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ABSTRACT

This work searches to build a framework for a rehabilitation strategy for distressed urban Public Housing projects. It is argued that an appropriate approach needs to address both, the physical and the institutional aspects of the projects, and that the core of the distress can be seen as a matter of levels of control at the project level. In this light, the notion of "mediating structures" —as an intermediate level of control to be built into the projects— is proposed.

The argument is developed through three stages:

* A search into the history of Public Housing and its decay, to pinpoint what built-in patterns of control —in physical and institutional terms— support the projects' distress.
* A review of current rehabilitation attempts in relation to the issue of control.
* An examination of what a mediating structure means and what the necessary conditions are for its support through a rehabilitation plan. The basic principles for the rehabilitation strategy, are then outlined.

Thesis Supervisor: Nabeel Hamdi
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INTRODUCTION

The subject of this work emerged from a questioning of the recent rehabilitation attempts in Public Housing, as I have seen them in the Boston and Cambridge area.

The endless repetition of monotonous blocks, the vast open spaces lacking any spatial configuration, the conspicuous isolation of the projects, and the vandalized and abandoned buildings and spaces, are a common characteristic of the massive Public Housing developments throughout the city.

The rehabilitation attempts seem to intend to respond to the failure of these projects to adequately house the poorest, and to provide them with a more appropriate opportunity to their social and physical re-integration to the city and the society.

To what extent is this really the case? The rehabilitation attempts --while upgrading the projects' conditions-- are still conspicuously homogenous and centrally controlled. To what extent is a new logic operating in the rehabilitation attempts as opposed to the one that dominated the origins of the Public Housing program? Or is it a new updated "solution" but within the same mode of thought? If this is the case, where lies the core for an effective intervention in the Public Housing projects? What are the basic conditions for it to work?

Section 1 of this work searches into the history of Public
Housing and into the causes of its decay. What were the built-in features that supported the projects' current distress? The focus of the analysis is on "control patterns". It reviews the control on users and the control through the form established by the design of the program, and their role in Public Housing's process of decay. It is then argued that the rigidity of the control patterns defining a vast publicly controlled realm and a tight privately controlled one, established a setting for the decay.

Section 2 reviews current programs for rehabilitation of Public Housing in the light on the focus on controls proposed in section 1. It examines to what extent the suggestion emerging in section 1—a need to redefine patterns of private/public control—is a focus of the programs. It is argued that the current programs, while upgrading the sites, do not actually address the nature of the control dilemma, but only its evidence.

Section 3 focuses on the proposed redefinition of patterns of control. The first part proposes the notion of "mediating structures" as an intermediary level of control to be built into the Public Housing project realm, and examines what it means and implies. The second part deals with how to make it work, and establishes the basic conditions for the development of a rehabilitation strategy for Public Housing that involves the support of a mediating structure in the project realm.
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SUMMARY / INTRODUCTION

This chapter will briefly review the conception of the Public Housing program and its formal outcomes. The purpose of this overview is to clarify the sources and processes that have led to the projects' current distress and to the enormous gap between outcomes and apparent goals of the program.

It will pinpoint at:

a) How the pressures of the private housing sector along with the concepts of ideal communities and the belief in constant upward mobility shaped the regulatory and formal aspects of Public Housing, ultimately leading to an amazing level of control of the part of public authorities over the form and users of Public Housing.

b) How this defined a pattern of strict division between a vast totally publicly controlled realm and a extremely tight privately controlled realm, that was clearly reinforced by the physical patterns.

c) How this extreme dichotomy and the lack of flexibility both in the administrative system and in the physical designs in affording alternative forms of control contributed to the collapse of the Public Housing projects once the original social circumstances had changed.

The reformulation of the control patterns at the project level in both, physical and institutional terms, seems therefore a necessary focus in any rehabilitation attempt.
It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to promote the general welfare of the Nation by employing its funds and credit... to assist the several states to alleviate present and recurring unemployment and to remedy... unsafe and insanitary housing conditions.  
(Declaration of Policy of the 1937 Act)

...we heartily approve the passage of this bill, for the reasons, first of its potentialities toward relief of unemployment; secondly, for its long-range planning effects, which will stabilize unemployment; third, for its slum clearance....  
(readings from Congressional records)

It is revelatory that the Housing Act of 1937—which is the basis of the institutional arrangements and physical products of today's welfare housing—was originally passed as an economic measure and not as a social housing program. The provision of housing was only one of multiple purposes of the program. Officially, the Act stated its goals as, mainly, the provision of jobs and stimulation of the depressed industry, and secondly, the production of housing as a means to achieve the former. In this context, the specific design and targeting of Public Housing was secondary to the larger production goals, and it responded basically to the pressures of the major interest groups involved: The private business sector and the depression-impoverished middle class.

As described below, these groups' pressures shaped the program, basically through the introduction of particular CONTROLS ON USERS and CONTROLS THROUGH FORM.
SECTION 1A

CONTROLS ON USERS
(1) Are you going to penalize the people who have shown some thrift in this country? Who should get housing first, the people who have shown some thrift and are able to pay rents, or the people who are the poor we will always have with us?
(President of a Redevelopment Co.)
(Bredemeier, "The federal.." pp131)

fig 1

Early residents of Public Housing.

(2) An employee who is spoiled every night by bad rooming and housing and who comes back in the morning not recreated... Much of the maligning, gentlemen, much of the criticism of workmen...is...because after they get home...they come into housing that is not fit.
(cited in Bredemeier, "The federal...", pp47)
1937
TARGETING THE POOR?

Even if by 1937 the recessionary economic conditions were improving, there was still an acute shortage of adequate low rental housing: The number of poor had increased enormously during the depression and millions of families were barely making a living. But these new poor were formerly members of the middle class and as such, retained their middle class culture, their habits of expressions in civic matters, their articulation, as well as their expectations. These millions were the actual pressure group and candidates for whom the Public Housing program initiated in the 30's was designed. Public Housing emerged not so much from a radical social ideology, but out of a clear demand of a politically active but generally conservative group. This point is best illustrated by the program's requirement that operation costs be offset by tenants rent payments: This arrangement clearly targeted a population with a basic income capacity, the working poor, the submerged middle class-- and thus established a form of CONTROL OF USERS of Public Housing. The real poor, dependant families with irregular or no income were too poor for Public Housing.

1937
A PROGRAM FOR SOCIAL REFORM?

Perhaps a fringe of social reformers looked on Public Housing as something more fundamentally "social": They saw in the program an opportunity to give form to their ideas of "model environments" that would relief the poorest
Management controlled every aspect of daily life— pets, overnight guests, color of paint on walls, schedules for using washing machines... in a combination of disdain and high minded belief that P.H. could elevate residents, make them more orderly.
(G. Wright, "Building...", pp232)

If a kid walked on the grounds, they almost got thrown out. If they found a paper on the grounds with your name on it you had to pay a dollar.
(Washington Elms residents)

The role of the government was—and has remained— that of doing for the sake of human rights what the business system failed to do... a dominating goal is the welfare of the business community, viewed as the main institutional structure of the society.
(Bredemeier,"The federal...", pp108)
citizens of their condition through an educational impact. Paradoxically, this philosophy of environmental determinism and its social goal was contradicted in its implementation, by the criteria used for tenant selection: "good" families (working, complete and white ones) were favored; and eligibility was established upon prior behavior screening, via house visits, recommendations, etc. ... The "model environments" seemed to require "model tenants" as a condition in order to work as envisioned. Given the high demand for housing units and the shortage of supply, authorities could be that selective. Further controls on users were also devised through monitoring in-project behavior, regulations on life modes, and through the month by month lease system, which allowed easy eviction on behavior grounds. The social reformers' notion of model environments was thus coupled to a high control power on the part of local housing agencies.

1937

Private Housing Sector: Curtailing Competition

The 1937 Act found stark opposition in the private housing market sector. Businessmen feared that excessive public intervention in the housing market would be an unfair competition to their activities. As a result of their pressures the program was structured in such a way that any competition was curtailed. Public Housing was conceived only as a "corrector" of the private market deficiencies, and therefore, responsible only for those groups the private sector was unable or unwilling to serve.
This created a "limbo area" for those making too much for Public Housing and still too little to access a private unit. In the long run, this created a disincentive for Public Housing residents to increase their incomes...

We must remember that our tenants come from substandard homes. They are low income families. The project homes are far, far above anything they have ever known. They are decent, safe, and sanitary homes with every convenience that is possible under cost limitations. Residency in a project is intended to be...a temporary bridge during a period of financial stress. (M. Dumayer, 1950)
(through eligibility) and PRODUCTS (through cost limits) were established to ensure this:

- **Controls on users:** Eligibility was limited to only those too poor to enter the private market: tenants' income had to be 20% lower than that allowing access to the least expensive private market unit. Once a family's income increased beyond this upper limit, it had to leave and resort to the private market housing.

- **Controls on the product:** Unit costs were limited (approx $100/room, $400/unit), to discourage any "extravagance" in the designs that would make the units similar to privately produced ones. The projects were sturdy, functional, but purposefully austere and minimal in standards, to convey the idea that the housing was not a free gift, nor an alternative to the privately provided units, nor intended for families to stay.

Both this "institutional" image and the controls on users reinforced a clear social and physical separation between the private housing and the Public Housing realm.

**1948: RESTATING THE MODEL:**

*GOOD* TENANTS AND PROTECTION OF PRIVATE BUSINESS

The second major piece of legislation on Public Housing -- the 1949 Housing Act-- followed very much the same patterns of the 1937 Act: It was also launched as a response to an economic crisis; The Housing goal itself was again subservient to the private business sector; And a selectiveness in the users group was maintained!

While this 1949 Act did state the goal of "a decent home and
(8) Business interests insisted in having a role in the Program, through the rebuilding of deteriorated urban sectors, converting deteriorating urban areas into tax bases. Under title I of the Act, the government would pay $2/3 of the costs. (G. Wright, "Building..." pp232)

(9) Like the cultural symbols of "good citizenship", the symbol "veteran" was used by supporters and opponents of Public Housing to justify the status quo. (Bredemeier, "The federal..." pp111)

(10) BHA, 1950's:
There is a difference between 'eligibility' and 'acceptability' as defined by BHA: An "unacceptable" family is one whose composition and behavior is
• a danger to the health, safety or morals of other tenants.
• an adverse influence upon family life.
• a source of damage to the property
• a source of danger to peace and comfort.
• in any other sense, a nuisance.
    ....A list allowing broad interpretation or bias...

Any rejected applicant has the right to ask for a rehearing; such right, however, is never officially explained to the applicant. (BHA, "Public...", pp27)
a suitable living environment for each citizen", in fact, it rather expressed the political pressures of the powerful private building businessmen: they conditioned their support to the Act on its linkage to a work stimulation program that encouraged slum clearance in inner city areas for private redevelopment. Thus, Housing the poor became instrumental for the removal of the poor from valuable sites. For each Public Housing unit built, a slum unit had to be destroyed— that was the deal. Unfortunately, the reverse did not hold: the new units of Public Housing that were built never matched the number of destroyed dwellings, thus postponing the "housing" goals of the program.

In terms of the users, World War II brought a new wave of "good" or deserving applicants to Public Housing in the war industry workers, service men families and later, in the veterans returning home. Controls on users through eligibility criteria, income brackets and behavior, were maintained. And during the 50's, despite some emerging laws against discrimination in Public Housing (1948, Mass.), local agencies used these controls and the priority given to veterans to exclude black and minorities, so that the tenant body still comprised a relatively "selected" white and upward moving population.

CENTRALIZING CONTROL IN LHA'S

At this point it is clear that these major pressures -- the alleviation of the needs of a crisis-impoverished middle class (first because of depression, then, war), the free
If there was something you needed and it couldn't happen in your house, there was always a friend that could do it. It was such a family thing. It was always a happy place. People would help each other.
(Washington Elms tenant)

There were numerous functions sponsored by the CHA, the School Department, community groups, and the residents. Some of the activities held were: a nursery school, a summer formal, an annual baby contest, a garden club, a father-daughter dinner, a horrible parade, and a playground pageant.
(Washington Elms tenant)
functioning of the private housing sector, and the ideals of social reformers—all led to the centralization in the public authorities' hands of a number of CONTROLS ON USERS mentioned above—upper income limit; lower income limit; good/deserving tenant selection criteria; behavior within project—and to a clear social and physical separation between the private housing and the Public Housing realms.

These aspects would later be crucial to the changes in Public Housing.

Nevertheless, in the 40's, the resulting conception of Public Housing as a publicly controlled way-station for upward moving families seemed to fit all those major groups' circumstantial needs. Being a way station for selected families, the clear distinctiveness of Public Housing was not seen as a negative feature. And indeed, great part of the initial success of these projects resided precisely in their being such tightly controlled environments and a "selected" community, with regulations fitting exactly the specific needs and capacities of that time.

Thus, in its initial years most projects were composed by a highly homogenous and articulate population, clearly upwardly mobile, that shared a conscient solidarity which nurtured friendship bonds and a clear sense of community. Since projects were well financed, and maintenance and social services were well provided by local agencies, it all contributed to residents pride and sense of care. The stark control on users was what supported a smooth daily life.
SECTION 1B
CONTROLS THROUGH THE FORM
A large project would have an increased chance for maintaining its distinctive character because its very size helps to dominate the slum neighborhood and discourage regression.

(Planner cited by G. Wright, pp234)

Planning has to be bold and comprehensive. If not, the result will be only a series of small islands in a wilderness of slums, beaten down by smoke, noise and fumes. No traffic should disrupt the community.

(Planner cited by G. Wright, pp235)

Walter Gropius: diagrams showing the development of a rectangular site with parallel rows of apartment blocks of different heights. 1929
THE 'PROJECT' APPROACH: A SETTING FOR CENTRAL CONTROL

The broader production goals of the program, the administrative needs of controlling a large public resource, along with the philosophy of physical determinism sustained by the social reformers, were the main forces that permeated the design of the Public Housing projects. Interestingly, these different forces converged in finding in the design principles of the Modern Movement an appropriate expression to their particular (and even opposing) needs.

- The architect's visions of open spaces and scattered collective buildings forming large self contained environments where a "liberated working class could dwell in healthy and spacious environments" found support among the social reformers. These well ventilated buildings, complemented with communal facilities, seemed an ideal opportunity to develop their social ideas.

- On the other hand, these formal visions were also largely appropriate to address the production goals of the program as well as to meet the interests of the building industry, since they were grounded in a mass-production oriented thinking, in the rationalization of standards and dimensions and in the development of repeatable models.

The consequence of these -- ideal communities, mass production-- led to land pooling and to the emergence of the "project" as a prototype product: the total design of a defined piece of urban tissue, generally many times larger.
LOCATIONS & THE "PROJECT APPROACH"

1941
Washington Elms/ Cambridge: replacing slums

1948
West Broadway/ Boston: replacing the slums

1950
Jefferson Park / Cambridge: on the urban fringes
than any surrounding tissue block. For the new communities to succeed, both physical and social aspects had to be controlled. While the CONTROLS ON USERS described before took care of the social side, the "project" approach came to be an adequate setting for controlling the physical side: it provided local agencies with a limited, non-distributed, measurable place, which facilitated both, the construction and administration stages.

The estates took the form of super-blocks located either in

a) the midst of decaying neighborhoods, or b) the urban fringes of that time. The former correspond to an earlier stage, when Public Housing was still replacing slums; The latter correspond to the period of Urban Renewal, when slums were replaced by offices and Public Housing was already being pushed to marginal areas that nobody would build on.

Having a clear, stereotyped formal image, and acute differences in scale and grain with their surroundings, the projects stand out as "different" pieces in the tissue, with little or no continuity with the older street grids or volume / void pattern. Intentionally conceived as places apart, this difference was seen at that time as an asset, symbolizing the progressive nature of the projects and their radical departure from the surrounding slums.

2 STANDARDS, LAYOUTS: HOMOGENEIZATION OF PLACE

The development of projects as repetitive models, was also an instrument to help centralized control and monitoring at
Ironically, in one aspect Public Housing was often built far better than private stock: --construction--. But then, non-tenant interests were at stake: quality construction was needed for buildings to last for 40-60 years in order to protect the bond indebtedness through which they were financed.
the federal level. It was argued that standardization was necessary for national efficiency and equity reasons. In effect, the U.S. Housing Authority produced the Unit Plans, a sort of a pattern book of typical apartment plans and block formations. As a result, this book also perpetuated a fixed idea of what an "adequate" design was.

The "adequate" design expressed the "no frills" requirements through tight standards, supported by somewhat curious educational grounds: no closet doors -- to encourage neatness; small parent bedroom -- so that no child slept in same room. Permanency was not to be encouraged, so there was little interest in providing an environment to satisfy long term family life. No doubt, production goals dominated over the livability aspects in the design of the projects.

Lay outs are very diverse and apparently arbitrary, although all tend to display a strong regularity in the spacing of blocks. There is a pattern of total indifference to the different edge conditions of sites; In some cases blocks are laid out parallel to the border streets, in others, in angles, the latter leaving undefined patches of land on side walks that underline the striking will for disconnection with the fabric.

Blocks are rather standarized and similar in all projects. Their lack of "endings" along with the lack of design difference between in-site-blocks or edge-blocks, emphasizes the homogeneity within the sites. Generally, in each block, common staircases (9-12 flats)
fig. 4
Accesses and staircases: tenants use of scarce intermediate spaces
are accessible both from back and front, which results in a rather undefined back/front relationship, given the lay out and facade design. This pervasive homogeneity in spaces, facades, accesses or views, would later support the rising problems of control and tenant alienation in the estates: The design not only kept projects from relating to context, but also impeded the projects from achieving an internal unity.

THE DICHOTOMY: PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC WORLD

A stark division between two types of territories was established by the lay out and the flat design of the blocks: Space was either exterior and totally public, or interior and totally private. No other form of intermediate space or territory was provided, but for the common staircases, basements, or the inside corners of L shaped buildings. As such, these took special significance as spaces for the development of social relations; The front door steps were also a basis for the definition of some semi private territory, a social sitting out place. But these elements were ill designed and barely sustained the definition of place. The territories would later be prone to easy dismembrement.

Tenants, therefore, moved between two extreme but still functioning worlds: a privately controlled but very tight territory, and an extremely regulated public exterior. As a publicly owned and maintained resource, these public territories were designed to be kept tidy and to offer an
There must be a definite limit to the maintenance a tenant is permitted to do or your project could soon become a hodge podge of interior color schemes; temporary, unsightly and unsafe repairs;...

(M. Dumeyer in J. of Housing, 1950)
image of permanence and institutional respectability. They could not be the object of individual expressions or timely transformations through personal interventions....What a stark contrast to the scenes of the slums, where private and public space, inside and outside, merged together and flowed and changed according to more or less spontaneous forms of appropriation through the residents activities...

These physical outcomes were, undoubtedly, a direct result of the interests and forces at play: Large and standarized developments for economic efficiency, a sturdy expression and an amazing low level of control over the environment of the part of residents, in order to avoid appropriation feelings ascribed to private homes. The "real" circumstantial goals of the 30's Public Housing program --economic production and the way-station dwelling concept-- were certainly built into the physicality of the projects. And while tenants were temporary, and the estates well financed and maintained, these physical patterns still fitted well the social needs.

But once those initial social conditions changed, the system and the physical patterns would not allow the consequent adaptation to new forms of control. Basically two built-in physical features eased the upcoming collapse of the projects: a) the afore mentioned pattern of territorial control (totally public vs.totally private), and b) the lack of integration to the neighborhood or "project" approach.
SECTION 1C
BREAK-DOWN OF THE CONTROL SYSTEM
(16)
You know, the screening process stopped, and that's when it went downhill.
Because then they let every Tom, Dick and Harry in. It wasn't a family housing anymore. The changes were drastic, you had to start locking doors and buying lock for your windows. I guess I noticed a change in 1962...when they came around and put the big heavy doors downstairs and locking them, that's when you know there was a big change, society is changing. The projects had to change too.
(Washington Elms tenant)

(17)
You got a lot of frustrated bitter women with kids to watch...The women were still here, some of the original women, but the men were no longer there. Families had broken up and the women stayed because it was cheap. That's what started the trap.
(Jefferson Park tenant)
The 1949 provision prohibiting discrimination of assisted families in Public Housing was the beginning of the erosion of the absolute control on users of the part of local agencies.

At the same time, the formerly critical situation of the submerged middle class was overcome, and these earlier residents of Public Housing were fleeing massively to the suburbs, pursuing the dream of the individual home. And veteran families were soon no longer found in the waiting lists. Public housing was thus progressively taken over by families displaced by Urban Renewal in inner cities, a population who radically differed from the original one.

A main factor was that, as a result of the Civil Rights Act of 1965, the then current discretionary tenant screening procedures were abolished. A "first come first serve" system was implemented, and later, in 1969 (Brooke Amendment), top rents were fixed at 25% of tenant income (with a supplement for operating costs provided by HUD). This had an enormous influence on the population's change, which tended to be composed more and more of minorities, immigrants, AFDC dependants, and female headed households, all residents who would not have made the first cut in the previous screening process. And these were not upward mobile families anymore. Instead of providing temporary shelter to "good" families, Public Housing became permanent home for a new welfare class.
Management got weaker and weaker, and tenants got worse and worse. Older tenants tried to keep the rules. Newer tenants didn't know anything about the rules. The rules changed, and then they made their own rules...
(Jefferson Park resident)
The provisions that required that rents offset operating costs had worked quite well through the 40's, while there was a consistent demand by tenants with a paying ability that kept pace with operating costs. But now that Public Housing became the urban renewal relocation resource and was opened for the real poor, rental incomes declined increasingly. With costs rising due both to inflation and to the aging of the projects (15-20 years), the gap between income and expenses at project management level widened more and more. The program's fiscal and institutional design, however remained unaltered despite the radical shifts in clientele...

A debilitating cycle was set in motion, leading to further increase in costs; Maintenance and capital improvements were deferred or ceased. Services declined, the projects deteriorated and residents' frustration heightened; crime and vandalism became a norm. Those families who could afford it, moved out, and turnover and vacancies in less desirable projects increased, dramatically affecting the social networks and the life and state of the projects.

It would be possible to argue that the apparent "failure" of the Public Housing program was not such: The program did succeed in serving as a way station for the submerged middle class according to the "real" original goals. Once this goal was satisfied, the system was only revealing what it never addressed nor intended to address:

It is clear that Public Housing was never intended to serve the tenant population who now for two decades have lived and
fig. 6

The tenants then

and... the tenants now
Because of banning of local agencies' controls on users, the Public Housing system is now --for the first time-- faced to address the "real poor", if not by political will, then because of historic circumstances. What this means in terms of related issues such as lack of education, lack of opportunities and jobs, and low level of expectations on the part of residents, has to be understood and addressed. Any rehabilitation process has therefore to be seen in a social perspective as well, and a perspective quite different from that of "good families" which permeated the original program.

2 PHYSICAL PATTERNS: SUPPORTING THE COLLAPSE?

What was the role played by the physical patterns in this spiral of decay?

Within the control patterns established by the design --a vast publicly controlled space versus tight private ones-- the financial crisis of local authorities inevitably had a major impact on the running and maintenance of these spaces: authorities found themselves incapable of maintaining the estates, and physical deterioration spread out.

With the more rapid turnover of residents the social networks also broke down. The physical patterns were not instrumental in supporting these weaker bonds, since the physically barely defined territories required of the social agreements to survive. On the contrary, in the absence of these social agreements, the formerly "social" territories...
(20)
Who is responsible for what?
I used to tell the kids to get out of that tree because they were going to break it, and they said to me "you don't own it, you can't kick me out of here because you don't own it". I'd yell at them "you don't own it either"
(Jefferson Park resident)

(21)
"Maybe I create a little mischief around here and create a little something" That's their kind of fun, what else are you going to offer them? Parents are too poor, so they don't have the money to take them out.
(Jefferson Park tenant)

(22)
The kids played ball here. The management didn't want it, but kids being kids, they still played ball in there. So they pulled all the bushes up, pulled all the grass up, and hardtopped it.
(Jefferson Park resident)
became too exposed, and therefore, settings for conflict:

Thus, the staircases, which had been a focus for a controlled semi collective life, became vulnerable and even dangerous places. The front/back ambiguity of the blocks facilitated the access of strangers into the estates, and since residents didn't know each other any more, there was no control. And the basements of the blocks, which had served as spaces for communal activities before, could no longer operate as such due to the lack of staff to run them; and because of their easy access directly from the now uncontrolled public space, they became too exposed and truly troublesome areas, filled with dirt, and used for all sort of non-legal activities.

New patterns of use emerged: unemployed youths and kids took over areas of the projects. The abandonment of maintenance of the exterior spaces left them prone to vandalism.

Authorities reacted to the evidence rather than the source: many formerly planted courtyards in the projects were paved over at about this time...destroying what little spatial hierarchy was still left.

The physical patterns and the system would not support --and rather curtail-- the emergence of alternative tenant forms of control over the grounds. Inevitably, tenants retreated increasingly to their only controlable sphere, their private apartments;

3 BREAK DOWN OF SOCIO-PHYSICAL FIT: A NEED FOR REDEFINING CONTROL

The physical design of the estates supported a livable
I guess the biggest disadvantage of growing up in Public Housing is the stigma: That if you live in Public Housing, you are shiftless, lazy and so on. There are drugs and crime here, but just like at any development, but the stigma is the worst.
(M. Hailey, Bromley-Heath, interview)

Project kids you could talk to, they respected you. Outside kids thought you were a 2nd class citizen, and they just didn’t pay attention to you.
(Jefferson Park resident)
environment only under the original conditions of stringent controls on users and high maintenance expenditures. Once the institutional controls broke down, the physical environment revealed its inability to easily sustain or promote any other forms of spontaneous controls of the social life or the physical grounds; This only contributed to accelerate the alienation of residents. The nature of the design itself reinforced the definition of only two forms of territory — totally public/totally private—. The dimensions and configurations of the public space made spontaneous individual control difficult and required some form of centralized control. Once the local agencies' control system over the public realm broke down, there was nothing left for the internal cohesion of the projects.

And in terms of the relation to their context, the "project approach" had a role: Defined now as areas serving the marginal poor and not the low middle class anymore, the projects'boundarization perpetuated the marginal condition of those who stayed: The physical demarcation results also in a clear social demarcation; those living in public housing were now stigmatized and seen as those "unable to do it". The physicality of the projects supported their becoming enclaves, ghettos for the poor.

In the 70's, emerging new visions about residential environments' nature, were supporting this idea that the collapse of public housing had also sources in design
The West End was a run down area of people struggling with the problems of low income, poor education, etc... But even so, it was by and large a good place to live.
(H. Gans, "The urban..."

Society has contributed to the victimization of project residents by setting off their dwellings, stigmatizing them with ugliness; saying with every status symbol available in the architectural language of our culture that living here is falling short of the human state.
Architecture can create encounter and can prevent it. Certain kinds of space favor clandestine activities of criminals; an architect armed with some understanding can avoid providing space which supports it.
(O. Newman, "Defensible...", pp12)

Habraken's diagrams on territorial depth:
1 illustrates Public Housing's dichotomy: the existence of only two types of territories, a vast public one and a tight private one.
2 on the contrary, shows a progressive move through public to private territories.
aspects rather than only social ones. Herbert Gans published "The Urban Villagers", in which he argues that older inner city environments did provide a far better physical support for a relatively safe and active urban life for a poverty stricken population, than its urban renewal counterparts.  

Oscar Newman developed his ideas of "Defensible Space": he relates quite directly design moves to deterioration patterns in Public Housing, basically by emphasizing the incidence of design in provision (or lack) of control mechanisms (vision, access, size, etc). John Habraken, on the other hand, in a more conceptual realm, developed a concept of Place based on the notions of "territory" and "powers" that seems to corroborate the troubles of the Public Housing experience.

Through this historical overview it is sustained that control patterns have both a physical and an social/institutional component. The control patterns build into the program as a result of particular historic circumstances in the 30's, still define the physical typology of the projects and their administration system. The extreme dichotomy "public vs. private" and the "project approach" in both physical and institutional terms have become now sources of distress. A lack of flexibility in the face of changing circumstances has characterized the system, contributing to the projects' current state. The reformulation of the control patterns at the project level, seems therefore a necessary focus in any rehabilitation attempt.
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CURRENT PROGRAMS AND THE ISSUE OF CONTROL

SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

This chapter briefly examines the initiatives for improvements of Public Housing that have been undertaken in the last decade in the light of the previous section's suggestion that a reformulation of the patterns of control in physical and in institutional terms seems to be in need.

This section pinpoints at:

a) How the attempts basically maintain the basic distribution of control on decision making and transformation of the estates.

b) How in its most comprehensive rehabilitation attempt, the system seems to resort again to an ideology of ideal environments where both form and users are a controllable component, and to the "one time investment project" approach. It is posed that while controls are necessary, the basic question is that of at which level these are exercised.

c) How some attempts at redistributing control at the project level have been devised basically through physical change. It is argued that a physical approach with no institutional support questions the current fit and the long range success of these design attempts.
RECENT IMPROVEMENT/REHABILITATION ATTEMPTS

The best argument for Public Housing is its permanence. The poor have been driven away from almost everywhere except the projects. It's a situation in which the pachyderm nature of government --its greatest weakness-- becomes its greatest strength in at least sustaining a place where the poor can live. We build on that to say not only "yes, you're staying", but "yes, we're going to reinvest". (H.L. Spence, receiver for the Boston Housing Authority)

In the last decade a series of initiatives for improvements in Public Housing have been undertaken under HUD, in view of the distressed and decaying conditions of the projects. What are the goals and approaches behind these? The previous historical overview suggested that a reformulation of control patterns in Public Housing was necessary. How do the current rehabilitation attempts address this?

Basically, the initiatives have been oriented to:

a. Operation improvements, in the form of subsidies to the local housing agencies, and

b. Modernization, through the funding of physical improvements in aging projects.

MANAGEMENT OPERATIVE IMPROVEMENTS

1. The Performance Funding System: Adressing the evidence.

This first program was launched in 1972, and it established a monthly operating subsidy for local housing agencies. The program recognized the financial gap affecting local authorities as a result of the changes in population and the consequent lower rental incomes. But the operating subsidy
### fig. 1
**Intended structure of the program:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Power</th>
<th>Control and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: R. Struyk, "A new..."

### fig. 2
**TARGET PROJECTS PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Title of Goal</th>
<th>Objective No.</th>
<th>Title of Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improving Operating Effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Perform needed training of PHA personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduce average time to satisfy maintenance service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduce vacancy loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reduce average rent collection time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reduce average eviction time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Provide effective management for implementation of TPP plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improve Financial Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase operating receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase ratio of operating receipts to total operating expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improve Physical Condition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve janitorial services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Improve exterminating services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Improve condition of grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve condition of structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improve condition of elevators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Improve condition of electrical systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Improve condition of heating systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improve condition of plumbing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Perform needed interior painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Perform needed exterior painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Provide needed replacement or repair of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Perform other needed physical improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decrease incidence of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Decrease incidence of vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improve Upward Mobility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase resident earned income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Increase resident employment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approach is one of addressing the evidence of the problem rather than its nature. Although it included a provision for incentivizing betterment of management (through sharing savings with the local agency) it was still a financial approach to fill a gap and did not address the issues behind, nor did it question the local agencies' operation or control system.

2. Housing Management Improvement Demonstration

As opposed to the above, this Demonstration program -- attempted between 1973-76 -- acknowledged for the first time that inefficiency problems might be addressed through a decision making redistribution at the Project management level. The original design of the program intended to test the efficiency of management strategies by varying the emphasis between staff and tenant control at individual demonstration projects. However, as it was finally launched, the program had a very unstructured form, and lacked a monitoring plan, so that no meaningful evaluation was possible, and the value of specific improvements never analyzed nor carried forward....

3. Target Projects Program: one time investment approach.

Interestingly, this was the first program with a project-focus rather than agency-focus. Between 1975-78, it channeled additional operation subsidies specifically to severely distressed projects. The program stated its specific "performance" objectives, but did not refer to the processes or methods to address those issues in a continuous form. Not
Of the Urban Institute's general conclusions in the evaluation of this program, one is worth mention in relation to this work: "Close tenant involvement made success more likely". (R. Struyk, "A new ...." pp144)

Public Housing Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program, HUD handbook
one objective refers to a redistribution of control. The underlying hypothesis seemed to be that a one time effort within the existing operating and control relationships would set the projects back into normal course. It is interesting to observe that this ideology still permeates current initiatives, and yet, their validity has never actually been proved. In fact, in this Target Projects Program, many participant projects that were actually improved with this massive funding, were applying for massive fundings again only two years later...since forms for sustaining those initial improvements once funding was exhausted were not actually worked out.

PHYSICAL MODERNIZATION FUNDS

The same "one time effort" attitude has also permeated the Physical Modernization programs started in 1978, (which became part of the Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program in 1982) and which represents the more ambitious and comprehensive attempt at rehabilitating Public Housing:

Modernization funds are meant for

"Improving the physical conditions and upgrade the management and operation of existing Public Housing projects, to assure that they continue to be available to serve low income residents".

Priority is given to upgrading older projects (over 20 years old): since they are reaching the end of their bond-indebtedness period it has to be ensured that they have no "major physical deficiencies".

"Priority work-items" for physical improvements are the core
Priority Work Items:
- Energy conservation improvements
- Upgrading of buildings to comply with health and safety codes.
- Ensuring the basic integrity of the structures and systems.
- Security and criminal abuse resistance.
- Any other improvement that signifies immediate and demonstrable cost savings for the maintenance expenditures of the local authority.

(R. Struyk, "A new..."

(I'd never join those tenants comittees again because they don't work. They try to make you think you're doing something. It's only a pacifier for tenants. Not one thing they ever asked for did they ever get.

(Jefferson Park resident)
of the program. Other provisions that are mentioned in the program include encouragement of tenant participation, and attention to the relationship to neighborhood. In this context, the program is apparently the most comprehensive one in its definition and its provisions, since it acknowledges that decay is a consequence not only of the financial crisis, but also a result of poor design and poor managerial procedures. Moreover, for the first time tenants and neighborhood are mentioned as participating parties for a successful rehabilitation.

A closer examination, however, reveals its problems:

Tenant participation is encouraged in the statement, but the program requires that "tenants be informed of the plans and discuss ideas and suggestions 3 weeks before submittal of application," -- which seems rather a token time, more than effective guidelines for involving residents in decision making and redistributing control. Moreover, modernization funds are explicitly inapplicable for tenant organization, discussion groups, information dissemination or social services... tenant involvement in local control is thus further discouraged via non-funding.

With respect to relationship to neighborhood, there is no mention of the potential role of the project as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization. The program still treats Public Housing as an entity separate from the community and other housing assistance programs.
The following elements of physical design contribute to the creation of secure environments:

- The territorial definition of spaces: reducing the public areas by unambiguous differentiation between grounds and paths, and creation of a hierarchy of public to private zones.
- The positioning of windows and accesses to allow natural surveillance over public areas.
- Adoption of building forms and idioms which avoid the stigma of Public Housing.
- Intensify the use of the grounds in predictable and social ways.
- Reducing the number of units grouped to share a collective area at any scale — per stairway, per block, per project...

(From Newman's "Defensible...")

Schematic diagram illustrating evolving hierarchy of defensible space from public to private. Arrows indicate entries at different levels of the hierarchy.
2 Physical Interventions and the Issue of Control

In sum, the "project" approach and the "one-time investment" concept characteristic of central control, still dominate. There is also an emphasis on the physical aspects of improvement, over the change in management procedures, which is reflected in the "priority work items". Physical form is a more controllable aspect (via standards for example) and therefore easier to plan and implement. Physical change is also more devoid of political risks and its potential implications on change in the power structure and in the relationships with tenants are more controllable. The relationships to neighborhood parties and tenants are maintained within a "secure" or "stable" margin. Finally, physical form is also politically, a strong communicating tool in terms of its physical presence, to underscore the achievement of an "improvement product".

Nevertheless, the form is the main means in the modernization program by which a certain redistribution of control is implemented at the project level. In spite of the diversity of proposals in different sites, this common underlying theme permeates them all. It derives basically from the researches of the 70's, notably Newman's theory and guidelines for a "defensible space": the notion that a space, to be secure and well kept, has to be under continuous surveillance. Newman's work has become the paradigm of renovation:

a) Programming and categorizing of public areas

The vast common, public areas are redesigned by intensifying
1 Washington Elms / Cambridge

2 West Broadway / Boston

3 Jefferson Park / Cambridge

PROGRAMMING PUBLIC SPACES

INTERIOR/EXTERIOR
and categorizing sub-areas with specific uses: gathering places for different age groups, drying yards, tot-lots, new pathways, etc, in a mosaic of uses; the pervasive parking lots are usually de-centralized and associated to the units, for easier surveillance; when the existing lay out suggests common courts, their boundaries are emphasized, and public throughways cut, so that the spaces become sort of semi-private areas for those living around.

On a larger scale, some projects seek to reinsert themselves into surrounding street grids, by provision of new conventional streets, and breaking down the super-blocks into more normal sized, controllable ones.

b) The interior/exterior relationship

Most projects, give a large proportion of the units their own private access to grade, converting the units into townhouse types; or reduce the number of families sharing a common stair to no more than 3-4, to ensure tighter social control. This is done by treating apartments as duplexes, and adding new stairs.

c) Reducing densities

Most projects reduce their densities, for easier control. This is also coupled with an upgrading of the original size standards, which are way below current regulations. The redesigns provide fewer but larger units, enough to accommodate the existing residents, given the high vacancies.

d) Image fit

The question of the "institutional image" is also addressed: the common theme is of ornamenting the blocks through colo-
In the Jefferson Park Renovation, the big court was to become a major play area with the 4 corner clotheslines clustered together. This met stiff opposition from tenants, because young parents with little mobility used the corner clotheslines extensively for drying and for observing their children and socializing.

...The design was changed. But the architect succeeded in centralizing child play. What little vestiges of the hierarchy of space that the tenants had been able to maintain in the face of increasingly aggressive affronts by children and youths, were completely disrupted by this renovation.

(D. Powers, "Jefferson...")

We didn't go out as much after that, it was too crowded. All different people were coming in, from the towers, the square, everywhere, for the ball playing. You don't have as much privacy; we had more fights and arguments then, with people from all over.

(Jefferson Park resident)
ring, addition of elements, bay windows, porches, stairs, pitched roofs...as a means of breaking the monotony and the flatness, and making them more consonant with their contextual typology.

Undoubtedly, all these moves aim at increasing in the territorial control and identity on the part of tenants, which is fine. But, the question still remains, who decides what, and in whose terms, in these redesigns? Elsewhere it has been pointed out how a well trained architect's own well intended decisions may be removing the existing --even if barely apparent-- local territories and networks, which, after all, have an incalculable role for those deprived residents.

Secondly, control is not ensured only by providing an adequate form --today, but in the institutional arrangements that mediate the continuous making of the form. To what extent can those given new forms be transformed, personalized and reinterpreted by residents? If they are not, we are only giving an "upgraded" but still institutionalized form, even if its not apparent today. The particularization of spaces has potential...if expectations are not too specific and if appropriate local institutional changes are devised as well.

3. RE-ESTABLISHING CONTROLS ON USERS?

With respect to the social aspects, the modernization program sets a goal of achieving 97% occupancy level and the need to review the local agencies' tenant selection procedures in order to support the production of a social enviro-
The CHA established as a primary goal in the renovation of Washington Elms, the need to revise and alter the tenant group.

...The strict application of the criteria established by CHA means an effective reduction of the minority population in the project.
(P.Jordan, "Public...", pp 136-7)

Some tenants would agree with stricter procedures, that coupled with their active voice in criteria definition encourages their own compliance with the rules and regulations.
(P.Jordan, "Public..." pp139)
nment that attracts some higher income residents to maintain the estates. So while there is an emphasis on the physical form, it is understood that formal change is not solely sufficient for the social upgrading of the project and the removal of their image of "housing of the last resort". But rather than using the improvement of the projects as an opportunity to upgrade the poor, "empowering" them through new forms of control over resources, the approach seems to resort again to screening and controls on users. This approach recalls the one mentioned in the origins of Public Housing -- the notion that a "good environment" also required "good tenants" in order to function as envisioned. The original ambiguity about who the actual beneficiaries of Public Housing should be, pops up again. The authorities notion is that if projects are to succeed, some social control has to be re-imposed. If this is so, the question then would be - who exercises this control? Could not tenants intervene? It is not a matter of having no controls, but of the level (central or local) in which they are exercised.

It is important to note that basically, this question is the same we posed when referring to the decision making on forms.

4 THE ISSUES:

1. THE NEED FOR INTERMEDIATE LEVELS OF CONTROL
2. INTERVENTIONS WITH COMPLEMENTARY LINKS

What seems clear is that all these improvement programs, while well intentioned, do not centrally address the issue of distribution of control over the local project resources.
Still, in the context of these interventions, projects undoubtedly do improve. The question, however, is how long can we expect it to survive and under which constraints on users.

One can argue that a centralized decision making power is more vulnerable because of its necessary rigidity to deal with a multitude of local particularities in an efficient way, as compared to a control pattern composed of more intermediary levels where adaptations and changes according to local requirements can be absorbed.

Finally, there is the question of what the actual goals of a rehabilitation effort should be. Should rehabilitation mainly aim at the upgrading of a still valuable physical stock? Should this be linked to the rehabilitation of the dependant poor? Are we rehabilitating the agency? To what extent is the project independent of the rehabilitation of the neighborhood itself? Selecting different hierarchies will imply different strategies, rules, and participants. While all these goals are not necessarily nor easily compatible, we believe that there are some issues that relate to others in complementary links, so that addressing one can more easily be used also for the simultaneous satisfaction of a secondary goal. That means there is some basic or "minimum" action that may lead to the rest. The redefinition of Public Housing's local control patterns (at the project level) in management and physical terms has potentials for the development of such relationships, and therefore be the core for an inclusive approach for rehabilitation.
SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

In the light of the previous section's observations, this last section sets a general framework for an approach to rehabilitation that addresses the redefinition of the patterns of control in the Public Housing project realm:

a) The dichotomy central/individual control in Public Housing is discussed, and the problem defined as one of levels of control. The notion of "mediating structures" --an intermediary level of control that stands between the central and the individual extremes-- is presented as a scenario for a rehabilitation strategy.

b) The second part, establishes conditions and modes of supporting the emergence of such a mediating structure in the Public Housing project realm.
   It discusses:
   - how can residents be involved,
   - how and what rehabilitation actions or plans be dealt with if mediation is a goal.

   The underriding goal of mediation necessarily shapes the approach for defining a rehabilitation strategy. A final summary of basic recommendations sets the framework for a future development of a specific strategy.
"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion."

Thomas Jefferson
The previous historical overview illustrated how the institutional and physical formalization of Public Housing in a stark division between a vast totally publicly-controlled realm and an extremely tight privately-controlled realm, worked only while the original premises (upward mobility, financial solvence of agencies) held true. But once the filter clogged and residents became permanent, those patterns became an alienating force and greatly contributed to the process of decay of the urban Public Housing projects:

- Within those control patterns the financial collapse of local agencies meant the loss of control over all running and maintenance aspects of the projects.
- And, unfortunately, that same physical and institutional structures would not support—and rather curtail—the emergence or development of alternative forms of control over the projects' grounds.

The vicious circle of vandalism, retreatment and decay reflects the central power's loss of control, the individual's reaction to his lack of control, and the powerlessness of both to deal with or relate to each other.

While it can be argued that the factual origins of Public Housing's distress lies in the changed social and economic conditions, in this work we have posed that a setting for the conflicts was given by the nature of the control patterns, that is, by the dichotomy individual/central control.
(1)
Berger and Neuhaus, "To empower people."
Berger and Neuhausen best describe the crisis posed by this dichotomy:

"For the individual in modern society, life is an ongoing migration between two extreme spheres, public and private. The megastuctures (public sphere) are alienating, that is, they are not helpful in providing meaning and identity for individual existence. Meaning, fulfillment and personal identity have to be realized in the private sphere. But there in the private life, the individual is left very much to his own devices, which he cannot rely upon; and thus he is uncertain and anxious".

"This dichotomy poses a double crisis: it is a crisis for the individual who must carry on a balancing act between the demands of the two spheres. And it is a political crisis because the megastuctures come to be devoid of personal meaning and are therefore viewed as unreal or even malignant".

This is exactly the conflict confronted by Public Housing today. And in this light, the core of the problems --and therefore the solutions-- can and should be stated in terms of "levels" of control. The issue of who decides what and in whose terms, becomes a crucial one. How can a channel be built from the sphere of the individuals or ultimate users, to the sphere of central decision making? How can one intercede in this extreme dichotomy?

The review --in Section 2-- of the current rehabilitation attempts, only reaffirms the issue. Little has been done by the system to effectively break this dichotomy. While the Modernization program does aim at a certain redistribution of control --basically through new physical patterns-- in our analysis we suggested that the question of who decides
Many assume that most or all resources for housing are controlled by large organizations and that the essence of politics is therefore the struggle between "private" and "public". A third sector, however, can be seen to control critically important resources, mainly those which are of a person -- imagination, initiative, cooperation...

(J. Turner. "Housing..."
Clearly, this third sector has been suppressed in Public Housing...

(2)

(3)

Berger and Neuhaus, "To Empower people"
what and in whose terms is still an open question in those programs, given the level in which decisions were being made. We proposed that rather than the controls and decisions themselves, it was the level at which they were exercised what had to be reexamined.

2 MEDIATING STRUCTURES FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

The conceptualization of the problem as one of "levels of control" recalls the idea of what Turner has called the 'community sector' as a means of defining new patterns of control. Berger and Neuhausen take a similar position, advocating for the reinforcement of what they call "mediating structures":

".......those institutions/organizations that stand between the individual in his private life and the larger institutions of the public realm".... which reduce "both the anomic precariousness of individual existence and the threat of alienation of the public order" ...."such institutions have a private face, giving private life a measure of stability, and they have a public face, transferring meaning and value to the megastructures" 3

Our proposal is that such an intermediate level should be built into the Public Housing project realm.

Public Housing rehabilitation should therefore involve the rethinking of the institutional and physical means by which control levels are defined. Such a proposal is not dismantling or attacking the Public Housing system itself, but it does look for better ways in which the two realms (private and public) can relate: --through the definition of spaces and organizations in between--.
(4)  
Locally controlled programs have demonstrated their potential for assisting the poor and disadvantaged to integrate into the social and economic mainstream.  
...because they are conceived and designed locally, are more flexible and responsive to local needs and conditions...
(G. Faux, "CDC's...." pp3)

(5)  
CDC's have managed to stabilize population in ghetto areas and stem the tide of abandonment: "people stay because they no longer have to worry about the area being too isolated or dangerous".  
(Ron Hafer, Urban Edge CDC.)  
The CDC's case is one from which there is something to learn that can be applied to Public Housing...
The emphasis is on personal and local. It is important to note that when referring to "local", this differs from programs for de-centralizing governental functions. The Local Housing Authorities are de-centralized. But this decentralization is limited to what can be done whithin governental structures. This proposal refers to organizations that stand between the individual and the governmen. It seeks an intermediary position that is not strictly private, nor public, but communal. It means to reinforce and institutionalize the individual/community link and the community/goverment link.

An important point is that such mediation cannot be a sporadic or occasionally devised from the central levels (as it was conceptualized in the Modernization Program discussed before), but must be institutionalized in structures springing from the needs of the local community. De-centralization or a participation devised from the top-down can give the people the feeling that they are being listened to, but it has little to do with development and governance.

A growing number of examples in the U.S. --a few in Public Housing, and many in other housing/neighborhood contexts-- demonstrate that there is a way, that this position already exists and that, if recognized and supported in Public Housing, it could be a potent force for rehabilitation. Cooperative organizations, emerging tenants Task Forces, and most recently, the growing Community Development Corporations, are all examples of forms that a mediating structure
(6) They have taken their destinies into their own hands, and are making sophisticated and complex deals with banks, charities and government agencies to get jobs and upgraded affordable houses.
(G. Faux, "CDC's..."

(7) The issue as I put it is "What it does versus what it is" If housing is denied the status of an instrument for action by people, then housing is ...removed from the cultural sphere, becomes a product, not an activity, and is reduced to the status of kornflakes.
(J. Turner, "Issues in...." pp106)
can take: they bridge between individual residents and the larger institutions of society to which they have no access as individuals -- financing institutions, for loans; investors, for local projects; city hall, for permits, plans and services -- for the accomplishment of the residents' common objective of rehabilitation and development.

3 MEDIATING STRUCTURES: A TOOL FOR SOCIAL CHANGE?

Clearly, a mediating structure is linked to a "community of interests": it has its roots in a common concern, task or fight, shared by a number of individuals, but which they cannot deal with or negotiate as individuals.

Elsewhere, it has been posed that mediating structures can be spatially disperse (i.e. professional organizations). But in this work we are concerned specifically with those defined by spatial relationships; Ironically, here the notion of the "project" as a tool, pops up again, --reversed: The boundarized residential environment can become now a clear physical anchor around which a new intermediary institutional structure can emerge.

In this light, mediating structures ultimately mean also a political change: Housing becomes important -- in Turner's words -- not only for what it is, but for what it does: a mediating structure in Public Housing becomes also a form of "empowering the poor."

One has to emphasize the relevance of this since the marginal poor is the most exposed to the alienation of central
Upper income people already have ways to resist the encroachment of megastructures. It is not their the plaything of utopian planners. They mayallow themselves to be victimized on these scores, but they have ways to resist if they choose to.

(Berger & Neuhaus, "To empower...")

"The outside power dominates the individual to such an extent that no transformations will occur unless the outside power acts. The model is one of negation: the powers of those who inhabit are neutralized, they cannot add to the site".

(J.Habraken, "Transformations...")
controls and the most lacking mediating opportunities. The residential context can clearly become one. Because of the homogeneity of the residents, and the evidence of its troubles, Public Housing is now a clear anchor for residents to get organized.

4 MEDIATING STRUCTURES: ALLOWING NEW PHYSICAL FORMS

How is mediation related to the physical environment of Public Housing?

J. Habraken defined "powers of inhabitation" as "the power to initiate and control change in the place". Centralized power in Public Housing developed in such a way that it actually prevented the exercise of these "inhabitation powers" at the local level altogether. It not only created an "instant environment", but allowed occupancy only on condition that nothing would be changed. When the tenants moved in, the configurations did not come alive: The user's opportunity to act is reduced to the relocation and distribution of furniture.

The public power tends to prefer a "communal space" between blocks rather than a proliferation of local and private spaces, on the grounds of managerial "efficiency" and a wrongly understood sense of equity. With the exercise of central control, spatial hierarchy tends to disappear.

Porches, alleys, streets and squares are the expression of a layering of different "levels of control", which produce over time a spatial organization with its own elaborate
Territories defined in Public Housing: A large public one and innumerable private ones: The central power acts through "standard" criteria, since it cannot deal separately with each individual's needs.

The redefinition of spaces in between: supports mediation among those sharing the space and internal rules of formal expression

The central power provides general conditions for the form; agreement on their specification and interpretation is provided locally.

On the other hand the number of interlocutors to deal with has been reduced...

The subdivision can be carried forward: successive spaces in between provide the settings for local levels of agreements and interpretation of the basic rules. Local expressions and variations can emerge...
hierarchies. Environments change through "additive transformations", in an incremental process of additions, reductions, or displacements...

- The retention of what already exists ensures a sense of continuity.
- The transformation of what already exists ensures its validity even in the face of new needs.

The definition of what has to be retained, and what can be changed is based on the distribution of control: only what has to be retained, is centrally controlled (building lines, heights, etc); many intermediate powers control other changes (a shared porch, a common courtyard) according to internal agreements among its users. Variety, and hierarchy emerge if control is distributed to mediating powers.

Under the current outcries against monotony, the Public Housing system has responded with the redesign of public spaces in the projects, addition of porches and new colors. It is a costly and undoubtedly helpful attempt, but it does not provide "powers of inhabitation" in the long run, it does not cure the immobility over time: We now see endless repetition of the same porches, in the same color... when they fade they will be repainted, but all at the same time, in the same color....

Control patterns in Public Housing have both a physical and an institutional component. "Mediation" has to be built into both realms.
HERE'S THE CHALLENGE,

The Report will then be submitted on the 8th of APRIL, after which, residents would all like to see IMMEDIATE ACTION and a PROGRAMME OF WORK.
fig. 2

1 INTERNALLY

2 VERTICALLY

3 HORIZONTALLY
MEDIATING STRUCTURES IN PUBLIC HOUSING: 3 TYPES OF RELATIONSHIP

Having presented the notion of "mediating structures" and its meaning in the realm of Public Housing, in this last part we will refer to the necessary conditions for the building of a mediating structure in a process of rehabilitation in Public Housing.

A mediating structure in Public Housing can operate in basically three different relationships:

1. INTERNALLY
   - It refers to mediation among residents, that is, at the lower levels of control, around issues of common concern.
   - Residents gain an institutional framework to determine what they consider their problems and their priorities for action in a rehabilitation strategy.

This recognizes that there are individual particularities but sustains that individual residents share some common concerns about their environment, so that a pluralistic position, option or solution can be discovered or devised together, that could not be done as individuals. Thus, it draws individual positions together to a common base to generate a new power position.

2. VERTICALLY
   - It refers to mediation between the lower level (the residents) and a higher level of control (LHA).
   - Allows for changes and particular variations to happen in any project or block unit, and for them to be absorbed,
fig. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODERNIZATION</th>
<th>LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITY</th>
<th>RESIDENTS ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need, remedy &amp; costing from engineering &amp; operational (central office) perspective</td>
<td>Review of findings &amp; proposed plan; adds, critiques, recommends amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus (notwithstanding pushing &amp; shoving in between)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to HUD (or other source) covering all technical &amp; administrative requirements</td>
<td>Expression of site/corporation support &amp; if necessary, mobilize political pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A form of vertical mediation

(Source: Tenant Management Demonstration, H. Moore, Jersey City)
or adjusted at an intermediary level, thus not clashing with the necessary rigidity of the central level. This recognizes that the different parties involved in the project have different interests or priorities about the same environment, and that these have to be negotiated. Since the relationship is vertical, the notion of mediation aims at a negotiation in which no one party necessarily rules over the other, but distributes control and decision making power. See fig. 3.

3. HORIZONTALLY

- It refers to mediation with other organizations of the same level (neighborhood assoc., local commerce, etc) that may conflict or complement with some object of interest of the project resident's.

Recognizes that different communities of interests may overlap or conflict in part of their interests, and that: if overlapping, --a common action can be more powerful; or if in conflict, --a negotiation can be handled at this level. This will contribute to the projects integration to its neighborhood. Neighborhood and residents can have a platform to deal with common issues such as the street "dividing" project and context, connection of throughstreets, development of commercial opportunities within the project, common social services, etc.

These three forms of relationship represent the "actors" for a comprehensive rehabilitation strategy: The internal role builds up a communal base; The vertical role aims at a
**fig. 4**

**WHO DOES WHAT?**  
Checklist example for separation of responsibilities of LHA by transferrance to Tenant Organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE MANAGEMENT TASKS</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>LHA/TO</th>
<th>LHA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Monitoring</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Eligibility Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Screening, Prioritizing &amp; Placement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Orientation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income &amp; Family Size Reexaminations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-site Apartment Transfers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing (Centralized, automated)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipt (Bank Collection)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency Listings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquency Follow-up</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Notice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summons Preparation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Filing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
redistribution of power and controls; The horizontal, at the project's integration to the neighborhood and at breaking the isolation resulting from its dependance from a separate central power than the rest of the area.

HOW TO MAKE IT WORK: GETTING RESIDENTS INVOLVED

The first and foremost resource in building an intermediary organization are the residents themselves. The basic question is how can they get involved? What are the necessary conditions to support the development of this intermediate community level? How can residents get organized through a rehabilitation process?

Tenant organization in public housing has been especially complexified because of the double nature that the Local Housing Agency assumes: on the one hand, it is the traditional "landlord" and business enterprise; on the other hand, it does not fit this role because it is also a social institution supposedly serving the poor rather than pursuing profit. Its roles are unclear and this is confusing for residents, who do not know where to turn to with their blames nor in which terms to organize. The traditional notion of the private landlord "enemy" against which to organize, is not that clear in PublicHousing.

In this context, a clarification of roles is essential for the dynamics of action and reaction to occur. The party that manages the everyday aspects of the projects should not be the same as the one who settles the conflicts between
Tenants' views about change:

"It is about time; I'm trying to bring my kids up right. This place is what I can afford and we have to do something."

"They're going to do what they want and we're just a big front. It's just to get our name on a paper to send to Washington so they can get funded".

"Don't they understand that the community isn't ever going to connect to this place?"
tenants and management, nor should it be the same that deals with selections or evictions... The potentials of a mediating structure—an intermediary tenant organization at the project level—for distributing these roles cannot be overlooked.

Historically, Public Housing tenants organizations have also been difficult to sustain because of the transient nature of tenancy (a way-station). Also, housing is not easily seen as a collective activity by individuals. In our society, the relations of consumption—food, clothing, shelter—are usually more fragmented than the relations of production.

In later years, however, conditions have changed:

1. The explosion of grassroots protests in the last decade generated a "culture" of organization and has set precedents for tenants to draw upon.

2. Poor tenants, locked into Public Housing, begin to think of themselves as long term residents, even if dissatisfied with their residential environment. Since they cannot afford to move out, they are more willing to fight for improvements and control.

3. Because of the de-personalized nature of the authority-tenant relationship, and the inability of the authority to provide adequate services, the gap between both has increased, generating an anger that has acted as a motor for organization.

Many projects, however, present an atmosphere of mistrust and failure and an acute scepticism towards any action: a
Any new program threatens the statu-quo. The unknown variable generates insecurity and potential conflict between the established order—even if informal—and the newly proposed. Conflict can be minimized if any proposal is based on the established infrastructure of tenant leaders and networks.

Jefferson Park courtyard, for example, is clearly characterized by block/corner social networks. Any proposal has to draw on or emerge from these... The previously mentioned failed renovation of the courtyard imposed a new order that overlooked these networks.
history of unfulfilled promises, neglect, and a confirmed inability to control even segments of their lives has taken a toll on residents, who -rather than anger- display despair and an inability to act.

A critical level of trust has to be re-established — The best way is the production of concrete results, dramatic improvements perceived by residents as being in their self-interest — in short time.

**INITIAL ORGANIZATION EFFORTS:**

**A** DRAWING ON EXISTING INITIATIVES AND NETWORKS

A first basic step is the careful recognition of any existing collective organizations, or any informal initiatives already taken by residents. It is important to emphasize that the process of revitalization has to have its nucleus in the existing human and organizational resources intrinsic in the local communities. These usually represent solidly tenured residents and a potential leadership base. Drawing on existing local communication networks will also probably be the most efficient channel, besides contributing to a sense of trust. The bottom-up concept is essential in terms of its implications on control and definition of programatic goals.

**B** DEFINING TASK/IMPROVEMENTS THAT ACT AS ORGANIZING TOOLS

A key issue is the definition of an initial task/improvement that can act as an organizational tool.

The basis for mutual trust has to be adressed early in the enterprise. Community-institutional relationships will
An example of a "first task" that met the conditions described here: (From a Tenant Management demonstration, H. Moore, Jersey City).

- The Authority would rehabilitate block accesses (lobbies, stairways and hallways).
- The tenant group would maintain the work, preventing vandalism and improving building security.
- The mechanism for this would be the establishment of a "lobby sitting" program: Tenants would monitor in groups of 3-4, everyday.

Access rehabilitation offered an inexpensive point of departure; The gouged and graffitied lobbies lent potential for highly visible improvements; Accesses were also areas of common use, and therefore of common concern. They are symbol to the outside world that the residents care it drew on the existing --if tenous-- "block-networks". Eventually, lobby monitoring served not only the security goal, but also as a mini social event, that fostered an organizational base -- the "block"-- of longer tenure than any immediate issue, and which could expand its focus to include other broader goals.
require long term maduration, but the initial action can be absolutely critical.

1) The task/improvement has to have dramatic potential, be highly visible, in order to rapidly establish credibility among all parties, and provide an initial sense of success.

2) It has to have the potential to be accomplished in short order, with the involvement of the residents.

3) The task/improvement should address a component of self-interest to individuals and of broad commonality to all residents.

Since organization actions rely on the resident's time and energy, the potential product has to be perceived by residents as accruing direct and individual benefits, and simultaneously it has to impact the community at large, in order to facilitate extensive and direct resident involvement.

4) The task/improvement scenario must involve both "rights" and "responsibilities" for the community. The task should provide the services the residents have a right to, and through their direct involvement in carrying it out, act as a training opportunity in taking the responsibilities inherent to self-control.

In sum, short term objectives, clearly within the capacity of involved parties, are a must in an organizing scenario.

DEVELOPING A REHABILITATION PROGRAM

Once the first tasks are being developed, it is necessary to work towards a longer term rehabilitation program. If the
initial tasks have been successful, probably residents' expectations and interest will have been considerably raised. It is most important that this energy be carried forward at this point.

There are typically two type-forms of dealing with a development and rehabilitation plan: A "comprehensive approach" and a "selected problems approach".

The comprehensive plan:
This type of plan assures that all upcoming decisions fit smoothly in the longer range goals determined by the community, and it also enables that the project's plan to be easily integrated into the broader city plans, or HUD's plans and budgetary processes. In addition, it facilitates review by city agencies and policy makers, and in HUD's world of centralized decisions and comprehensive planning, it can be a useful tool for advancing the cause of the project.

However, the comprehensive plan tends to degenerate into lengthy debates, sometimes over periods of years, thus blocking effective action. Moreover, its comprehensive and more complex approach tends to be coupled with a centralized control.

The selected problems plan.
This type of plan is based on an action-oriented approach that focuses on a few selected problems. Typically, it works by identifying 3 to 5 "action programs" that can be developed in a relatively short time (3,5,12 months) and
then moving successively to other action programs.

This type of plan -- short ranged, goal oriented and incremental -- appears to be more appropriate in the context of building an intermediary residents' organization that can control the process. It allows for the development of realistic goals and quicker results. Elsewhere, it has been mentioned that the planning process is often perceived by residents as unnecessarily lengthy: there is a difference between "people's time" and "government time" that can become a real problem. Resident's interest and their sense of participation have to be maintained.

A careful combination between a general comprehensive plan and more specific action plans can be the right way for the mediating organization to deal with both, the immediate needs of its resident constituents and the longer term planning requirements posed to it by the Public Housing system.

While the longer term plan sets the general goals and major interventions (for which also long term financing is also necessary) the action plan will help build up credibility, and its accomplishments can then be used as a case in the pursuit of longer-term or special funding for the long term tasks.

Finally, such a double layered strategy allows for a constant feed-back from "reality" to "policy": on the one hand, actions are framed according to the broader goals to avoid fragmentation, on the other hand, policy can be adjusted according to the lessons, products and receptivity.
Form sheets for evaluating priority of options.

WIN A BETTER HOME AND NEIGHBOURHOOD

Not a dream house - This is FOR REAL! But again the point is - IT IS UP TO YOU!

GET TOGETHER — TELL US WHAT TO DO.
obtained from the actions' experiences.

SETTING GOALS AND PRIORITIES: A CONSENSUS

A central task in the development of the rehabilitation programs (long or short term) is the setting of goals in a consensual mode: A list of issues related to the project should be developed identifying the issue, and the problems and assets related to it. These can then be discussed by the residents at large for review and ranking, according to:

a) local priorities,
b) impact of issue,
c) likelihood of implementation of a solution.

A combination of these a, b, c will help determine what has to be done and when. Initially, it is important that goals be kept on a general level, in order to arrive to a consensus and gain wide support on the basic notions. Later, these goals can be made more specific. Subcommittees or Task Forces can then focus on specific problem-areas (security, vacancies, dissemination/newsletter, public spaces, etc.). In order to build up consensus it is important to develop appropriate participatory decision making instances such as, public meetings, a dissemination network, or charrette-workshops in which residents participate directly in identifying problems and options.

Their direct involvement in the development of the program will spur their identification. Only then can the Residents' Organization assume a "real" mediating role in resolving conflicts with city or federal plans or in putting
The table lists all the goals and objectives in the upper part. On the side, the three instances for establishing complementary relationships, for the selected problem. The dots establish where the linkage may occur. The lower part describes the means to establish the linkage.
pressure on agencies for funding or approvals.

DEFINING OPTIONS: THROUGH IDENTIFICATION OF COMPLEMENTARY LINKS

The action plan or "selected problems" approach—as said before—rests on the selection of some priority "problem components" and on the development of a rehabilitation action to address those, rather than intending to address comprehensively the whole range of problems of the site.

The point to be made here is that this should not mean addressing the problem component narrowly in its own scope, but rather on the contrary—it should be dealt with comprehensively. This means: identifying all potential complementary links to other (secondary) goals, that can be devised by addressing the original problem component in a particular way.

The key question to ask when addressing a problem component is "how can we address other secondary goals through the solution of this problem component?" see fig.7

In a very simplistic example, if the problem component is "daily commercial opportunities: not available on or near site" and the goal is "provide on-site shop", the questions to ask would be, for example:

How can this help crime prevention as well? —through location, a shopkeeper can have an eye on who comes or goes;

How can this help providing income opportunities? —by having residents run it.

How can it help upkeep of play ground? —Using shop's profits.

Particularly, in the approach taken in this work, solution
options should be devised in such a way that they reinforce the building of the intermediary level of controls and that they support residents organization in a structured way.

Given two possible options, their potential for involving residents, for developing solid networks and for offering intermediary levels of control, should be rated and considered as a main factor for the selection of an option. The former question then becomes: how can a solution be devised for this problem component that also gives a new share of control/opportunities for mediation for the local resident community?

There are basically three instances in which control channels and mediation opportunities can be devised:

The physical design instance:

This is a most crucial one since it means deciding what will be done, where it will be located; it is essential that design reflects residents needs and priorities, and its implications have to be carefully addressed: What kind of territories will it define? How will it relate to the context and the neighborhood?

The implementation instance:

Here the basic questions are:

- Can it be implemented by the residents organizations?
- Can it be implemented through a joint effort/mediation by residents and the public or private sector? (LHA, neighborhood organization, consultants, etc)
- Can it only be implemented by the local government or
local housing agency?

The operation instance

Who will operate and maintain it? Can it be done by the residents? Can it be done through a joint venture residents-LHA, or residents-other outside agent? Can it only be operated by the LHA?

While it is not a realistic nor efficient goal that the local community controls every instance, it is important to realize where it can step in. Solutions options have to be evaluated according to their capacity of providing this opportunities to step in.

The Public Housing system needs the development of community based organizations. But "organizations" cannot emerge in the void. Rehabilitation programs, in particular the action-plan type is an opportunity to catalize the collective local resources, if channels are built-in complementarily on the solution options being used.

THE CURRENT MOMENT: THE RIGHT TIME TO INNOVATE?

A main question is that of the willingness of the Public Housing System to actually adress the rehabilitation process through an institutional change. Local Housing Authorities are ultimately responsible to HUD on their local projects. To what extent the implementation of an intermediary control level threatens the agency's position, or internal staff positions, goes beyond the scope of this work.

Nevertheless, the conditions seem to be set today:
Ironically, the current financial crisis of Local Housing Authorities can be seen as an opportunity to innovate: The convenient assumption that money is the solution has to be abandoned and authorities and tenants are forced into new directions. The current administrations' federal cuts in comprehensive Modernization funds has some implications:

a) Authorities will be forced to reject any at-large strategies, characterized by the "one-time investment/total project" approach. The only reasonable plan seems to be an incremental/specific target areas approach to initiate a turn about in the projects.

b) Authorities are forced to ground these efforts in new approaches, relying on resources other than monetary: that is, a transformation in their management procedures, with the residents as a resource, and a consequent transformation of the spatial patterns, to encourage tenant-territorial control.

Nevertheless, some primary variables have to be checked before embarking on the process:

EXTERNAL-TO-SITE VARIABLES

- An amenable political atmosphere at the local level: This refers not only to the Housing Authority or residents, but also to city government and neighborhood institutions. Nevertheless the Housing Authority's unequivocal commitment is essential. "Cooperation" is not sufficient, it requires to commit staff and energy, to challenge the
INTERNAL VARIABLES

If there is a high turnover and if the patterns of site household are varying as well, it means that the nature of the constituency and therefore their priorities will also alter rapidly, thus affecting participation and consensus on previously agreed upon objectives. In this case, organization may not prove successful.

Assessment of site should identify trends.

Household transition graph of a Public Housing project.
self-serving maxim that "we know better", and a willingness for significant internal adjustments in the functioning of the LHA.

- Sufficient monies to offset the cost of the program start up: This includes the funds for the initial improvements themselves, costs of training and technical assistance, and salaries to support tenants organizations and staff. Eventually these would be offset later by increased rental incomes and reduced management expenses.

- Professional training and technical assistance for the actors in the program: If residents are to assume control they need familiarization with the Public Housing program and with principles of real estate management and operation.

**INTERNAL VARIABLES**

- Existing residents leadership patterns, even if informal, with a well evidenced resident commitment capacity: The process of assuming control at the project level requires a degree of personal and collective resolve beyon mere participation. Not every project community is necessarily "ready" or willing to assume control through self management. Different forms of control or intervention in decision making have to be devised according to site patterns. Mediation can also be devised by bringing an external agent (a private realty firm) to bridge and mediate between the community and the authority, either as a temporary step while strengthening local
organizations, or as more permanent form of redistribution of control.

In examining the internal or external conditions, it has to be kept in mind that delegating control is an evolutionary process. Only gradually can one capitalize of the community assets. Funds can be attracted only after a case begins to emerge; Political support also comes only after the evidence of positive results; Community leaders also need to develop skills through achievements more limited in scope. Assessment of a project site has to be done in terms of POTENTIALS, rather than through the static view of current pluses or minuses of the site.
BASIC PRINCIPLES: A SUMMARY

In this last chapter we have presented the conditions and means for supporting the emergence of local organizations at the project level, that could act as mediating structures between the residents and the public powers or other private powers. Having this goal of mediation necessarily conditions the process of rehabilitation and the mode in which it is carried out.

The following basic principles stem from this conditioning. As a very succinct summary of the issues discussed in this chapter, they form the basis of a general framework for the development of a rehabilitation strategy according to the principles sustained throughout this work:

PRINCIPLE 1
A COMPREHENSIVE DOUBLE FOCUS IS NECESSARY: ON BOTH INSTITUTIONAL AND PHYSICAL ASPECTS.

The history of Public Housing shows how physical and institutional aspects sustain each other. Mediating structures have therefore, to be built in both realms. Their linkage is essential for them to function effectively in a continuous process. A physical intervention with no effective institutional support does not provide effective "powers of inhabilitation" in the long run.

PRINCIPLE 2
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES SHOULD REFLECT CONSENSUS.

Identifying participants, their interests, motives and differences is critical for local support and for mobilizing
residents.

a) Mechanisms for dissemination and exchange of information, and,
b) A structure for participatory decision making instances, have to be devised to establish healthy working relationship between parties for decision making.

**PRINCIPLE 3**
WHILE THE APPROACH IS COMPREHENSIVE IN SCOPE, IT SHOULD BE ESSENTIALLY INCREMENTAL IN NATURE.

As opposed to the typical HUD one-time investment/project approach—which is necessarily coupled with a large central power—an incremental approach will support the emergence of intermediary organization around specific and manageable tasks, thus allowing for the progressive development and refinement of residents' capabilities and organization. In addition, it allows a re-evaluation of goals and products according to reactions and experiences along the way. In physical terms, this will lead naturally to different transformations, so that the process itself contributes to create diversity and change in the estates. The approach is based on the notion that policy is reinterpretable and not a vision of tomorrow, to be fixed on site.

**PRINCIPLE 4**
IMPACT SHOULD BE IMMEDIATELY FELT, BUT NOT FRAGMENTED.

Rehabilitation should be tackling immediate issues, but at the same time, respond and keep pace with a broader process. It is necessary to develop a feedback process between two plans:
a) An immediate action plan,

b) A framework identifying broader long term goals.

In this context, first actions should have maximum and immediate impact in order to lever resident involvement and re-establish credibility, but also contain the clear potential of successive actions to be derived from them.

**PRINCIPLE 5**

**ACTIONS AND SOLUTIONS SHOULD BE DEALT WITH COMPREHENSIVELY, BY IDENTIFYING THEIR POTENTIAL COMPLEMENTARY LINKS.**

While any action should be problem-specific, its potential linkages to other goals should be examined. Whenever complementary links are established, the action should be divided in such a way that it addresses those secondary goals as well. The purpose is to heighten the impact of any intervention, given the financial constraints. Nevertheless, the main linkage to be worked out is the support of mediating opportunities.

**PRINCIPLE 6**

**ACTIONS SHOULD SUPPORT THE BUILDING OF MEDIATING OPPORTUNITIES IN PHYSICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL TERMS.**

While actions should accrued direct individual benefits in order to involve residents, these should also,
a) address a collective component of the site, thus contributing the creation of either anchors for group activity or intermediate territorial patterns, that can heighten local control patterns,
b) be resident-developed and/or managed, not withstanding necessary support from other parties (LHA, neighborhood groups). Actions should be devised as training and learning
opportunities for forming a capable community based organization.

PRINCIPLE 7
ACTIONS SHOULD INVOLVE 'HORIZONTAL' LINKAGES AS WELL, TO LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS.

Actions that establish mediating opportunities with the project's neighborhood should be encouraged, either at the physical level or institutional level. Actions should address problems that can be addressed in a joint effort, through coordination with local organizations (CDC's) on issues such as, linkage to the street pattern or transportation and trash collection networks; establishment of commercial opportunities within the project site, sharing social services or centers, dealing with borders streets, etc.

Nevertheless this should be seen as a second-stage goal, once credibility and a basic working organization have been established, as well as some visible improvements, that can support the move.

PRINCIPLE 8
LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITIES SHOULD REDUCE THEIR DIRECT INTERVENTION BUT OFFER MAXIMUM SUPPORT

The different parties have to deliberate and establish who does what. A delegation of controls should be done in a incremental way, according to what residents potentials and willingness are at the start of the process and according to what they can become in the long run. Site specific options have to be divided; be it a private realty firm stepping in, tenants forming a tenant management corporation, or eventually, establishing alternative tenure systems.
Given the scope of the problem and the limitations of time, these basic principles are necessarily general. Each of them however, offers a field of further exploration and specification. In their further development one thing has to be kept in mind: They all aim at an approach to rehabilitation that --because of its mode-- supports the emergence of intermediate organizations in the Public Housing realm. The Urban Policy of the 80's needs to recognize that within local communities lies a strength; and urban practice needs to respect and build upon it.
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