent subsidy they currently pay can be transferred to the unit they will
occupy, resulting in no loss of rental subsidy for each woman, which the housing authority fears. The Housing Authority is currently collecting rent subsidies on the vacant units in the eight mothballed buildings awaiting development. It will continue to collect rent on the vacant units even while they are under construction.

**Client Population**
The Housing Authority is concerned not only with the needs of Orchard Park residents, but also with the housing needs of the waiting list which, as of 1993, numbers approximately 21,000 people. According to the authority, one of the largest growing populations within the BHA system is female head of households between eighteen and twenty-eight years of age. In most cases the women are not only living doubled up with their parents, but also off their mothers’ welfare benefits.

While the Consortium does not dispute these facts, it points out that the group that is most at risk of living in persistent poverty are young women who are having children at fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen years of age, and who sometimes have two or three children by the time they are eighteen to twenty-eight years old. Additionally, their children are suffering because the girls are too young to know how to parent adequately, and may have come from households in which their own mothers were young mothers. The maturity levels of a twenty-two year old mother and a sixteen year old mother are vastly different.

The Consortium, while mindful of BHA statistics, heeds the recommendation of the Orchard Park Task Force when it says that the majority of pregnant women living in Orchard Park are under eighteen years old, sometimes as young as fourteen or fifteen. This is the reason behind the “early intervention philosophy.” If you can reach a girl who was pregnant at sixteen, and teach her how to parent, and to get her to finish school, she very likely may not have the second child until she is ready, at a much later date.

**Relocation and Split Household Status**
Because of impending redevelopment, many residents in Orchard Park are eligible for “split household status.” This enables “doubled-up families to develop two tenancies, one for the parent(s) of the family and one for the remaining household members with children.
This status provides housing for another member of the family, and holds them responsible for lease provisions.” Presumably, the majority of households which would elect to split are headed by women ages eighteen to twenty-eight, with eighteen being the youngest age a person is eligible for an apartment under BHA regulations. To this the Consortium responds that yes, the household be split, and the additional housing unit be assigned temporarily in the supportive residence, not another unit in the development.

This presents two problems. The first is the notion of supporting the Consortium’s prime incentive for young women to enter the program in the first place, which is to enable them to get their own apartment upon completion of the 18-24 month program. Even social workers at the Roxbury Comprehensive Health Center, an on-site health clinic at Orchard Park, agree that this incentive alone virtually guarantees young women’s participation because their wish to have their own apartment is so great.

The structural impediment to this is the current BHA policy that when households split, one faction must remain in the development, and the other must re-apply to stay in the same development. Thus, current residents who wish to split households must relinquish their current housing status, and are subjected to the bottom of a waiting list of 21,000 for BHA housing. This policy is unfair, and it flies directly in the face of preserving community, and further provides a strong disincentive to split the household in the first place. Most people would rather remain in an overcrowded living situation, than move away from family and friends, which may be the only support they have. Young women with no visible means of support, who have children, are rendered impotent in this situation.

In order for the Consortium’s incentive to work, the housing authority would have to grant the split households priority status so that they would not have to re-apply to the same development they were already residing in. In addition, rules about open and closed developments, predicated on whether a development was about to undergo redevelopment, would have to be re-examined. For example, Orchard Park is about to undergo redevelopment, and has been for two years, so it is “closed” to the waiting list. No new residents are able to request Orchard Park because the authority is trying to relocate existing residents until their new units are complete.

In BHA terminology, these priority slots are called set asides, and as one BHA official put it at a meeting I attended:
...if we give them to you (the Consortium), every special interest group in town will want them, and we'll have to give slots to them, too.

The split household presents another problem for the Authority when it considers implementing a supportive housing model. It is possible that when the young woman decides that she is eligible and would like to participate she will have to relocate. The method she uses to accomplish this, will be discussed later. But, the initial move is complex. When she indicates that she wants to move, she is inviting attention to herself and her household. She may have been living in an overcrowded household, which is called being "underhoused". By leaving that household, her absence might reduce the ratio of persons to bedrooms to a better "fit." Or conversely, her absence might yield an "overhoused" situation, which means there are too few persons per unit. In the case of being overhoused, the family might need to be relocated because another family which actually needs all that extra space might be next on the waiting list. In essence, the departure of one member of the household, might necessitate additional transfers for her remaining family members, which makes a lot of work for the Authority, and in the context of impending redevelopment, changes the intended unit count necessary.

**Lease Agreements and Eviction Policy**

New lease agreements, similar to current BHA leases, but tailored to the young women, can be written so that their subsidy gets paid to the authority. Special clauses pertaining to rules that must be upheld in the residential and service program can be linked to reasons for eviction. Currently, if a person living in public housing commits an infraction that is punishable by eviction, their entire family (the other occupants of their unit) can be held accountable and evicted. This policy is effective when dealing with families where drug dealing and sheltering of criminals is taking place.

However, in the Orchard Park model, if a young woman is emancipated, and is living on her own in the supervised residential setting, and commits an infraction, the case management system in place would be ready either to refer her, in the case of drug use, to a rehabilitation program, or to refer her for special help. In any case, the lease provisions would carefully spell out the degree of infraction and the punishment for it, and the girl would have to sign the lease to take part in the program.
The housing authority is afraid that the actions of the emancipated woman would leave her family, living in a different unit, vulnerable to eviction. Clearly, they are not accepting the notion that these women are responsible for their own actions and have signed a legal document that binds them to a certain code of behavior. The reason why the BHA continues to refer to this threat of eviction as a premise upon which to refuse the Consortium is clearly indicative of a need for paternalistic control over families and especially young women.

First, the BHA would have to agree to allow minors into the supportive housing, under the direct supervision of case workers and house managers. All women would have to be eligible for public housing and meet the criteria for the program, which includes age, number of children and pregnant status. The participants would have to sign a lease agreement with the BHA, agreeing to pay rent under the usual predetermined method not to exceed 30% of their income, which will probably be welfare. In return, the women have to agree to participate fully in the rules of the service program for its 18 to 24 month duration, which binds them to attendance at meetings and school, and to other responsibilities for themselves and their children. Their successful graduation will depend on the fulfillment of program and personal goals and will be granted upon permission of the program director.

The lease agreement between the service provider and the BHA would stipulate the terms of the maintenance and management of the building. For example, in Delaware, at HomeLife Management Center, the YWCA did routine maintenance to a HUD-sponsored modernization, and the housing authority assumed the cost of utilities, as well as the responsibility for screening potential residents, all of whom were previously homeless. The service provider did not pay a subsidy to the housing authority for rent, and it brought in private and public donations that subsidized its operations and paid its staff.

Upon graduation, each woman should have a choice between going to public housing, or getting a Section 8 certificate that enables her to choose where she wants to live. For many service providers, it is not enough to help these women learn how to survive public housing, but it is important to get them out of public housing. The supporters of the Orchard Park model haven't decided whether a specific goal should be to get the women out of that environment entirely. If you ask the chairperson of the Orchard Park Tenant's Task Force, Edna Bynoe, what she thinks the goal should be, she'll tell you it is for a girl to get her own apartment, to get out from under their mother's bad habits. The young girl that I interviewed, "Denise," felt that, if given the choice between staying at Orchard Park in her
own apartment, going to another public housing development, or getting a mobile Section 8, she would choose staying at Orchard Park first, because her friends and family were there. Her second choice was the housing certificate. Under no circumstances did she want to go to another development because she felt that everyone would identify her as coming from Orchard Park, which was bad.

Broadly speaking, the decision to evict a woman from the program does not rest on the housing authority, but on the shoulders of the housing manager. If a woman commits an infraction that violates a house rule, such as missing curfew, she is not subject to any punishment by the authority. If she commits an infraction which is punishable according to the terms of a standard lease agreement between the housing authority and the woman, she is more at risk. The housing authority is afraid that they will be forced to evict the woman from the program, and that upon her probable return to her mother’s apartment, she leaves the entire family vulnerable to eviction as well. This is a highly exaggerated probability, because, first of all, if a woman in the supportive housing program commits a serious infraction, she will be referred immediately to the appropriate social service agency or medical facility to help her deal with the problem. Upon her proving that she can again accept the terms of the program, she may reenter, subject to supervision. There really is no reason for the housing authority to necessarily be concerned with this. The idea that a seventeen year old woman may commit an infraction which is serious enough to warrant her entire family’s eviction, despite the fact that she does not live with them, is absolutely ludicrous. The environmental support network of these women will close in around her and help her immediately. That is what they are there for.

Upon graduation, the young woman will now have few choices if current regulations do not change. For example, the housing authority believes that the prioritizing of slots on the waiting list for graduates of such a program is irresponsible. They believe the women should be placed at the bottom of the waiting list. However, the list currently numbers about 21,000 people. Furthermore, the women who were residing in public housing before they entered the program are still eligible, and should merely be transferred to either another development, or to the one they came from, which ever they choose, if possible. At Orchard Park, this is especially tricky. While the development is undergoing redevelopment, it is closed to the waiting list, so no one can select Orchard Park. Furthermore, because of redevelopment current residents get to decide if they want to split their household.
Splitting a household is a practice whereby a subset of a current household gets to transfer to another development, if they choose to split. Both households cannot stay in the same development. This has serious implications for the supportive housing program. One, it forces the graduates to leave their community, which some will not be ready or willing to do, and this will have a direct consequence on the number of willing participants. Two, it forces the authority to reexamine the proposed unit counts for redevelopment, and to make fewer five and six bedroom apartments, which are very large, in favor of more two and three bedroom apartments for small families. The Young Mothers Housing Consortium felt the sting of this dilemma when it approached the authority with the proposal for Orchard Park. Here they wanted to accomplish this by using Phase One construction dollars, yet the fact that they were possibly splitting up households may have necessitated a recount of the unit mix, which holds up the redevelopment process entirely.

Finally, the notion of designating any one group a priority over the other is a slippery slope for housing authorities who are quite wary of discrimination suits, and of being besieged by "every special interest group in town who will want one." The Consortium's sense is that unless the housing authority guarantees the participants a prioritized slot, they may have to return to the dysfunctional environment they came from, and all the young women's hard work may go to waste. Furthermore, they believe that an internal transfer is much less difficult to achieve than a relocation.

The previous paragraphs detail the specific objections that the Authority had with the proposal for the supportive housing model. I have taken this a step further and developed a policy scenario that tests the assumptions of the program. This scenario begins with a fundamental assumption on my part. This assumption is that before a woman is eligible for the program, she must legally be counted on the lease. This move is an attempt to assuage the Authority a bit. It will help them in addressing the problem of "undercounting." Undercounting is a serious problem. It means that there is really no precisely accurate way for the Authority to count its population. Currently, residents update their leases, and add new or subtract members of their families on the lease. Sporadic checks on their populations may yield different information. Temporary guests will not be on the list. Boyfriends of female heads of household who are not financially responsible for child support may reside there illegally. There are other examples of possibilities. The number of residents who may be undercounted is hard to estimate, but the New York Housing Authority estimates its resident popula-
tion to be undercounted by 20%.  

Suppose there was a family with four members, head of household aged 47, adults ages 30 and 20, and a minor female aged 17, who is pregnant and already has one child. How can we re-write the rules to get her into the program?

Step 1. Determine if family composition is accurately reported to the BHA; are all the family members listed on the lease or the latest reexamination?
If yes, then it is time to initiate the transfer process for this woman to enter the supportive housing program.
If no, there should be a screening process which requires the woman to be processed as a new applicant, for which there is separate waiting list. Perhaps a waiting list could be developed with local priority given to women at Orchard Park, who might not be at fault for not being reported on the lease.
*This may create an under- or over-housed living situation at the apartment of origin.

Step 2: For the woman on the lease, she is put on a transfer list which could include a special program category (Supportive housing) which would give her priority over new admissions and some transfers.

Step 3: The special program transfer list can be matched to availability of units in the program, which is in either one entire building or a portion of a building.

Step 4: The woman signs a standard public housing lease, which has an amendment that stipulates the specific program requirements. She must sign both, and attend an orientation so she becomes aware of her rights.

Step 5: The pregnant woman is moved first into a congregate room, of which there are 4-5 units, and then during the next year to an independent unit in the same building. Both are connected to the service component.

Step 6a: Does she successfully complete the program? If no, she is referred to an intervention program, which she must successfully complete before she is readmitted to the supportive housing model. If she does not complete the intervention program, her lease with the program will be terminated, and
the Department of Social Services will be brought in to help her explore other options.

Step 6b: If she graduates from the program, she as a program graduate will retain special program priority on the transfer list, but would be matched to the next available generic unit in the BHA portfolio; and/or, she will be given priority for a Section 8 certificate (which may require an amendment to the Section 8 administration plan), of which a certain number can be set aside per year for expected graduates of special programs.

Step 7: The woman and children receive a BHA unit or a Section 8 certificate, whichever is available first.

When you look at it this way, it seems much more simple than it actually would be. It actually is more a matter of rewriting public housing policy in order to facilitate these kinds of unique yet necessary programs. Supportive housing programs for teenage mothers are run much the same way that programs that aid the elderly with "aging in place." Both believe that housing is integral with services.

In fact, because there are many original residents of Orchard Park still living in the development, the authority may find itself wondering how to help these residents stay in their community. Because it is not cost effective to equip all the units with devices, such as handrails, that assist the elderly, it may be necessary to build a program which gathers similar elderly residents into one communal environment. The scenario's logic plays itself out only slightly differently—this time the transfer is for an elderly person, not a minor.

Group adult foster care exists in the private sector, including private housing and service provision contracted by the social service agencies or welfare departments. Often services are funded through grants which are health-related. Assisted living funds for an elderly resident are much harder to obtain if the person is of a middle-class income bracket. These services tend to occur at the bottom and top of income brackets. The similarities are hard to ignore: developing a special program designation which carries a special transfer status is the first step for the housing authority.
PART II: ELIMINATING IMPEDIMENTS TO INNOVATIVE DESIGN

While there are structural impediments to realizing this kind of project at the policy level, likewise there are literal structural impediments to achieving any real innovation in architectural design of these models. Because the funding requirements for modernization specifically prohibit demolition and further stipulate a 1:1 replacement rule for units lost, housing authorities aren’t lining up at architect’s offices and saying, “let’s see what you can do.” They are much more apt to make do with existing stock, to modernize the building and re-landscape the grounds. Even in my design project I found that I was unable to justify this no-demolition rule, and so I interpreted it to mean selective demolition of pieces was allowed. The demolition was replaced with infill-structure of a lighter material, and probably with more glazing.

I would argue that the shape of a public housing building is not the optimal envelope for a supportive housing program. For example, its "s" or "z" shaped form is open on either side, leaving its residents feeling exposed. Take the notion of a courtyard scheme instead. Its enclosed form surrounds the open space and protects it. The form of the building actually offers refuge, rather than promotes exposure. Many new models are being built in courtyard schemes, but they are not for public housing.

Architecture and the SRO Trend

The trend to develop single-room occupancy hotels is spreading like wildfire, so to speak, in California. New zoning laws written in the 1980’s help spread the fire. The need for well-maintained, basic dwelling units, at an affordable price in the heart of the cities such as San Diego, is overwhelming. In fact, SRO’s have become so prevalent, some towns are now trying to outzone them to prevent more of them being built in the downtown. Three projects in California by two different architects stand out. The first is La Pensione, and the second is Harborplace, both of which are in San Diego, and both were designed by Rob Wellington Quigley. In Harborplace, see Figure 6.1 and 6.2, one can see by looking at the elevations that this building is exploded into discreet pieces, which, when one examines the plan, look very regular and linear. The project is a hotel/studio hybrid, home to students, elderly living on fixed incomes, and the working poor.

The massing of the building was entirely Quigley’s idea. While I can make connections to the rather clunky building masses of public
I realize that under current regulations you could never build this kind of building, which is new construction but would blend with the old.

The second Quigley project is La Pensione, in Little Italy. It is an 80-unit project which combines housing with a pair of restaurants. The hotel's facade is broken into two 50-foot volumes, which echo neighborhood low rises with storefronts. In Figures 6.3 and 6.4, you can see the volumes expressed, and begin to get a sense of the rich articulation of detail and scale.
The last project is James Lee Court, by architect Michael Pyatok. See Figure 6.5 and 6.6. The city of Oakland built the project to house its homeless. The city bought the land and provided funds for construction. Potential residents participated in the design of the project, which yielded the project’s U-shaped plan.

Townhouses for families are located on the ground floor. The building steps back to respect the scale of the Victorians across the street. The program called for 6,000 s.f. of social services, which are located on the ground floor in the southwest corner. A daycare facility for up to 40 children will be used rent-free by Head Start, and rooms for counseling, management and parenting are available for parents. For singles, there are communal lounges and an outdoor deck. The architect secured a 1% for art grant from the city, and commissioned a team to design and install African-inspired tiles that zigzag along the top and across the entrance. See examples of the detail in Figure 6.6. Reflecting Oakland’s cultural diversity, a mural with Latino themes will be installed in the archway. Three Buddhist spirit houses built by the architect are intended to shelter spirits displaced by construction. In James Lee Court, everyone is safely housed.

The point of relating how to build publicly funded new construction projects, while at the same time courting cultural diversity, is important. There are many opportunities at Orchard Park to engage residents in the design of the structures in the development. A similar venture was conducted by the nearby Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, or DSNI. It sought to engage young people in the community to design their community building under the tutelage of architects and planners. The children, seen in Figure 6.8, were grouped into similar age groups and were taught how to build models, and draw what they were thinking about. When they were finished with the schematic design, many of the kids felt they owned the building in a not so small way. In fact, some of them were even considering architecture as a career.

Perhaps the supportive housing model can be treated in a similar fashion. Perhaps it is different and that difference should be celebrated by the use of new materials and colorful finishes and banners and flowers. Maybe the idea should be not to literally integrate the building, but to figuratively re-integrate its graduates back into the community.

The essence of this thesis then, is about developing a range of options. In Chapter Two, I detail how women experience space differently from men, and also how that difference is socially constructed. Women experience everything differently than men do. This is an
Figures 6.5 and 6.6: Axonometric and courtyard view

Figure 6.7: Corner view
obvious point. But, if all things were equal, women would have the same right to claiming territory as men do, and to define which kinds of housing they would choose for themselves. All things are not equal, especially for poor, minority women, and even more pointedly, for teenage women, who are experiencing adult responsibilities, but are not of legal age to be recognized as an adult. It is for these young women, who are in danger of harming these infants and themselves, that options such as supportive housing are envisioned. While this thesis focuses on young women in public housing, the same is true for teens everywhere. They need parenting support.

I refrain deliberately from dictating which option a woman should choose upon graduation from the supportive housing program intended for Orchard Park. This is because I believe that each individual should be able to choose, whether she wants to remain in public housing or whether she elects to move of-site with a Section 8 certificate. Each woman will graduate with different skills and at a different level of personal empowerment. She might feel ready to strike out on her own, she may not feel quite ready to move so far away from Orchard Park, and may wish to stay in Boston. It is up to the individual to decide how to interact with all the networks of support that surround her. For "Denise", these networks include family and friends at Orchard Park, and the counselors at the model. Whatever she chooses to do, it is fairly certain, that she has made a fundamental change in her life for the better, by virtue of having participated in the supportive housing model. More importantly, her children have a far greater chance of living a stable life, because their mother had the courage to participate.

This thesis really sought to look past myths about welfare mothers and cultural stereotypes and to focus on the "welfare" of the children being born to young mothers. It was Aldo Van Eyck who said, when designing the Single Mother's Home in Amsterdam:
"If childhood is a journey, let us see to it that the child does not travel by night."

NOTES

Appendix: Redevelopment at Orchard Park
Elements of the Plan

Broadly speaking, the current plan for Orchard Park contains a plan for reduction of density, creation of new through-streets that will facilitate integration into the community, and the creation of zones ranging from private units, and backyards for ground floor units, to semi-private spaces which it is hoped will encourage exemplary behavior. It also includes the implementation of a community policing plan— which is a partnership between residents, management, and the Boston Police department to make the environment a safe place. Orchard Park was once the location of a development-based criminal enterprise, headed by Daryl Whiting, who has since been convicted. Orchard Park residents do not want to lose any more young people to drugs or violence.

The discussion that follows will be organized according to the principles of the EOCD Handbook and will describe the generic design guidelines and simultaneously delve into each one using Orchard Park as an example. Redevelopment guidelines have been organized into three categories:

Site:
- Streets and Orientation
- Parking
- Open Space
- Recreation and Amenities
- Trash Disposal

Units:
- Unit Mix
- Unit Design
- Accessible Units

Non-Residential Facilities:
- Management and Maintenance Facilities
- Community Facilities
- Space for Service Providers

Streets

Streets are important for many reasons. When a person has a street address they are able to find their apartment, and so can delivery men, friends, and others. When all the buildings look exactly alike, because of similar materials and identical design, it is disorienting. People want to park their cars outside their doors for security and convenience. Police will not patrol non-city owned streets within a development because it is not their legal obligation to do so. Streets
that do not bisect a development become safe havens for drug dealers because they stymie security officers from pursuing them in cars. At Orchard Park, two new streets are featured in Phase One of redevelopment, which comprises only 9 of the 27 buildings. Three more new through streets would be undertaken if rehabilitation of the project was complete, for a total of five.

However, when streets are made safer and more convenient for residents they may also be more convenient for people living outside the development. There should be a balance between the two, one which encourages safe pedestrian traffic, but one which discourages vehicular traffic from outside from using the development streets as a racetrack. The goals should be safer, accessible streets which encourage resident socialization, but which are also active play spaces for children, and which by virtue of their active use discourage drug traffic.

Design responses to this usually involve looking at the original street plan before the development was built. The housing authority will have a record of the original designs which may have a plot plan of the original street grid and possibly ownership of the parcels which had to be acquired before the project could be built.

Fronts and backs

Additionally, streets can enhance access by delineating which is the front and which is the back of the buildings. Because the redevelopment process often involves the use of designating private backyard space, and therefore streets belong to the public front space, they can help in reinforcing the notion of public and private. A code will be established when entries are no longer shared, but are entered from the street edge. The front elevation has porches and pediments, the rear elevations are considerably plainer. The backs remain institutional-looking.

Pedestrian vs. Vehicular Circulation

Likewise, there are ways to physically separate pedestrian space from vehicular space. Sidewalks wide enough to accommodate both a child playing and two adults walking should be provided on both sides of the street. Mechanisms that seek to reduce speeding cars should be employed, such as speed bumps or changes in materials. This worked very well at Commonwealth. Designing streets that curve or bend may also slow down cars.
Parking

Parking has become a more serious issue over the past twenty years. Many more people own cars now than they did in the 1950's. People now choose to be able to park in front of their apartments, for both security as well as convenience. Locating parking in lots away from a cluster of buildings is dangerous and should be discouraged. In fact, if a parking lot is the only official place to park, people have been known to drive over grass, and anything else to park next to where they live. The amount of paved space in the development actually accommodated this practice very well. There is much less choice about what to trample if there is no landscaping left. The amount of parking made available should be considered within the context of other uses on the site. Community facilities, management offices, etc., need parking too, and a balance should be struck. At Orchard Park, parking is being designated parallel to the new streets, rather than in mini-lots perpendicular to the street like lots at Commonwealth.

Open Space

Open space, or the lack of it, is a serious problem. Although most of the public housing projects in Boston are low-rises, and have a lower density than some in larger cities, such as Cabrini-Green in Chicago, lack of open space exacerbates overcrowding in apartments, which leads to deterioration of the overall environment. Often there will be none to speak of because the sites were paved over in the 1950's.

The concept of “defensible space” is based on the notion of being able to define and control territory, whether it is private, semi-private, semi-public or public. A resident cannot control someone from loitering outside their window because there is no demarcation of territory for that person to defend. If a resident is given space outside their unit to use as they like and be able to change it over time, they will most likely maintain and defend it. The ability to see a space from their own unit also may prove to be defensible. A principle goal of redevelopment then is to design all areas with a specific user in mind.

Recreation and Amenities

Semi-private areas include tot lots, drying yards and sitting areas near parks. At Orchard Park, these spaces occur in the private,yet
collective, back yards. These will be clearly delineated by level changes or materials such as fencing, and should not be shared by more than 15-20 families, or they will be overcrowded. The housing authority will probably maintain these spaces also.

Semi-public areas such as parks, basketball courts, and large playgrounds should be conveniently located. At Orchard Park, there was a substantial rehabilitation of the Park in 1991, yielding ample space for basketball courts or for larger uses than a tot lot. These are shown in Figures A.1 and A.2. Because not all the housing will be redeveloped, facilities on the park side will probably be used by residents who have no other open space. Again, the housing authority will maintain this, continuously.

Public areas are really the ways that people move in and through the site. If the development has a recreational facility that neighborhood kids use, for example, then existing shortcuts should be taken into consideration. Likewise, shortcuts taken by residents to points out of the development may need to "re-designed" in to the equation. At Orchard Park the main desire line is a short cut, (seen in Figure A.3) winding its way from Eustis Street to the BHA Administration Building, which houses mail boxes among other uses. The other major short cut was through the development's Harrison Avenue "gate", through the middle of the development before the buildings...
slated for redevelopment were fenced off, seen in Figure A.4. This path was also a major drug-trafficking path, out of the visual range of police or BHA security. Residents want the Harrison Avenue access to be closed off.

Recreational amenities are some of the more public uses such as playgrounds, basketball courts and facilities, but they may also be hopscotch games, or community gardens or paved areas that are for play. They will probably be maintained by the Authority.

**Trash Removal**

Trash removal is a seemingly simple issue but actually poses many problems. The fact that large trucks collect trash means that any enclosures must accommodate such equipment. The presence of large dumpsters also means that volume of trash collection is large, and anonymous and when placed next to someone's unit may pose health problems in addition to being eyesores. Other people from outside the development may use these and if improperly disposed of may cause an increase in “subterranean varmints”. Collection points must also be convenient for people to haul their trash to and, again, talking to maintenance about what size containers need to be, as well as other issues, is advisable. At Orchard Park, the dumpsters are integrated into the gate at the termination of a courtyard, providing a visual, and no doubt, an aural screen.

**Units**

Units constructed to design standards of the 1950’s no longer serve the needs of today’s families. Most units were built as one and two bedroom units for “starter families.” Most units are too small to meet the needs of today’s larger families, which may be multi-generational. The spatial standards themselves are too minimal to meet current need. The advent of kitchen appliances and other household equipment itself renders these apartments too small, even for the one and two-bedroom units. The need for units with three and four bedrooms is underscored today, and is evidenced by preliminary designs for Orchard Park, shown in preliminary design drawings in Figures A.5, A.6, and A.7.

Accordingly, the need for larger common spaces within units for larger families to dine or lounge together is necessary. Children will spend time away from home because there is "no
Figures A.5, A.6 and A.7

Figure A.5, A.6 and A.7 show the plans of the first, second, and third floors of a residential building. The layout indicates a "suite" at home, which makes parental supervision impossible. The threat of violence outside means there is a greater need for people to be comfortable inside. There is no space in which the entire family can assemble at once, and so the opportunities for family gathering are further limited.

Circulation often bisects a room further limiting its usable space. Bedrooms will not meet furnishability tests that determine whether standard size furniture pieces will fit. Bedrooms will
not accommodate double occupancy either. Bathrooms designed for one to four persons do not accommodate more than six persons very well. An extra bathroom could be necessary. Lastly, there is seldom any closet space for bulk storage or clothing, because public housing residents were thought to be temporary and to own little.

Design responses to these issues range from re-classification which redefines the number of persons assigned to a unit, thereby increasing spatial standards. Another method is redesign within the existing walls. This means removing interior partitions to increase room sizes, which in turn may reduce the number of bedrooms the unit may have. Temporary relocation of tenants may be needed. Another modified method would be to extend the unit footprint by combining units, vertically or horizontally.

These are called break-throughs. They may also address the problems of adding bathrooms. Temporary relocation is required. The most comprehensive method is to rehabilitate the complete unit by redesigning the building. If the original design was poor or if costs associated with the above measures are infeasible to achieve the desired result, this may work. It is easier to design without these constraints. This approach requires completely vacant buildings, so residents have to be relocated. Often at the time redevelopment is considered, a housing authority may have already done horizontal breakthroughs to accommodate the needs of a few large families where this could be done inexpensively.

Generally, because housing was built before there were standards to ensure handicap accessibility, there will be no accessible units whatsoever. Some may have been made ad hoc over the years. (The rule is if 25% of the replacement value of the development is exceeded by the value of construction work then all aspects of the redesign have to comply to current standards). Five percent of the units need to be made accessible, as well as all public areas and the site itself.

A barrier-free environment is one that accommodates the needs of a person in a wheelchair. Variances have been granted that stipulate that only building entries with accessible units need to be made accessible. However, this causes a problem if someone in a wheelchair wants to visit someone else at their apartment. At Orchard Park, efforts have been made to locate accessible apartments in varying locations. The possibility of retrofitting other units with devices for persons who are hearing or visually-impaired were also
Additionally, federal dollars mandate that two percent of units should be provided to accommodate the sensory impaired. It is considered good design practice, and is mandated by the state of Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (MAAB) to distribute all accessible units proportionately across the bedroom mix. Clustering such units on the site will stigmatize residents and in effect create a ghetto of handicapped persons. Handicapped-designated parking spaces should be provided to facilitate easy access from apartment to car.1

Management and Maintenance Facilities

Some housing authorities relocate their central offices on-site after redevelopment to reduce crime and increase visibility of management. They are sometimes accommodated in basements of existing buildings or may be located in a separate building altogether. Care should be taken to insure that the administration does not disturb the residents, and vice-versa. Separate facilities accomplish this better than when both are located in residential buildings. These buildings may need to be brought into compliance with the MAAB.

Management offices usually have to provide accessible facilities also. Mail pick-up is usually located here as well as rent collection. At Orchard Park, the BHA administration building is not accessible, which is a big problem. Because of pressure being applied on the BHA, there is an immediate need for relocating their offices to an environment that is accessible. Residents think that is why the BHA is eager to settle the question of the Family Investment Center. They are scheduled to get new office space in the Center, which will be connected to the current teen center building, and will have an elevator. If the BHA has to renovate its current office building, it will waste hundreds of thousands of dollars bringing it into compliance. Hence the need for new space.

Community facilities

Public housing developments usually contain one or more facilities that are/were home to services or recreational facilities at one time or another, this is the case at Orchard Park. Examples of other types of facilities could be community halls for social gatherings or resident task force organizations, health clinics or mail facilities or
day care or laundry facilities.

Federal guidelines now prohibit the delivery of mail to new private entries so that even newly redeveloped public housing will have need for a central mail facility. Security concerns about mailboxes being locked or people being able to discern what other peoples' mail is, such as magazines, flyers, etc., as well as theft of government assistance checks are very real concerns of residents and should be addressed. Designers should be mindful of the fact that the mail area might be a viable gathering spot as well. The presence of management near such a facility might be interpreted by residents as an invasion of privacy. At Orchard Park, the residents requested spatial separation between the management offices and the task force office and mail boxes. They "don't wish to be spied upon."

NOTES

2 EOCD, p. 59.
3 EOCD, p. 62-63.
4 EOCD, p. 68.
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