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Abstract

This study focuses on the redevelopment of Jefferson Park, a public housing project in Cambridge, Massachusetts. The work establishes the historical political, social, and physical context in which that redevelopment takes place. The study uses that historical context and the current realities as the basis for the evaluation of the programs, processes, and products of that redevelopment. The purpose is to measure the responsiveness of the entire process to the historical context and to long and short term needs of the tenant population.
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INTRODUCTION

The subject of this study is Jefferson Park in Cambridge, Massachusetts, a public housing project in the process of redevelopment. The purpose of this study is to understand the social, physical and administrative context in which the redevelopment takes place in order to isolate the elements responsible for the ultimate successes and/or failures of the redevelopment effort. This inquiry is a study in change, social and administrative change in a relatively static physical environment, and an examination of the processes and products of the planned transformation of that environment. It is my intent through this study to illuminate the particular responses over time of the tenants and administration of Jefferson Park to the varying nature of social, physical and administrative forces.

Initially, this study establishes the historical political context for public housing. A review of past and recent writings surveys the ebb and flow of legislation for the program. The purpose is to examine the priority of needs, nationally and locally, that dictated management practice, the nature of the built environments and tenant populations of the projects and of Jefferson Park in particular.

This study examines the particular impact of social, physical, and administrative change to the tenant population of Jefferson Park. The primary source of information for this was the tenants themselves. Interviews with tenants focused on their interaction with their physical setting, with each other, and with management and how these networks of interactions have changed over time with respect to each other. Since I lived in Jefferson Park until 1973, my understanding and experience serve as a
complement to those of current and former tenants. Interviews with some members of the Cambridge Housing Authority staff focused on the administrative perspective to changes in the networks of forces.

Having established the historical and current social and political context, this study uses that understanding as a basis for the evaluation of the processes and products of the planned redevelopment of Jefferson Park. This study examines the program for change, the processes of its development, and its success at addressing the long and short-term concerns and priorities of the tenants of Jefferson Park. This work evaluates the proposals for redevelopment, their compliance with the program, and their relevance to the needs of the tenants. Interviews with the architects focused on the rationale behind their designs and their interpretation of the goals expressed in the program. Interviews with some tenants focused on both the relevance to their needs of the goals expressed in the program and the compatibility of some of the proposal solutions to those needs.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW:
Government Policy and Practice

Government intervention in housing historically has been reluctant and inconstant, responding to diverse, varying and often opposed pressures for and against intervention in an area traditionally recognized as outside the government domain.

The history of the American housing reform movement is, in part, the history of a pervasive tension between two elements of the creed of individualism: the humanistic or "humanitarian" element, which emphasizes the equal inherent dignity and worthiness of every individual; and the rugged element, which emphasizes the responsibility of individuals to fend for themselves, and which includes the corollary that what they are entitled to is just what they get....1

It might be said that reform walked on these two legs, humanitarianism and self-interest, and every time one move forward, the other was prepared to follow.2

In the absence of a national resolve of our housing goals these two "legs" are likely to continue to trip over each other. The government's stand has been mainly reactive rather than active, reflecting the temperament and ideals of its loudest and most politically powerful constituents. Government has only reluctantly intervened in the productive process, an area normally left to private enterprise. But private enterprise has proved to be unable or unwilling to provide housing equitably at all times to all those in need. How does government react to the voices that are

---


2 Bredemeier, p. 2.
raised on behalf of those who are unable because of limited resources or special needs to prompt private enterprise to meet their urgent needs?

The predominant perspective of proper government-business relations has been the notion that the government should, on humanistic grounds, decide on a "desirable" outcome of the productive process, and then attempt to manipulate the business environment so as to make entrepreneurs "voluntarily" produce that outcome.³

This formula of government-business interaction may function effectively under ideal circumstances to produce an adequate quantity and quality of housing. In times of crisis, however, such as war, economic catastrophe, or social upheaval resulting in or focusing on an inadequate supply of adequate housing, government direction has proved to be an insufficient lever in coaxing private enterprise to produce enough adequate housing to meet all the need and demand. Under such circumstances the government has taken direct action on meeting housing needs. Varying economic, political, and social forces have prompted diverse actions at different times. The establishment of the public housing program is one form that this action took.

In overviewing the history of the public housing program it is not my intent to detail comprehensively the ebb and flow of legislation promoting housing for the poor. This work is a study of one public housing project, Jefferson Park, in Cambridge, Massachusetts. My purpose is to outline the varying, often conflicting forces that preceded the building of this project to understand the general intent of the builders and promoters of that project with respect to the overall goals of the program. These potent political, social, and economic forces reflected and influenced public opinion and attitudes toward public

³Bredemeier, p. 120.
housing. They determined the character of the tenant populations and established the nature of the build environments of the projects. The objectives and impact of the program surfaced rapidly, while clarity of commitment to solving the problems surfaced slowly and erratically.

The uneven political fortune of public housing expresses a continuing lack of consensus about its objectives.4

The precursor of the public housing program was initiated under the Public Works Administration, established in 1933. The PWA provided jobs that were otherwise unavailable during the economic crisis of the 1930s. Although new housing was not being built, economic circumstance had lowered rents and the supply of rental housing was relatively plentiful, however deteriorating. The government reluctantly got involved in housing production and then only as a means to provide jobs for the building and construction trades. The provision of housing for low-income people was a subordinate objective. The PWA housing was intended to be an interim "port in the storm" for those with immediate but temporary need for help. The program was small in scope, building about 22,000 units between 1933 and 1937, while destroying 10,000 substandard units. Early proponents and planners of PWA housing envisioned the projects to be self-contained communities, removed from the ravages of the slums, adequately incorporating all the essential components of family and community life. Their vision proved to be short lived, however.

...By the time some PWA housing began to be visible and when it was seen that a large housing policy measure was in the cards, the vested real estate and private home-building opposition was able to inject the

principle that public housing must operate in a way that would offer no possible competition to private enterprise and must be built to standards of the direct minimality. Their influence left an indelible dull imprint on the program.\(^5\)

The private builder's concern was that government housing might be seen as more desirable than their own. To preclude this, the PWA developed standardized, minimal plans and design criteria, a model for acceptable design practice.

The Housing Act of 1937 was the first major enabling legislation for the public housing program. By 1937 economic conditions were improving, and rents decreased by the depression were starting to rise. There was a shortage of adequate housing, since little new housing had been built and what was available was seriously deteriorating. The 1937 act has considerable support from many areas. Labor supported it because it would provide jobs and housing for union members made poor by the depression. Social activists and reformers supported it, seeing it as a way to alleviate dreadful slum conditions. But more importantly,

The size and power of the submerged middle class underlay the success of the Housing Act.\(^6\)

Their political power and therefore their need for housing could not be ignored by government.

It seems clear that...two non-housing goals, employment-generation and maintenance of private enterprise -- were major elements in its acceptance by Congress.\(^7\)

---


7 Bredemeier, pp. 85-86.
There was strong opposition to the program by the private housing market. A number of provisions in the act were a response to their fears of "socialistic" interference with private housing. The act limited eligibility for public housing to only those people who were too poor to prompt the private market to adequately meet their needs. Further, the act was presented as a slum clearance program. An Equivalent Elimination Provision stipulated that for every public housing unit built, a slum unit had to be demolished. The program did not add to the net supply of housing, but simply replaced bad housing with better housing.

Rather than prescribing direct federal administration of the building of the projects, the act provided for the establishment of independent local housing authorities in communities that wanted participation in the program. The LHAs sold bonds on the private market to cover the cost of land acquisition and building construction. The Federal Public Housing Authority then entered into an annual contributions contract with the LHA to cover the annual interest and principal payments on the bonds.

The government bought public housing on the installment plan.8

The operating expenses of the projects and payments to cities in lieu of property taxes were to be paid from rent revenues, giving the appearance that the projects were normal real estate operations, paying their own way. Public housing was "designed" to serve a very narrow economic stratum. In order to prevent interference with private housing, the system of graded rents was set no higher than to cover operating expenses. The income level for eligibility was set at five or six times the rent level, depending on family size.

8Friedman, p. 108.
The requirement of a rental sufficient to meet expenses would, furthermore, tend to restrict public housing to the honest, working poor. Dependent families, families with no incomes, and problem families would be usually too poor for public housing.9

The number of units built under the program, about 170,000 between 1937 and 1949, was far short of that required to meet the need for low-income housing. Because of this,

Local housing authorities had virtually a free hand in the selection of tenants, and it was their practice to choose their residents very carefully. They tended to select a highly homogeneous and stable tenant body... a group of "temporary" poor...10

The onslaught of World War II greatly limited the goals of the 1937 act. Adequate housing was still in short supply but labor and materials had been diverted to the war effort. Veterans and defense workers were given priority admission to public housing without any income restriction. The government generally recognized its responsibility to house veterans in public housing. Veterans returning from the war encountered a severe housing shortage. The government sought to fulfill its self-imposed priority responsibility to house the veterans. Some states, as well, established housing programs specifically for veterans.

Massachusetts developed one of the most inclusive programs for veteran housing of any state. In 1948 Massachusetts passed the Veterans Housing Law which made $200 million (later increased to $225 million) available to local housing authorities for the building of permanent housing restricted to low-income veterans and their families. This

9Friedman, p. 109.

Chapter 200 housing apparently had more public appeal than conventional public housing authorized under the 1937 act, because the number of communities establishing local housing authorities nearly tripled in response to the program. The promoters of the program anticipated that at some later time federal assistance would be available. The signs that a new Federal Housing Act would soon be passed were already visible. They strove to conform to existing federal guidelines for design and operation.

The Act requires that project design conform "as nearly as possible to the existing published requirements of the federal government for low-rent or other housing projects..."[11]

The intent of the state law was to conform to federal standards in anticipation of refinancing under federal legislation. This Chapter 200 Veterans Housing Program was the one under which Jefferson Park was built, 109 units in 1950 and an additional 200 units in 1952.

As Massachusetts legislators had foreseen, federal action on housing was forthcoming in the Housing Act of 1949. Private sector opposition to the act was strong, as it was in 1937. The act had strong support from veterans groups and labor. Although it was nearly defeated, the act passed with an authorization to build 810,000 units over six years.

The provisions of the 1949 act expressed the synthesis of political pressures for and against public housing for low-income people. To promote such a substantial program for meeting the serious post-war housing need, the fears and needs of the powerful private sector interests had to be accommodated. The act was presented as a work stimulation program and as a slum clearance, urban renewal program.

Slums were to be cleared to make way for a revitalization of the inner city. Like the 1937 act, there was an Equal Elimination Provision, for every public housing unit built, a slum unit had to be destroyed. Unfortunately, the converse was not true, that for every slum dwelling destroyed, a public housing unit had to be built. The slums were cleared but the ambitious goal of 810,000 units by 1955 was never realized.

The Korean War forced postponement of that goal, and an unfriendly administration in 1953 deferred it indefinitely. ¹²

Eligibility for admission to public housing, based on narrow income criteria, was further limited by the 1949 act in order to reinforce the goal of non-interference with the private housing market. An eligibility gap of 20% was instituted between the highest rent that public housing tenants could pay and the lowest rent for comparable private housing. The intent as in earlier legislation was to prevent those who could be housed by the private market from being housed by public housing. Tenants whose incomes exceeded the limit of five times their rent were evicted. This provision created an economic limbo whereby some people were ineligible for public housing by earning too much but were still unable to afford adequate private housing. This provision established the upper income eligibility limit. The stipulation that operating expenses were to be paid by rent revenues established the lower limit of eligibility. The act changed the character of tenant populations by restricting eligibility to even lower income people than before, by giving priority to diverse populations of poor displaced by slum clearance and by expanding federal mortgage programs, allowing working-class families an alternative to public housing in the private

¹²Aaron, p. 109.
market. Although families on public assistance were not specifically excluded from public housing by earlier legislation, LHAs often excluded such families.

In 1949, the Federal Act was amended to declare that local agencies must "not discriminate against families otherwise eligible for admission ... because their incomes are derived in whole or in part from public assistance."¹³

In spite of a 1948 Massachusetts law against discrimination in public housing, and similar laws in other states, the LHAs often used their control to exclude blacks and other minorities.

By the time of the passage of the 1949 Housing Act there was already a fifteen-year record of government-sponsored housing for people of low income. The nature of these physical environments was based on the pattern established in the late PWA days and by the Housing Act of 1937. The forces that fostered these environments were clear, and the shortcomings for the tenants of this housing were equally clear to a number of interested observers and critics. The 1949 act established no new directions for the design and use of the living environments. The physical status quo was to remain unaltered. This prompted criticism of the past record, and of the implications of continuing with the established criteria.

That public housing should not be built to a standard any higher than that of comparable private housing was explicit in both the 1937 and 1949 acts.

The Federal Government was allowed to support only projects without "elaborate or expensive design or materials," and which did not cost more than the "average construction cost of dwelling units currently

¹³Friedman, p. 109.
produced by private enterprise, in the locality." That public housing should not have "frills" was almost taken for granted.14

Under the 1949 act, the Public Housing Administration used a similar standard of comparison with comparable private housing in the community. Some, however, disagreed that the government's standards should be delimited by the vagaries of the private market at any given time. A perspective underlying the notion that the poor should be provided with no more than anyone else is that they were already getting, if not more than they deserved, at least more than they expected.

We must remember that our tenants come from slums and 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 and luxury that is possible under cost limitations. Residency in a project is intended to be ... a temporary bridge during a period of financial stress.15

Permanent tenancy was not to be encountered and there was little interest in providing an environment to satisfy long-term needs of family life.

In some ways, public housing was often built far better than any private produced housing, but usually when non-tenant interests were at stake. Often public housing was built of concrete and brick construction, certainly not the method of choice of the private residential builders. Financing arrangements for the projects had the most impact on this choice of construction. First, to protect the bonded indebtedness, the buildings had to be built to last for the life of the bonds, usually from 40 to 60 years.

14Friedman, p. 112.

Second, the federal government paid for building construction, with operating expenses, which included maintenance, coming from rent revenues. The LHAs built projects that were of a construction and materials that would minimize subsequent maintenance costs, thus maximizing their benefit from the financing arrangement. They did, however, have a per unit limit of construction cost. Apparently the utility and livability of the units and outside space were sacrificed to the relative permanence of the construction.

Minimum size was the result of the effort to meet the very tight cost limits set up by legislation.... Yet the addition of square feet to a dwelling unit comes at a remarkably cheap price: added space is virtually "almost air."16

Considerable criticism was leveled against the PHA for its heavy handed cost cutting techniques, with their inherent impact on family life.

The typical publicly subsidized dwelling is a home from which most of the space normally required for storage, laundry washing and drying, children's play (indoors and out), household maintenance functions and most adult recreation has been removed....

No more than miminum accommodations are justified. This is obvious. But "minimum" according to what standard? What is our objective? True homes in which families can live at a level not substantially below, or different from, normal minimum American requirements? Or institutionalized shelter in which the subnormal character of the tenants' former mode of existence is considered to justify their being accommodated in another subnormal environment....17

This criticism was presented in a series of articles in the 1950 and 1951 Journal of Housing, written by an architect pen-named Maxim Duplex. The articles sparked a debate in the journal between architects, public housing officials and others. Some of the particulars of those articles and the responses to them are highlighted here. In addressing the specific problem of inadequate inside play space for children, Duplex states,

The typical public dwelling contains inadequate space for children.... There is no floor area in bedrooms, kitchens, or utility rooms for toys, games, carpentry or mechanical interests. Although some children of some ages can undoubtedly use the living room for recreation with reasonable success, this arrangement is unsatisfactory in most cases for obvious reasons. Children track dirt on floors, put feet on furniture, break small objects around the room, damage curtains, knock over lamps, and leave a litter of toys, mud, water, and food wherever they stay for any length of time. 18

Mr. Duplex further elaborated on the inadequate provision of outside space for tenant use, pointing to studies, including one conducted by the PHA, that focused on tenant desires for outside space for their use.

The PHA field survey, "The Livability Problems of 1000 Families," published in 1945, reports that about 90 percent of families interviewed wanted porches.... The survey points out that 80 percent of tenant families have children, that in 50 percent of these cases the children are small, and implies that the more general provision of enclosed backyard play space would be desirable. 19

The Housing Research Council of Southern California, Los Angeles, in a 1950 survey found that,

... the desire for a small private yard is almost universal among tenants. They justify the need for such a yard because of the many restrictions imposed by management concerning what tenants may and may not do outside the unit. They want an area that they feel is their own, to use as they see fit...20

What seemed clear to Duplex and to others, and less clear or at least less important to those fostering these environments, was,

... that families live on the outside of their houses as well as on the inside.21

It is bad enough to design dwelling units that are too small to conveniently contain essential family activities but it is much worse to design yards into which these activities cannot at least occasionally overflow. ... Dwellings should be so designed on their interiors, and so related to each other on the site, that most of the project's landscaped areas could be apportioned among tenant families in the form of private yards, individually used, controlled and maintained. ... Such a departure in design not only would be better for the tenant but ... it also could be as cheap, or cheaper, than present practice over a reasonable period of time.22

Some, including Harold Robinson, the Executive Head of the Massachusetts Veterans Housing Program, through which Jefferson Park was built, disagreed in principle with Duplex.

... Low rents are a must if low-income families are to be housed and ... low rents are inconsistent with roomy indoor play areas, hobby rooms, and landed estates.23

This appears to be a specious argument, since rents were determined by expenses and not by capital costs. With only moderately different priorities in the use of capital, the projects could have been made significantly more compatible with tenant needs, without significant increase in capital costs. Much of the housing built under the Veterans' Program in Massachusetts was in small, scattered sites, built of standard construction, with larger than minimum dimensions, and with private outside space. But Jefferson Park and the other projects in Cambridge built under the program were built to the customary minimal standards, reinforcing the enduring biases against the tenants. These projects are built expressions of the priority of needs that pervaded the system at that time.

Life on the Urban Fringe

The purpose of the preceding history is to focus on the predominant political and socio-economic forces that were to have particular impact on the built, social and administrative environments of Jefferson Park. But Jefferson Park is not only a component of a government program, it is part of a community. The larger political setting relates only tangentially to its physical and social setting as part of the North Cambridge community.

North Cambridge has "a three hundred year history as the fringe of Cambridge."24 The colonial establishment of this area as the fringe was due mainly to Cambridge's topography and landscape. A range of small hills separated the urbanizing Harvard Square area from North Cambridge. The most desirable farmland was the south slope of these

hills. What lay beyond these hills to the northwest was an area that was swampy and of little agricultural value. The natural and major routes of travel out of the city went around these hills, skirting the edges of North Cambridge, with its great swamp (Figure 3).

The first half of the nineteenth century saw the development of North Cambridge as the center of cattle trade, mostly centered around Porter Square. In 1837 a race course was built on the land north of Rindge Avenue, in the area bounded by Clifton, Cedar, and Harvey Streets. It was a popular attraction to the cattle traders (Figure 4).

In 1841 a railroad line was built through the great swamp (the current railroad location at the south edge of Jefferson Park). It was built by Fresh Pond ice merchants to carry ice from the pond to the Charlestown wharves. Further rail lines were built parallel to the ice railroad. These lines led to the outlying western communities, carrying passengers and freight. With the railroad expansion in 1842 came the commercial blossoming of the most influential industry in the history of North Cambridge, the brickyards, affecting the economy, culture and landscape of the area. The presence of the clay pits under the great swamp had been known since colonial times, but their commercial exploitation didn't come into being until 1844 when the first brickyard opened on a site called the Torrey Lot. The Torrey Lot currently underlies the eastern half of Jefferson Park. The success of this first brickyard encouraged others, and many independent brickyards opened in the area of the great swamp.

It was the need for manufactured brick in the rapidly growing cities of the mid-nineteenth century New England that prompted commercial development of the clay lands. What had been a vacant wasteland of meadow grass, bramble thicket, and swamp willow...
FIG. 1: NORTHWEST CAMBRIDGE
FIG. 3: NORTHWEST CAMBRIDGE
Topography and Highways  1638
was totally transformed in a few decades into an industrial complex of brickyards, drying kilns and clay pits... 25 (Figure 5)

The laborers for the brickyards were mainly Irish Catholic immigrants fleeing the Potato Famine. The Irish were "social outcasts in Protestant Cambridge." 26 In 1846 the plot to the east of the Torrey Lot was given to the Catholic Church for use as a cemetery, the first Catholic cemetery outside Boston.

Its location was the essence of the urban fringe: a cemetery next to a brickyard, near a swamp, along a railroad, for the dead of an outcast group. 27

In the first few years after the brickyards opened, the Irish workers lived in the few available boarding houses, but mainly in tents and shanties on the edge of the clay pits. By 1847 the location of the best clay pits had been determined. The brickyard owners, who had bought up and consolidated most of the parcels in the area, were then prepared to make plots available for housing for their workers. Between 1848 and 1855 housing plots were laid out along the west end of Rindge Avenue, on the edge of one of the largest brickyards.

As the clay pits expanded in the 1850s, the workers' cottages were left perched upon the edge, surrounded by swamps and kilns. 28

The last area to be subdivided was the race course, in 1855. It was conceived as a suburban venture for Boston's middle-class Irish, and when it failed to attract them, it was

26 Survey of Architectural History in Cambridge, p. 50.
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made available to the brickyard workers. The end of the nineteenth century saw the influx of French Canadians into the area to work in the brickyards. This prompted the further residential development of the north side of the race course that had been vacant since the subdivision of 1855.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, much of the claylands had been consolidated by Peter Hubbell, one of the original developers of the Torrey Lot. By the end of the century most of the original clay pits along Rindge Avenue had been exhausted. Hubbell's Bay State Brick Company operation had moved its clay digging efforts to the south side of the railroad, into the heart of what was the great swamp (now the proposed site for a city park). At the beginning of the twentieth century the Bay State Brick Company and the remaining small brickyards were consolidated into the New England Brick Company. They continued their operation until 1952, digging to a depth of 80 feet in the clay pit that, when exhausted, was sold to the city for a dump. Their extensive development of brick sheds and kilns along the railroad, on what is now the Rindge Tower site, was demolished in 1955.

The history illustrates the traditional role of North Cambridge with respect to the city as a whole, and the role of the Jefferson Park site and its immediate surroundings with respect to North Cambridge. The Cambridge Housing Authority in reusing part of the brickyard lands for public housing guaranteed the perpetuation of the site's lackluster image. Public housing, even though for veterans, was an unpopular intrusion into the neighborhood. Public housing's national reputation had grown progressively worse and evidence of its problems were available and apparent in Cambridge as well. A 1952 study of two federal projects in Cambridge confirmed what must have been already clear to
public housing tenants and to their neighbors outside the projects. The study showed that although the housing quality of the projects was better than any census tract in the city, the projects had the highest density of people under 20 of any area of the city, and the second highest incidence of social problems. At least one of the continuing and implicit goals of the government had been achieved through their building and management practices: public housing was truly unappealing to the vast majority of the American public. It was even less appealing to those that lived near the projects, such as in the politically and socially isolated working-class neighborhood adjacent to the Jefferson Park site.

It was in this social and political climate that Jefferson Park was built. In 1950 109 units of housing were built in four three-story buildings with public interior stairways leading to the flats (Figure 6). The majority of units were small, two bedroom apartments. The buildings, and most front entries, were organized around two open-ended, connected rectangular courts. The scale of these courts, the distances between buildings, was not much different than the scale of the existing residential neighborhood. The public space consisted mainly of central fenced green spaces not intended for tenant or children's use. The paved, south facing back door courts enclosed by the two large U-shaped buildings were presumably for tenant use. There was one small sitting area at the juncture of the two courts and little accommodation for children's play space (Figure 8).

In 1952 Jefferson Park Extension was build adjacent to and south and east of the original site. The extension consisted of eight three-story walk-up buildings with public interior stairways and a six-story elevator building (Figure 7). The majority of units in the extension were
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large family units. Most buildings were organized around very large open spaces. The largest open space of the entire development, more than an acre, was the area enclosed by four three-story walk-up buildings with inward facing entrances, known as the courtyard. The other large open space of the development, a parking lot, separated the original buildings from the extension.

Although sharing the same overall site, the different design approaches and programs of the two sections augmented their differing characters and reinforced a perception of the separateness of the two parts. The original development was organized around small distinct open spaces, had a clear association with the existing street, and was mostly populated by small families. The extension was organized around large mostly paved open spaces, was inwardly focused, had a tenuous relationship with the street and was mainly occupied by large families. Although isolated from the existing development and the street, the general isolation of the extension was reinforced by the nature of its other edges: the cemetery to the east, the brickyard to the west and the railroad and city dump to the south.

The dictates of the Veterans Housing Program insured a fairly homogeneous tenant population in the early days of Jefferson Park. Admission was restricted to veterans, active servicemen, and their families. Many having come from the adjacent neighborhood, they were not unlike their neighbors outside the projects either in goals, values, or lifestyle. The predominant difference between themselves and their neighbors was the institutional nature of their housing and their lack of attainment of the common goal of homeownership, a goal that many were striving for. A number of the early residents were city workers, policemen, firemen and project maintenance men. They were a group of stable, young, working-class families who were neither
perceived nor perceived themselves as being outside the mainstream of Cambridge social life, except in the particular nature of their housing.

Demographic information on J.P. is sketchy, at best, but extrapolation from census data and the recollections of tenants provide a general qualitative and quantitative profile of past residents. 1960 census data indicates that the population of Jefferson Park at that time was around 1400 people. Single parent families were exceedingly rare in the early days. Assuming them, that there were two adults in the vast majority of families, the population was composed of 600 adults and 800 children. The child density was not uniform throughout the development. The original Jefferson Park with its 109 units, averaging two bedrooms per unit, had about 200 adults and 200 children. The 200 extension units averaged 2.7 bedrooms per unit, with a population of about 400 adults and 600 children. It is clear that the child density and the child-to-adult ratio was greater in the extension than in the original Jefferson Park. Even within the extension the child density was far from uniform. Most of the large units of the entire development and of the extension were concentrated in the courtyard buildings. Vacancies were relatively uncommon in the early days. Growing families were forced into dramatically overcrowded situations waiting for larger apartments to become available. The largest apartments in all of Jefferson Park were four bedroom apartments. Half of the four bedroom apartments of the entire development were in the courtyard. Any very large family, some with up to ten children, would be squeezed into these apartments. The 72 courtyard apartments with about 140 adults had at least 275 children, one third of the children of the entire development. Unlike the original buildings, having front and back entries, the extension buildings had only a front
entry with the second means of egress being over the roof to the adjacent stairway. The building entries of the courtyard were oriented to the inside of the court. Originally the courtyard had a children's play area on the east edge with sandboxes in each of the four corners of the court. The central area consisted of a large fenced green area that covered about a third of the area of the courtyard. Tenants and children were prohibited from this green space as with all the green spaces in the development. It proved to be impossible to keep children out of the fenced areas particularly in the courtyard. Management found the wear and tear on this large green space objectionable, and in the early 1960s the space was paved. Except for small fenced green areas at the building edges, the courtyard was then a barren sea of asphalt. Isolated from the rest of the development, the courtyard was a world unto itself, dominated by children.

Although there were many children in Jefferson Park, the families were young, as were their children. In the early '60s, the early residents were beginning to leave J.P., having been able to save for private market options, no longer seeing J.P. as a necessary or desirable alternative to either private rental housing or homeownership. The vacancies left behind by the early tenants were not uniformly distributed throughout Jefferson Park. The original buildings experienced the least turnover, being perceived as the most desirable of Jefferson Park. This perception was reinforced by the relatively low child-to-adult ratio, by the nature of the small, identifiable and controllable public spaces, and by management public space maintenance and tenant placement practices which favored the original site over the extension. Within the extension vacancies were not uniformly distributed. More vacancies occurred in the elevator building, called the "six-decker,"
and in the courtyard, the least desirable areas of the project. The six-decker had small units, usually occupied by elderly residents, interspersed with larger, family units. The six-decker was just beginning to experience the problems commonly associated with family elevator buildings in public housing: kids playing in and vandalizing the public hallways and elevators. The courtyard with its large isolated barren area dominated by large families and small children was least desirable of all.

The public housing authorities customarily had been granted great latitude in the selection of their tenants with little interference from the federal government. The 1949 provision prohibiting discrimination of public assistance families and the 1948 Massachusetts legislation against racial discrimination was the beginning of the erosion of the absolute power of the LHAs. The state program being predetermined as veterans housing allowed the LHAs to maintain control in some projects, while the tenant populations in the federal projects began to change. Public housing never has served more than a small portion of the poor eligible for the program. Many of the eligible poor, and particularly the ones that the LHAs saw as their preferred tenants, the stable white working poor, began to abandon the program. With the gradual erosion of LHA control in tenant selection and the abandonment of the program by the preferred tenants, recent tenant populations have in large part been determined by the segments of the poor who see public housing as a priority need. In the early '60s the number of eligible families applying for existing public assistance programs began to increase. Veteran families were no longer found on the waiting lists for state public housing. Admission was opened to other segments of the poor and the waiting lists became dominated by dependent, female-headed families. The turnover in the
less desirable areas of J.P. was rapid and dramatic.

The reputations of the different public housing projects in the Cambridge system varied, usually according to size. The largest projects, of which J.P. is one, had the worst reputations, were least desirable and had the most turnover and vacancies. Placement in a better project required influence, being a politically motivated process. The female-headed AFDC families, having usually limited political influence went to the worse projects. In spite of federal directives in the early sixties against racial discrimination in both tenant selection and placement, the CHA continued its practice of excluding minority tenants from projects in white neighborhoods. The neighborhood adjacent to J.P. was less than 1% minority until the early seventies. Jefferson Park was less than 5% minority in 1960 and this percentage did not change significantly until the mid-1970s.

I lived in the courtyard at Jefferson Park for seventeen years, until I was nineteen years old. It may seem then that the descriptions of changes in Jefferson Park are unduly and subjectively focused on this area. It is an area that I know well and can describe with some conviction, but it is almost universally held by J.P. tenants that the courtyard has always been the most troublesome area of J.P. Changes that eventually spread throughout most of Jefferson Park at later times and to different degrees were first experienced in the courtyard and to the greatest extent. The courtyard is almost a caricature of the problems in Jefferson Park. From the late '50s to the late '60s, the number of female-headed households in the courtyard increased from one of 72 families to over two-thirds of the families. Unlike the early families, most of these were not the temporary poor and tenancy in the project for many was likely to be permanent, being unable to make the
quantum leap to private housing. Unlike the early tenants, many of whom left while their children were relatively young, the children of these families grew through their teenage years in the projects. Poor teenagers had no monopoly on the problems of drugs, alcohol, and crime that became part of teenage life in the late sixties. The tenants in the projects were directly confronted with the by-products of that life, teenagers hanging out, drinking, fighting, making noise until all hours of the night, that people outside the projects could often avoid or call on police to control. In the early days of Jefferson Park, social control on children's activities was powerful. Management was aggressive in restricting children's activities. Strong and determined adults were able to guide children's activities to socially acceptable forms. The children were relatively young, and the number of aggressive adults was relatively large. Many of the adults, particularly the men, were capable and willing to counteract serious breaches of behavior with threats of coercion. Many of the aggressive individuals left in the early '60s as did a significant percentage of the adult male population. The aberrant behavior of children, being careless, noisy, and annoying was superseded in the late '60s by teenage activities that were disruptive, destructive, and dangerous. It would be wrong to underestimate the power and determination of the women of Jefferson Park, but in the face of the escalatingly disruptive behavior the coercive power from within the tenant group, most often seated in the male population, was dwindling. The energies of the single mothers were understandably focused on their personal plight of single-handedly raising a family on a bare-bones budget. Maintaining a sense of security and control in an increasingly disruptive environment became a secondary priority. Many tenants became inured to the disruption outside their apartments and retreated behind their apartment doors.
Management was either unwilling or unable to exercise the authority it once had over its tenants. The most disruptive behavior of the teenagers was at night, long after management had gone home.

It's ironic that when the population was much more stable, the manager had much more authority....

The police were at best inconsistent and at worst indifferent to the problems of the tenants. Their limited and inconsistent surveillance inadvertently sanctioned J.P. as being a focus of nighttime illicit teenage activities for the area. The majority of the teenagers disrupting life at J.P. were teens from outside the project, from the local neighborhood, and from other areas of the city, who saw J.P. as a safe and convenient haven. The teenagers, particularly the ones from outside J.P., were oblivious and at times defiant of the rights and needs of the tenants.

The late sixties and early seventies saw a number of changes in Jefferson Park, in the community as a whole, and in the Cambridge Housing Authority. In 1970 an effort was undertaken to renovate the public space of the courtyard. The renovation, as will be discussed later, disrupted what little sense of territorial control that the tenants were able to maintain. The problems in the six-decker began to escalate. The building having been completely occupied in the early 1970s was completely vacated and boarded up by 1974. Problems in the courtyard began to intensify as well. In the early seventies a teen center opened in the basement of the southwest courtyard building. Whereas before this, the teen nighttime activities were located in fringe areas, usually in the big parking lot at the north entrance to the courtyard, they then moved into the courtyard. Because of this the southwest building became the least desirable of the courtyard buildings. Vacancies became rampant. As the

From an interview with a CHA staff member.
Apartments were vacated they were vandalized and were boarded up rather than reoccupied.

Significant changes in the Cambridge Housing Authority occurred during the late sixties and early seventies. Federal influence prompted changes in the way the CHA selected its tenants, attempting to eliminate discrimination and arbitrary selection criteria. A racially-blind selection and placement plan was implemented by the CHA in 1967 but full compliance with the plan was not achieved until 1975. Careful screening of applicants including home visits and reference checks was conducted until 1969. When HUD required the implementation of a detailed non-arbitrary selection and screening system the CHA responded by abolishing tenant screening, undermining the CHA capability to admit tenants who would be compatible with management and other tenants. The 1970 Brooke Amendments underwrote the escalating operating expenses of the projects by providing subsidies to stem the fiscal crisis in public housing. Further the Brooke Amendments limited rents to 25% of tenant income. The Amendments allowed the housing authorities to admit tenants who were even poorer than previously since rents were no longer directly determined by operating expenses. In 1971 the three-year Cambridge residency requirement for applicants was deemed unconstitutional, opening up Cambridge public housing to a larger group of the poor. The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974,

... required local housing agencies to establish tenant selection criteria to insure that in a reasonable time period, each project would include families with a broad range of incomes and would avoid concentrations of low-income and deprived families with serious social problems.\footnote{Jayne Shister, "The Strategy of Tenant Selection in Cambridge Public Housing," MIT MCP Thesis, 1976, pp. 50-51.}
The 1974 legislation eliminated the 20% income gap established by the 1949 legislation to protect private enterprise. It must have been abundantly clear since the mid-fifties when the ambitious goals of the 1949 act were suspended that public housing posed no threat to private enterprise, yet the 20% gap remained until 1974. It seems unlikely, with the negative image that was built into the public housing system, reinforced by the circumstances of the past thirty years, that the program will attract moderate income people.

... Serious questions still remain about the value of a goal of attracting higher-income tenants, when hard evidence is generally absent on the relationship of household behavior to its income or other characteristics for households residing in large public housing projects.\(^3\)

Changes in the CHA, however reluctant, have reflected adjustments in the program at a national level. A drastic change in the board of the CHA in 1974 was evidence of a turnaround of the arbitrary political practices of the past, beginning the slow process of changing to a fair, equitable, and workable system for Cambridge public housing.

Along with changes in Jefferson Park and the CHA, there have been dramatic changes in the community as a whole. In 1969 and 1970 three 22-story mixed income buildings were built on the vacant brickyard site to the west of Jefferson Park (Figure 10). The number of owner-occupied housing units in the neighborhood has remained fairly constant throughout the past thirty years at about 400. The number of rental units, however, has increased dramatically from about 600 in 1950 to over 1600 in 1980. Most of this increase was the result of the building of J.P. in

Rindge Towers...

...looming over JEFFERSON PARK
the 1905s adding 300 rental units and the building of Rindge Towers, adding 800 rentals units in the 1970s. However, the population of the whole census tract has increased by only 1000 in 40 years, from 4000 in 1940 to 5000 in 1980, even with the more than doubling of the total number of units from 1000 in 1950 to 2100 in 1980. The population of the neighborhood outside of J.P. and Rindge Towers has dropped from 4000 in 1940 to 2300 in 1980. The combined population of J.P. and Rindge Towers at 2700 made up more than half of the total population of the census tract in 1980. The minority population of the census tract has increased markedly. In 1940 the white population was about 4000 and the minority population less than 25. In 1980 the white population had dropped to 3000 and the minority population had increased to about 2000. The area has changed from less than 1% minority to 40% minority in 40 years and almost all of this change occurred since 1970. Ninety percent of this minority population is in Jefferson Park and Rindge Towers and 85% of that is in the Rindge Towers. The building of these two projects had changed the area from one of white working-class families to one of predominantly poor white and minority families.

The change in the population at Jefferson Park has been as sudden and dramatic as that in the community at a whole. With the abandonment of certain areas and buildings and the decrease of family size in Jefferson Park, the population had dropped from 1400 in 1960 to 700 in 1980. In that same period the number of female-headed households increased from a negligible percentage to the current figure of 70%. Elimination of discriminatory selection practices that kept J.P. over 90% white until the early 1970s and the subsequent abandonment of the program by many poor whites have changed J.P. to 50% minority in only ten years.
... White families turn to public housing much less readily than black families, in other words, have to be more destitute to see public housing as a residential alternative.32

Discrimination in the private housing market limits the options of poor minority families, who are therefore more likely to seek public housing.

Historical accident or perhaps placement practice, or their combination have created segregation of different groups within Jefferson Park. In the early 1970s the waiting lists were dominated by Hispanics. Most vacancies at that time were in the courtyard, and the Hispanic families were placed in those vacant apartments. The original Jefferson Park buildings, always having experienced less turnover than other areas of the project, started to experience the results of the discontent pervading Jefferson Park. Vacancies started to increase in the late seventies in an area that then became predominantly occupied by Haitian families, the next group to aggressively seek public housing. The rapid rate of racial and ethnic change and the relative physical isolation has lead to a certain degree of social isolation of the groups. Scobie's study of tenants in Boston Public Housing suggests that,

... Socially similar families may interact in ways that are either harmonious or conflict laden, while dissimilar families may simply fail to interact.33

Public housing continues to be a valuable resource to the segments of the poor whose other housing options are severely limited. Rapid change in the balance of the

33 Scobie, p. 70.
different groups can create a situation where one group may perceive itself as in competition with the others for the same limited and valuable resource.
PAST RENOVATIONS AND SOCIAL PRECEDENTS

The history of government intervention in public housing since the mid-sixties demonstrates the belief that,

A one-time, intense effort would set the projects back on normal course.1

These government efforts have been poorly coordinated, to the extent that the results of these efforts are rendered inconclusive and difficult to incorporate into policy. These efforts have variously attempted to impact management procedure and practice, the physical environments of the projects, social service networks available to tenants, and numerous other variables in the public housing equation. The variables have been treated as independent rather than as parts of a comprehensive network of interdependent issues and forces.

Positive physical intervention in Jefferson Park has been infrequent and largely unambitious in scope. The only physical changes in J.P. were ones reflecting changing patterns of use and abuse of public space, inside and outside, until 1970 when Jefferson Park was the subject of one of those single-minded efforts to turn the project around. Otherwise the Jefferson Park of the 1980s looks startlingly like the J.P. of the 1950s (Figures 11-18). In 1970 state aid was provided for rehabilitation of the public space of J.P. The effort was mainly concentrated in the courtyard, the single most troublesome public space of the development. To understand the consequences of this change it is essential to recognize how the priorities and practices of different groups have coordinated with the variety of public space and building organization, to understand both the

1Stryuk, p. 144.
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physical and social context in which this change took place.

The site plan of Jefferson Park clearly shows a diversity of size and scale of public spaces, with varied relationships of buildings and entries to each other, to built boundaries and edges, to pedestrian and vehicular networks within and without of the projects, and to the different site boundaries. The different areas have had varying fortunes. Some of this variability can be ascribed to investment of management resources and control in the different areas and placement practices that favored some areas over others. From discussions with current and former tenants, reinforced by my own understandings, it is possible to identify the qualities of the areas that tenants perceive as more appropriate and suitable to their use. As was the common practice in public housing design, very little of the vast outside space in Jefferson Park was specifically designed with tenant use as a priority, either for children or adults. Different tenant populations have been able to adapt their needs to the kinds of spaces provided with varying degrees of success. In a generally anonymous public space environment, the areas in which tenants have been most successful are those that provide more built, clear definitions of spaces that can be identified with individual buildings, individual doorways or small groups of doorways. The control and/or responsibility that tenants feel for an area is most often inversely proportional to the number of people who use an area, or feel they have the right to use that area, and varies similarly with distance from one's doorway or apartment.

There is a distinction between the areas that tenants use and the areas that they feel they have control over. For adults the former is usually a subarea of the latter. Adults generally define the area that they use as a small
zone with their entry door as its focus. This area is delimited by built nearby boundaries, when they exist, usually not more than about fifteen feet from the doorway. The boundary can be a building edge or corner or as minimal as a broken down fence. In the absence of even minimal built boundaries the outline of this area becomes less distinct. The boundaries usually terminate on a built feature, a building corner or edge or a fence. This area associated with the doorway is where adults sit out, watch over the little kids, have cookouts with the kids and neighbors, and talk with neighbors. Although not necessarily used as actively by all tenants on a doorway, this area is recognized as a collective space for that doorway. In the original section of J.P. buildings have front and back entries. The space that people tend to identify with is associated with the one entry that they most often use, rarely with both entries.

The areas that are actively used, at least by adults, are a small portion of the total site area. Although some people define the area in which they feel they have the right and ability to exercise their influence and control as limited to the small use area associated with their doorway, others are more aggressive and expansive in expressing their control. The extent of the control areas, where adults will oversee the play activities of children, protecting the area from abuse and vandalism, is a function of the distance from one's apartment or doorway area. Sense of control decreases with distance and diminished visual contact. The absolute limits of these areas are as variable as the personalities and wills of the individuals trying to exercise their influence. These areas rarely extend more than about fifty feet from one's doorway or apartment and often considerably less than that. Figure 20 represents areas identified by three tenants in different
doorways in "the castles" and "showers" area shown on Figure 21.

The ability of people to exercise their control depends a great deal on the site plan, building and entry organization. The clarity with which public areas are associated with individual buildings, doorways, or groups of doorways and the extent to which spheres of collective or individual influence tend to overlap in a public space greatly affect the exercise of control. The ability and determination of control varies with the nature and intensity of affronts to that control. Those who are very diligent in overseeing the activities of children may be less inclined and less able to control the disruptive activities of teens. Interviews with tenants give some evidence that sense of control varies with length of tenancy, the extent and determination of that control in the public space being related directly to length of tenancy in a particular area. Newer tenants seem less inclined to intervene in areas controlled and used by tenants of longer duration. Newer tenants are less likely to feel that their term or tenancy is indefinite as do many of the tenants of longer duration.

I came here temporarily for two years -- eleven years ago.2

It is likely then that newer tenants have less commitment to areas outside of their specific individual control. As length of tenancy increases the clarity and extent of control seems to increase. All other things being equal, areas with the highest concentration of new tenants might be expected to have the least supervised public spaces.

The preceding overview gives a static synopsis of how people have tended to use and interact in public space.

2Unless otherwise noted, all comments are from tenants. See Appendix.
Areas defined by adults:
- Primary use
- Primary control
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FIG. 19: Courtyard areas before the renovation

FIG. 20: Areas defined by some current residents
FIG. 21: SITE PLAN 1983
From this it should be clear which areas would be expected to be more in concert with tenants' needs and desires as they relate to the specific built nature of the environment. The original section has fared the best, with its small-scale public space with easily identifiable boundaries. Tenants generally give names to spaces and not to buildings, except for the "six-decker." Individual doorways are simply identified by number. The original buildings are most often referred to as the front, and the extension, the back. It's interesting to note that, even though the front has considerably less public space than the back, there are more names given to specific spaces in the front than in the back (see Figure 21). The scattered buildings of the extension have fared relatively well, mainly due to their isolation within the site, providing clarity of definition of the building space by strong, however unpleasant, roadways and parking lots as boundaries. The courtyard has historically had the worst fortune with its large open space too big to be easily controlled and too open to be ignored, surrounded and isolated by four inwardly focused buildings.

The big court is like a different world, crossing the street to a different world as far as I'm concerned. I don't know if it's that everybody's clustered together. You could sit here [the front] and have a barbeque and nobody's going to bother you. Over there it's like everybody's on you, around you. For the same place it just seems like two entirely different places.... Maybe it's because every doorway is right into the same area, where over here they're more spread out.

In spite of the great variability of the types and nature of the public space in Jefferson Park, all areas, including the courtyard, worked surprisingly well in its early history. What was within the abilities of the early group proved to be beyond the capabilities of later groups. The
courtyard, once a workable public space, became in later years a cauldron of discontent.

There was a strong social cohesion between the early courtyard tenants, with individual doorways as the basis of the developing social units. The nature of the buildings with their common entry stairs impelled and enabled interaction of the tenants sharing that stair. The ease and uniformity with which the doorways were established as the primary social units was in large part due to the social homogeneity of the early tenants, the relatively small number of families per doorway, and the relative long tenure and association of the early residents.

The neighbors were the best when I first moved in there, very helpful, very sociable. They had a little party when I moved in. It was their custom to have a little coffee klatsch and invite the new tenant and make her feel at home which they did, which I thought was kind of nice because I didn't know anybody there.

This pattern of association and identification with the doorway was not unique to the courtyard. It was common to most other walkup buildings of the development. However, aspects of the built and changing social environments of the courtyard disrupted this pattern more readily than in other areas. Use of the outside space was focused on the doorway and the space immediately surrounding it, perceived as under the exclusive control of the residents in the doorway. Each L-shaped courtyard building has three doorways, two in the corner with adjacent use areas. The third doorway is separated from the other two by the building contour and the small use space was clearly separated from those of the other doorways. The undifferentiated space of the courtyard provided few built or "natural" edges to define the boundaries of these spaces.

Outside of the specific doorway area were the areas in
which tenants exercised their control both collectively and individually to moderate the activities of children, young and old, delimiting activities and ousting intruders. This pattern was common throughout the development.

If kids came over to play near our building the people would say, "You don't live over here, go over where you live."

As noted, the extent of this area and its boundaries were vague and fluctuating, varying with the needs and determination of collective and individual control and with the nature of affronts to that control. The major building corners in the courtyard in conjunction with nearby fencing, helped to define the collective use and control space of the building, or at least that of the two corner doorways. The spheres of influence of the two doorways overlapped in this collective area. The control and use area of the third doorway, isolated from that of the other two, had less built definition of the limits of the controllable area and smaller concentration of influence in that zone. Figure 19 is a diagrammatic reconstruction of these areas before the 1970 renovation based on the recollections of former courtyard tenants, including my own.

Although the identification with one's doorway was primary, both with the people and the associated spaces, there was an important, secondary identification with the people and collective spaces of the entire building. Together, the people of one building would sponsor collective events, holiday parties, held in the basements or the common outside areas. The basements, accessed from the common stairs, were a continuous connected space under the building. They were a much used common activity space.

We used to do everything in the cellars. We used to have parties down there and everything. It was fantastic. One of the men in our building had a bike shop. He
used to fix everybody's bike and remake bikes. They used to bring record players and have dancing parties. They weren't destructive they fixed the place up more.

The basements served utilitarian functions collectively for the entire building of clothes washing and hanging and bulk storage for the apartments. They often served as play space for young children while their mothers washed and hung the laundry. This arrangement was not without inconveniences, mothers lugging laundry up and down stairs trailed by small children and their toys. Most people at that time did not have laundry facilities in their homes.

Although there was considerable interaction of people within each of the courtyard buildings in the early days, there was little interaction between the different buildings. The courtyard was viewed as four separate areas, a considerable social and physical distance apart, separated by a large, mostly barren no-man's-land dominated by kids.

When I moved from one side of the courtyard to the other I never saw the people in my old doorway again. You're cut off from people because if you don't see anybody or hear anybody coming through the hallway, you're cut off.

Although interaction between buildings was limited, everyone in the courtyard could at least identify all other courtyard residents by family name. There was little turnover initially in the courtyard, so associations and familiarities developed over a long period.

Although adults were ardent in protecting territories that they saw as under their control and/or for their own use, children were far more aggressively territorial than adults. The public space was used more actively and extensively by children and most defined a much larger area as their exclusive use domain than adults did. Children from one doorway or building would band together to prevent
intrusions into their territory from kids of other doorways or buildings. Even though kids defined a much larger use space than adults, inclusive of the control space of their parents, there was still a vast space central to the courtyard that few felt a personal responsibility for or exclusive right to. This area was actively used by all of the large population of courtyard children.

The courtyard was split in two ovals, with a path through the middle. One oval was slides, jungle jim, swings and sandboxes. The other oval was just bushes and grass. The kids played ball there. The management didn't want the kids playing ball in there, but, kids being kids, they played ball in there. So they pulled all the bushes up, pulled all the grass up and hardtopped it. That made it ugly. (See Figures 22 and 23.)

Although the courtyard was the largest play space of the entire development, few parents from outside the courtyard allowed their children to use the play space in the courtyard, seeing it as an objectionable area.

People that didn't live in the courtyard didn't associate with people in the courtyard.

As the population began to change in the early and mid-sixties, the patterns of tenant association and space control in the courtyard began to erode. With the exodus of the early tenants out of the courtyard, single mothers with their kids moved in. The turnover was rapid and substantial.

There were a lot of great people that were in there and they're gone. They went, and when they left they took the best of it with them. Then you got a lot of frustrated, bitter women with kids to watch.... The women were still there, some of the original women I knew but the men were no longer there. The families had broken up and the women stayed there because it was cheap. That's what started the trap. Then they imported women
FIG. 22: THE COURTYARD 1955, looking northeast.
THE COURTYARD, 1969, before the renovation...

...and 1983, looking southwest

FIG. 23
from all over the city that were in the same boat. The women were left there and the men left.

The hierarchies of tenant association and interaction and control began to erode slowly. Strong identification with one's doorway persisted. However, with many new people moving in and old ones moving out, social bonds between families on a doorway had to be continually reformed. Identification with one's building diminished as both the familiarity with one's new neighbors outside the doorway became less likely, as collective activities decreased and collective spaces become abandoned due to vandalism. The basements were no longer the collective resource that they had once been. No longer were they used for parties or play space or even for clothes washing and hanging. The washing machines had broken down from normal heavy use and from vandalism.

When we started hanging clothes on the fences, they gave us lines outside, because after a while you couldn't trust your clothes in the basement because things were deteriorating.

The sandboxes in the corner areas were filled and paved and used for clotheslines.

When I first moved in there it wasn't a bad place to live. There were a lot of people in a small area but it was not a bad place to live, the people were decent. If you spoke to someone else's child they paid attention to you because you were somebody's mother or you were a mother or a father. That part of it deteriorated. After a while you were afraid to talk to a three year old...

It was a time when the tenants were losing more and more control because the families were all moving out and you were left with just mothers and children usually. There were only two men in our doorway. When the families started to move out, that's when the kids took over.

Patterns of space use and control began to change.
Although tenants on a doorway still identified with and used a small area outside their entry door, their ability to have control of the peripheral areas diminished. Control in these areas was never administered uniformly by all tenants. Some, often the men, were the most ardent protectors of these areas and many of these people moved out. Control in these areas became less diligent and the kids were becoming more inclined to intrude in the areas that they once had accepted as out of bounds.

A lot of it was not having that male authority that all kids need became some kids just won't listen to a woman.... I used to tell the kids to get out of the 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." And I'd yell at them "You don't own it either, so get out of the tree."

Management control, which once had been very strict, was beginning to dissipate. Both the system of informal tenant generated rules and the formal management rules began to break down.

In the early days management inspected your apartment before they let you in. You thought you were going into a king's palace when you walked into housing. You weren't allowed to put a nail in the wall. It was so extreme one way, and they went from that to an almost "I don't give a damn" attitude. And that's how it became like it is, with the people they let in from management not caring.

Management got weaker and weaker and the tenants got worse and worse, and I don't know if one resulted from the other. Your older tenants tried to keep the rules. The newer tenants coming in didn't know anything about the rules. The rules changed and then they made their own rules.... You were called to task for what your kid did and they hit you in your pocketbook where everybody appreciates that hit. They can't do that now. They couldn't put a tenant out, a filthy tenant, because she paid her rent.
In general, the ability to supervise the kids dissipated as the inclination and ability of some mothers to supervise their own children in the public space decreased.

Some women just couldn't cope. The phrase was a "project mother." A project mother was one who just threw her kids out in the courtyard and to hell with it, whatever they did they did. They put them out and forgot about them. Some women can raise kids alone and some can't. Some women have to have the man there, and some women don't.... I saw kids who were absolute demons out in that courtyard, got inside their own house and you'd think they were altar boys. So there was some control there.

Although many adults were beginning to abandon their territorial prerogatives, the kids still remained very territorial about their own perceived property rights in the public space. The courtyard was still recognized as four separate areas. Interaction between the tenants of the different buildings remained limited. Before the rapid turnover everyone at least knew the names of all 72 courtyard families. Later, the familiarity of the tenants with each other changed drastically. Two women who had known each other as kids lived on opposite sides of the courtyard, unaware of each other for over a year.

When we first moved in there the families stayed there. When all the families started to move out, then a lot of people came, and it took you awhile to catch up with it.

The hierarchies of order and association were decaying from the top, down and from the outside, in. Certain vestiges of that order remained intact and were even reinforced, most often centered around individual doorways or buildings. The associations and bonds between the women, for whom welfare dependency was a recent and unanticipated circumstance in their lives, developed into an important social support network.
You weren't lonely, there was always someone to talk to, when you got tired of talking baby talk. That's the part of the project that I personally miss, is the social aspect. And we also helped one another, we minded each other's kids. There was no such thing as a babysitter, who had the money for that? "You mind my kids today, I'll mind your kids tomorrow." That's how it worked out.

The networks of social and emotional support were the few positive aspects in an otherwise deteriorating social, physical, and managerial environment.

It was in this progressively disintegrating climate that a major public space redevelopment was undertaken in 1970, principally an attempt to revitalize the public space of the courtyard. The effort was unanimously decried as a disaster. The space was redesigned by Randolph Hester. In his book *Neighborhood Space*, he professes to have learned a lesson from his previous designs of public activity spaces in Cambridge.

I turned down Elm Street with an image of parents sitting in the shade of trees reading, watching their children; of neighborhood children climbing, running, playing house; of teens playing street hockey, hanging around in a space we had designed together. At Fletcher School, I stopped and walked into the neighborhood playground and my image was destroyed. There were no children climbing, no parents reading, no teens hanging around. There was no one. All that was left was a hulk of a swing frame, a charred wood climber, twisted basketball goals, and dead trees with their bark stripped and limbs broken. I asked myself: "What's going on here?" and then, "What went wrong?"

Although the residents had been involved in the design process, I had relied on my elitist criteria rather than on their needs, and my criteria for the design of the space were quite different from those by which the residents decided whether or not to use the space. Whereas I was concerned about "hardware," how
the forms looked, how materials connected and weathered, and how circulation worked, the users were concerned about being safe, being with their friends, expressing anger, or controlling their turf.

I suspect that Mr. Hester didn't learn his lesson quite soon enough or well enough to be of benefit to the residents of Jefferson Park. In spite of his alleged extensive analysis of the way people interacted in and used the public space, it is startling that he could have prescribed a change of environment that was so mismatched with tenants' needs and wants.

The big court was scheduled to become a major play area and the designer suggested clustering the four separate clotheslines to enlarge the open space. This was met with stiff opposition on the part of the residents because the young parents with limited mobility used the clothesline area extensively, not only for drying clothes but also for observing their children's play and for socializing. Four separate friendship circles existed, based on the clotheslines as a socializing space for families with young children. Even the fathers met there to drink beer after work and saw the design proposal as interrupting their home-oriented meeting place. The design was changed to accommodate and reinforce these corner areas as four separate, semiprivate interaction centers.

Although tenants and I agree that Hester elevates the importance of the clotheslines as a social focus far beyond that which they actually had, he was right in interpreting the importance of the corner areas as four separate social entities. Hester alleges that his design reinforced the distinct use of the corner social spaces. In the view of the tenants, quite the opposite was true.

Then the "great" architect came in, he devised that hockey rink and the whole bit, and the tables and that grand thing there.
It was lovely, but it never worked. It was a playground surrounded by 72 families.... When they built the hockey rink, it made it seem like one big yard instead of several separate yards. (Compare Figures 8 and 21, see Figures 24 and 25).

The design included a sunken area for basketball, street hockey, and ice hockey in the winter, a tot lot, and a sunken circular shower spray also for winter skating. What little green space that still existed in the fenced areas at the building edges was removed (see Figures 26 to 29). A number of yellow fiberglass tables and benches were placed more or less randomly throughout the court. Many point to this redevelopment as the "swan song" of the courtyard.

That's when people said, "I've got to get out of here."

Hester's initial inclination as expressed with the clotheslines, was to centralize activities, treating the courtyard as uniform public space. Although tenants resisted his intention to centralize the clotheslines, he succeeded in centralizing child play activities in certain areas. What vestiges of the hierarchy of space that the tenants had been able to maintain in the face of increasingly aggressive affronts by children both young and old, were completely disrupted by the renovation. Up to that time the normal play activities of most kids were focused in their own quadrant of the courtyard, near their own doorway or building. The design centralized different kinds of play activities in different corners of the courtyard bordering on the semi-private corner areas. The new attractions were like an invitation and encouragement to kids all over the courtyard, all over Jefferson Park and even outside of J.P. to invade people's private domain.

We were never allowed in the courtyard, but once they put the basketball things up, we used to go over with the boys sometimes and
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watch them play, or play with them.

The aggressive territorial tendencies of kids, which played a large part in focusing the play activities of kids to their own areas, nearly dissipated. The existing minimal built definitions of corner area boundaries, which established the conventional limits of the areas, were removed. The limits of the areas were made quite indistinct, contrary to the professed intention to reinforce the areas.

The location of trees and landscaping was essentially random throughout the courtyard. Little effort was made to locate them in areas where tenants might have been able to protect them from vandalism. Very young trees were planted, in spite of tenant admonition against the use of small trees. The green areas as the building edges were paved, leaving only small strips of ground area at the building edges that were planted with very small pine trees. The placement of the fiberglass tables and benches had only a very tenuous relationship with the areas that the tenants used or were likely to use. Within two years all of the tables, all of the small pines and more than half of the larger trees had been destroyed.

It's like they build something to put there for the project, but not for the ideal of the people, for their comfort or how they're going to use it. And the way the people are using it just the way they built it. The people are getting exactly what was built there. It was built poorly and that's how people are using it -- poorly. If they designed it right, to fit the ideal, then it would be used the way it should have been used. And it would be better maintained because people would be using it.... They put a sand box in there, it was just poorly designed. There's been more kids with broken arms over there. With the kind of playground they designed, it's like a little battlefield.

The rapid degeneration and vandalism by kids and the growing teenage population affected the extent and way that adults
used the outside.

We didn't go out as much, it was too crowded then. All different people were coming in. You didn't have as much privacy because they came from Rindge Towers, they came from Walden Square for the ball playing. We had more fights and arguments then because all the teenagers were coming in then from all over, so you couldn't go out.

It seemed bigger, too [before the renovation]. Now it seems smaller.

Not all the problems experienced in the courtyard after the renovation were the direct result of poor interpretation and design implementation. The growing teenage population was the cause of much perceived and actual disruption, particularly at night. The problem for the teens was a simple one: there was nothing for them to do and few resources to provide them with any activities. They were becoming an unsupervised and unsupervisable group. There were limited, short-term programs for the teens, generated through the teen center that opened up in the basement of the southwest courtyard building.

They had camping trips, getting the kids and the teenagers off the streets, bring them out in the country, and let them know there were other things in life to enjoy.... We used to go camping, you used to have to clean up after your mess. You run wild in the country and by the time you come home you didn't do the things you used to do around here. When you go on a camping trip you can't be throwing your bottles or glass. You have a counselor on your ass saying, "Pick up this, do that, you can't do this." You might take it home with you, so you don't throw a bottle out on the street saying, "Geez, what am I doing that for. I live here now." If you've got nothing to offer them and there's nothing to look forward to and it all looks bleak, "well, to hell with it, I might as
well throw a bottle, it's something to do. Maybe I create a little problem, a little mischief around here and create a little something." Or, "Gee, let's cause some trouble and get chased by the cops. Ha, ha, ha." That's their kind of fun, what else are you going to offer them? The parents are low income so they don't have the money to take them out.

I think the kids learned not to expect much out of life or out of themselves.

The teenagers, most of whom were not from Jefferson Park, had begun hanging out just outside of the courtyard at the north entrance even before the courtyard renovation.

They just designated that spot to hang out, and when teenagers designate a spot to hang out you have a hell of a time trying to break it up. The manager told me he could do absolutely nothing about it, I was the tenant and if I didn't like it, I had to do something about it. Project kids you could talk to, they respected you. Outside kids thought you were a second class citizen and they just didn't pay any attention to you.

When the teen center opened up it brought the nighttime teenage disruption into the courtyard, a major factor in the eventual tenant abandonment of the southwest building and vandalism of the vacated apartments.

The importance of delineation of the hierarchy of public and private spaces by site plan, building and entry arrangements and by scale and size of the outdoor space can be made clear when comparing the different areas in J.P. It's unfortunate that Hester's analysis of how people used and interacted in the public space was limited to what he saw in the courtyard. There were examples right at hand of spaces in J.P. that worked relatively well. The understanding of the qualities of those spaces and the way people used them would have provided a much better model for the intervention into the courtyard than Hester's own
abstract, probably intuitive, notions.

Within a year of the courtyard renovation, a much smaller scale renovation took place in the front part of J.P. (see Figures 13, 15, 16). The south, central green space was paved and provided with play equipment for small kids. The adjacent fenced area at the juncture of the two central open spaces was reused as a shower spray for kids. Next to that, at the location of a seating area of the original design, new benches and tables were provided. The seating area, not in a location likely to be used by adults, was only used by kids and teens and was quickly destroyed. The other two areas are still actively used and relatively well maintained, as compared with the courtyard. The small renovation of the front part did not undermine the priorities of the tenants there and did not disrupt the existing hierarchy and patterns of use, but only legitimized the use as play space of areas that were already actively used by kids.

I'm sure the intentions of the Housing Authority and the architect were well meant, in general. However, there is good reason to question the focus of the program for intervening in J.P., particularly with respect to the courtyard. The courtyard was already an actively used playspace, however barren. The redesign ultimately provided very little more play facilities than what already existed. The shower area worked for one summer and the management made only one cursory attempt to fill the winter skating areas. It is unfortunate that the limited resources were focused on physical revitalization, however sorely needed, when social disruption and discontent and diminishing administrative commitment, which reached a low point in the early 1970s, were more urgent priorities. Without a concurrent effort to address these priorities, the physical
intervention was bound to fail, particularly when in and of itself it proved to be so disrupting. Part of the architect's problem was a misreading of the needs and habits of the tenants and prescribing a change of physical environment that was mismatched with those needs. But the fact that the courtyard renovation was rejected like a transplanted heart was only partly due to the disruptive rather than constructive effect of the renovation. It's clear that too much was invested in searching for an architectural solution to what was essentially a social and management problem. Architectural intervention can only work very small miracles in addressing social problems.
A dramatic shift in the commitment of the Cambridge Housing Authority to its public housing program was evidenced by the CHA's aggressiveness in securing federal and state funds in the late 1970s and early 1980s for substantial rehabilitation of its largest and most troubled family housing projects. This shift was prompted by the change in the CHA board in 1974. In 1980 the Cambridge Housing Authority secured $12.5 million for the redevelopment of the J.P. extension from federal funds and $2.2 million for the original site from state funds. An overview of the programs and processes for the redevelopment provides insight into the goals and emphases of the redevelopment.

There is a wide range of redevelopment strategies that could have been employed. Each one represents different emphases, providing significantly varied results and would have required very different programs. It's clear that there exists a substantial mismatch of both tenant and management needs and priorities with the nature of the physical environment. A real change is in order, but what should the emphasis in that change be? If tenant and management needs were not in accord, then a program for change might have reflected either management priorities, tenant priorities, or an attempt to compromise their opposing needs into a coordinated set of guidelines. The extent to which tenant needs were a priority would have necessarily influenced administrative procedures for information gathering on tenant needs, dissemination of information to tenants, involving tenants in the process, and the tenant role in decision making. Whatever the balance of management and tenant priorities that the process has presumed, a program for a static solution of current management and
tenant needs would have been distinct from one that had
dictated a solution for projected future needs or a solu-
tion that could adapt to changing needs of management and
changing tenant populations.

The program for the redevelopment of the extension
dictated a considerable change in the basic organization
and form of the built environment both in public and pri-

tate space, inside and outside. The program prescribed a
change that was quite specific in intent and intractable
in nature. The nature of these changes was largely initi-
atated by the CHA, based mainly on their experience and
intuition, tempered by input from design professionals and
tenants. The appropriateness of those changes to long and
short-term needs can only really be tested by implementa-
tion of those changes. By prescribing a process that dic-
tates a one time, intense redevelopment of the extension,
as this effort does, the CHA eliminated the opportunity to
test the impact and appropriateness of those changes that
a phased redevelopment would offer. Both implicit and
explicit in the program was that the effort was to specifi-
cally respond to the perceived immediate need, with little
projection of response to the long-term variability of
needs. Within the legislative context of recent and past
history of national and local public housing efforts, this
is a predictable response. As early as the 1950s, strate-
gies were proposed that projected designs for adaptability
and flexibility in public housing. Efforts were focused
both on the possibility of combination of adjacent units
to respond to varying needs in unit mix and the possibility
of rearrangement of partitions within a unit to respond to
the individual needs of families. The need for adaptabil-
ity recognized by these designers and administrators was
equally clear to at least one J.P. tenant.
If I was going to be an architect I would have to build a place where knowing that maybe 20 years from now something might change, make it so it might be able to change. To be able to adapt so we can change this without having to renovate the whole building, just a little change, make it more flexible but also sturdy and durable. They just made this place sturdy and durable. You can't do much about flexing it unless they tear something down. I think they can do something where maybe 20 years from now you might be able to change it but it won't be such a change where we've got to do heavy makeup on it or really gut the building out and build again. Maybe they can do something where it makes it easier on the person going in that has a contractor do it.

The history of public housing is one of unforeseen and largely uncontrollable change in tenant populations and needs and management priorities and capabilities. Bureaucratic priorities and inertia prevent the shift to physical solutions that might be adaptable to continually changing needs. As has been the case historically, the government has been reluctant to subsidize operating and management costs. They have preferred, instead, to cover building expenses. Whatever the projected role might be of tenant initiative and responsibility in a proposed adaptable environment, management and maintenance involvement would certainly be increased. Promotion of such an adaptable environment would require a complete restructuring of management's role and of the government's physical design standards. As will be pointed out, rather than increasing administrative responsibilities, one of the implicit desires expressed in the CHA's program for redevelopment was a decrease in management and maintenance responsibility, attempting to shift some of those responsibilities to the tenants. This is a predictable and understandable desire given the escalating costs of operating expenses and the
reluctance of the government to fund anything but direct building costs.

The front and back parts of J.P. are being redeveloped separately, with different funding sources and amounts and with substantially different programs. There is good reason at the outset to call attention to the likely impact of funding the project in different amounts for different phases of the redevelopment. A continuing problem in J.P. from its earliest days has been the actual and perceived separation of the front and back parts.

It's like two totally different places.... There's always been a rivalry between the front and back, the back thinking that the front thinks they're too good and the front thinking that the back are too bad. And there's always been this big concern of how are we going to get it to be one project. So what do they do but divide it into two parts, federal and state. Now they're going to take the back part and completely rebuild that, and give us showers. So that's their way of getting us into one big community family.... I think what they're going to cause is more separation. They've got one designer for down back, they're going to have another one for up here, and a third one for the community center, the bridge, and the health center. It's going to be interesting to see how they're going to blend it all in together. They've got three different firms with three distinct different ideas.

Certainly the sources and amounts of funding may well be beyond the control of the CHA. However, the areas in which the money is spent is not completely beyond CHA's control. Of the $2.2 million to be spent for the renovation of the front part, more than one third is to be spent on the site improvements. This priority was established by the CHA to bring the site improvements of the front part up to level of the extension improvements. The CHA intent to keep the front part occupied during its renovation limits the extent
of improvements that are possible within the units.

I think there's an awful lot of emphasis being put on the grounds moreso than the apartments. I think that should be secondary, not first. And right from the start that was the first thing that came up each time, until we started to try to turn the meetings around and say, "Hey, look, you're telling us that we can have whatever we want and what we want is the apartments fixed up, and the buildings fixed up, then do the grounds."

A relatively small portion of the funds is to be spent on specific improvements within the apartments. All decisions and priorities for the allocation of funds were established without any input or involvement by tenants.

It is revealing that in the program for the extension, that aside from the developers' working out a site plan for the front, there is little specific emphasis on decreasing the social and physical separation of the two areas. There is more specific emphasis on decreasing the separation of J.P. from the greater North Cambridge community. History has shown that this goal may be unrealizable, especially in the view of most tenants.

Don't they understand that the community isn't ever going to connect to this place?

Decreasing the separation of the community and Jefferson Park may well be beyond the limit of the CHA's influence, whereas decreasing the separation of the two parts is within the CHA's power and could have been addressed more directly and aggressively.

The choice of development process by the CHA has anticipated advantages for the authority, but also perhaps largely unanticipated disadvantages both for the long and short-term needs of the tenants and the authority. The J.P. extension is being redeveloped by a turnkey process. Construction is financed by the developer, to whom the site
will be turned over, and then the completed project will be purchased by the Authority for the pre-established price. Under ideal circumstances this process has many advantages for the CHA. The conventional procedure is one where the Authority selects an architect to work with them to develop the design and to produce construction drawings that are then submitted for public bid. The bidding process eliminates Authority control in the selection of the contractor. The Authority may be required to work with an incompatible low-bid contractor. The turnkey process side-steps some significant problems. The Authority gets the contractor of its choice who agrees to build the project within the budget limit. The turnkey process has proved to be more efficient than the conventional model. It might seem that a turnkey redevelopment, with submission of proposals by a number of different developer/architect teams, would produce a wide range of design strategies. In concept this is probably true. However, with no control on the number of developers submitting proposals and great pressure to select from one of the submitted proposals, the CHA was compelled to be quite specific in dictating the kinds of interventions that were appropriate and compatible with the needs at Jefferson Park. In many ways this greatly limited the range of proposal solutions. Inherent in the great degree of control that the Authority has at the outset of the process is the obligation to be quite specific in deciding on appropriate interventions over a broad range of issues. All of the issues had to be addressed in advance, mainly through the developer's packet with its program. In some areas where there was not consensus on the "best direction for development" the CHA left the guidelines broader. There was, however, no provision for an interim design review before proposal submission to
consider the responses to the broader guidelines, in order to make adjustments in broad strategies that might have otherwise disqualified the proposal. Although there is continual review and adjustment through the construction drawing phase, both the CHA and the developer are committed in principle, if not always in detailed specifics, to the dictates of the proposal. Once the site is turned over to the developer, CHA control of the construction process is very limited.

The choice of development process has significant impact on tenant involvement in that process. The development of the program for a $12 million construction job and the evaluation of proposals for that construction are outside of the normal experience of most public housing tenants. The skills and information necessary for such an undertaking are not quickly or easily acquired. The effectiveness of tenant input may be stifled by their lack of familiarity with the requirements of the process and their lack of experience at reviewing graphic architectural information. Without a diligent effort to develop in them some of those necessary skills, their impact on the process is inevitably limited. Their perception of the structural limits of their role becomes a source of frustration, resulting in a questioning of the CHA's sincerity in involving them in the process.

They're going to do what they want and we're just a big front, that's all. It stands to reason, right? I didn't go to architect school, I don't know construction. It's just to get our name on a paper to send to Washington so they can get funded. The way I figure it is, they're covering themselves to put a couple of tenants on [the steering committee] because there's more housing people on it than tenants so naturally they can talk and wangle you around. You just automatically say "yes" because who am I to say? So this covers them.

The appropriateness to tenant involvement of the format
for program generation, largely determined by the development procedure, delimits the extent to which the program reflects tenant needs and concerns. The diligence with which the Authority seeks out broad tenant input and the priority that they put on preparing tenants to deal with the range of issues and specifics of the procedures influences the representation of tenants' concerns in the program and products. A process that either intentionally or inadvertently underrates the value of tenant experience of their own environment is neglecting and wasting a very precious resource.

The traditional development strategy, with the selection of an architect to work with the Authority and tenants, is more appropriate to tenants' needs and experience. This is the model being used for the redevelopment of the original section of Jefferson Park. When tenants are involved in the architect selection process, they can judge the architect based on presentation of completed, built works, on his/her commitment to addressing their needs, on their perception of his/her ability to work with them and for them and on his/her personality. At present the redevelopment process for the front part has only proceeded to the point of architect selection. Even with this process there is no guarantee that tenants' concerns will be adequately represented. The CHA and other government agencies are still the controlling force between the architect and the users of the environment. In the selection process for an architect for the front part of J.P., the CHA's focus was on satisfying its own needs with only cursory attention to selecting an architect compatible with tenants. The conventional model allows the architect to work with the tenants to gather information on their particular concerns, and to attempt to coordinate their concerns with those of the Authority. The turnkey process puts one more obstacle
between the architect and the users of the environment, that being the developer, since the architect is hired by the developer. The architect then has two clients between him/herself and the eventual users. The architect has no contact with the users before review of the redevelopment proposal. Since the proposals are based on the dictates of the program, the proposal strategies are only compatible with the users' needs to the extent that the program is representative of their concerns.

In conventional practice the architect is a mediator between the owner and contractor. The architect, whose contract is normally with the owner, has a responsibility to promote the priorities of the owner and/or users over those of the contractor. When the architect's contract is with the developer, the architect's priority for promoting the ideals of the owner and/or user may be subjugated to the priorities of the contractor. In general, the interaction of architect and contractor can be of tremendous benefit in promoting the efficiency, economy, and workability of the design. However, this intention may not be in the best interest of the users and/or owners if the contractor has eclipsing control on the establishment of design goals or if the design intentions become subjugated to or diffused by the contractor's economic priorities.

Tenant cynicism, a result of their perception of their limited role in the development process has a great impact on their willingness to participate on advisory tenants' committees. Their perception of the lack of CHA commitment to involving tenants in decision making is based on both recent and past experiences. A tenant who had been involved in the process for the courtyard renovation in 1970 says:

"I'd never join a tenants' committee again because they don't ever do anything. They try to make you think you're doing something."
It's a pacifier for the tenants. Not one thing they ever asked for did they ever get.

The CHA does little to reach out to provide incentives to participation. Many tenants are reluctant to make the substantial commitment of time and effort. The diversity of tenant opinions and concerns is often underrepresented in the tenant committees, as many outspoken tenants are frustrated from participation by their perception of the Authority's insincerity.

They want you to go to all these meetings, they want all of your input and all of your time, and then they decide what they want, not what you want. The thing that gets me with housing, when you've got people who are willing to stand behind you, and take care and put a little input into it, why don't they listen to them? We're the ones that live here.

One simple strategy for increasing tenant participation in the process would be to pay them. They are the only participants in the process who are not compensated for the substantial time and effort involved. Then they would have something to take away from the meetings other than frustration, bewilderment and cynicism.

The program for the turnkey redevelopment of the Jefferson Park extension was developed by the CHA, in connection with professional designers and the Jefferson Park Steering Committee. The Committee, "a review and advisory group," was comprised of CHA staff and tenants. The program identified some specific problems to be addressed by the developers. Some of these were: an unclear, poorly defined site entrance/exit system; poor circulation within the site leaving "an enormous amount of the site as
undefined roadway and parking, much of which is not used; inaccessibility to the Fresh Pond Shopping Center and proposed city park; isolation from the greater North Cambridge neighborhood; small apartment size; abuse of common hallways; an illegal trash incineration system; uninhabitable six-story building; social support services scattered throughout the site; lack of private or semi-private space; excessive undifferentiated open areas; institutional character of the buildings. The program established some guidelines of varying specificity to resolve some of these problems. As noted, the separation between the original front section of J.P. and the extension has been an enduring problem contributing to the divisiveness of the community. This issue was not given much emphasis in the program.

CHA treats the two sections of Jefferson Park as one management entity. Therefore, developers should develop proposals which assume compatible site improvements for both portions of Jefferson Park. Specifically, developers are instructed to propose a site plan [for the front section].

The guidelines for vehicular site circulation were fairly broad. The program prescribed that the current exit at the northwest site corner be closed. The main entrance to the site was to utilize one or both of the existing site entrances to make that entrance "significantly more inviting, less constricted, and easily recognizable from Rindge Avenue." The program allowed for removal of buildings or parts of buildings to achieve this end, although demolition of buildings was, in general, not encouraged. The internal street system was to provide "a visually and physically clear path of travel," without creating "speedways," with cul-de-sac drives to parking areas in small lots, near units. The important focus was to "give careful consideration to the development of street patterns amenable to the
establishment of street addresses for individual doorways and entrances."

The system of pedestrian circulation was to connect all areas by a "realistic shortest path," to focus on the site entrance, community facilities, and the proposed bridge over the railroad tracks to the shopping center and proposed city park. The original siting decision to reuse the brickyard for housing left Jefferson Park isolated, with three long, unapproachable edges. This isolation had produced some unplanned benefits. The major pedestrian routes for all residents, front and back, enter the site at its corners along Rindge Avenue (see Figure 21). The strictly limited routes increase the face to face contact of all residents, affording a sense of security that they otherwise might not have had.

I can sit out on the steps alone. It's just the people that walk by, they stop, they talk. I know about 90% of the people in here. Ask me if I know their names, I couldn't tell you. We run into each other outside somewhere. I think that's where that feeling of safeness comes.... I really do get a safe comfortable feeling in here. It doesn't phase me to come walking around 2, 3, 4, 5 in the morning, where to walk out on Rindge Ave. at three in the morning, I'm petrified.

I'm not afraid of the neighborhood. I wouldn't walk down Rindge Ave., but it doesn't bother me to walk out in the middle of Jefferson Park. The only ones that are afraid are the ones that don't live here.

A lot of people from down back, they walk by, and people we never even knew talk to us now, "Oh, you're out here again?" and they know the kids' names. It's nice.

The program established a preferred hierarchy of open space, to eliminate undifferentiated "no-man's-land." The program precluded any significant large-scale play area and prescribed that communal space be used for small "passive
activities." The program dictated a hierarchy of space at the building edges to give the building a definite front and back, each with a distinct character. The building fronts, with the unit entries, were to have an association with the street and parking. The program called for a clearly defined semi-private space associated with the unit entries, separated from the main circulation, in close proximity to the apartments and entries for sight and sound surveillance. This collective interaction space was to provide a small seating area, clothes drying space and a tot lot. This transition space, through which the entries were to pass, presumably was to function similarly to the areas currently associated with small groups of units on individual doorways. The program did not define the appropriate size of space or number of families that should use one space. Implicit in the program language was that this space was to associate with all the entries of a building collectively rather than with small groups of entries. The program did not specifically provide for a small individual space directly associated with the entries similar to the space tenants have always defined as associated with their common doorways. Although in general the program prescribed a significant change in the organization of buildings and public space, the desire for tenants to define an individual area associated with the entry is likely to persist. The organization of the space that is the juncture of public and private functions is very critical. The program guidelines for the new pattern of organization of that space did not adequately reflect the enduring priorities and patterns of tenant use that exist at the public/private interface.

The program called for the back of the buildings to be used for private backyards for ground floor and upper units, accessed through a back door. The private yards were to allow a more spacious feeling to the unit by
providing an individual space for each unit with tenant responsibility for the space.

The HUD grant was for 175 units, a reduction of 25 from the total of existing units. It was the CHA's intent to "maximize the number of units resulting from this turn-key process." This is a very reasonable goal considering the desperate housing situation for families of low income, particularly large families. Jefferson Park is small compared to some housing projects in Boston and other large cities. However, it is one of the largest in Cambridge and in the view of one CHA staff person, "It's too big and too dense." Although the HUD grant was based strictly on walk-up and elevator accessed apartments, the CHA allowed a townhouse or rowhouse model in order to eliminate the common hallways. The CHA saw the below grade space as a valuable unutilized space resource.

The Authority strongly recommends that developers explore the use of these below grade areas in combination with duplex apartment design as a means for expanding unit sizes.

This strategy allowed for increasing the size of units without decreasing their number.

The developer was to insure a means of providing security to these below grade spaces. Security is only one problem inherent in the use of basement space for living area. A more pervasive day-to-day problem is likely to be privacy, an issue not addressed in the program. The maintenance of privacy becomes increasingly difficult to achieve, along with adequate light and ventilation, when the duplex requirement increases the number of entries on both sides of the building perimeter for both upper and lower duplexes. The program offered no direction for acceptable or appropriate methods to achieve privacy on the building fronts, where the below grade space might be
adjacent to noisy and active public space. There are potential conflicts of privacy of below grade space and private backyards inherent in the program. If upper and lower duplexes were prescribed to have private backyards, then conflicts of privacy could arise if yards of upper apartments are adjacent to the basement areas of lower apartments.

The predominant overall approach expressed in the program for Jefferson Park is one of individuation of outside space and entries. It is an approach that is currently common in the redevelopment of many public housing projects, of which J.P. is typical, with pervasive collective use of entries and outside spaces. But what should be the goal of individuation and what degree of individuation is appropriate to Jefferson Park or to public housing in general? Individuation has clear advantages for both the CHA and the tenants. It allows the CHA to shift some responsibilities to other city services and to the tenants. Because of vandalism to mailboxes and lack of security in the hallways, the management has had to take on the responsibility of mail distribution in recent years. Individual entries allow for secure mail delivery to individual apartments. (However, because of the post office's reluctance to increase its own burden for mail distribution, outside cluster boxes are likely to be used.)

Developers were encouraged to be innovative in dealing with trash disposal and prohibited from using dumpsters. The only other common trash disposal systems are gas fired incinerators, compactors, and individual trash cans. The first two are very expensive and would continue the involvement of maintenance in trash disposal. The only system that eliminates management involvement, and the only one specifically mentioned in the program is individual trash cans. This system appeals to developers because of the
insignificant cost and to the CHA because with individual entries on a street, the tenants are individually responsible for bringing trash to the street where the city picks it up. The CHA's responsibility is eliminated.

The unanimously desirable goal of providing private outside space for each individual family also has the advantage for management of shifting maintenance responsibility for a significant portion of the site to the tenants. The program recognized the advantages specific to the tenants of providing private outside space. However the language of the program suggests that the goal of shifting responsibility to the tenants for the outside spaces was at least as important as the perceived advantages to the quality of tenant life.

The use of a duplex model is primarily a mechanism to eliminate the shared interior stairs. It has presumed advantages to the tenant in personal identification with home, entry and outside private space. However, the elimination of these shared hallways is by no means unanimously endorsed by Jefferson Park tenants. In spite of the inherent lack of security in an unlocked public stair, vandalism by kids, problems with keeping them clean, some people, particularly the single women with families, find some important advantages to the hallways that the CHA and the architects do not seem to recognize or appreciate.

What [the architects] are looking at is a building, they're not looking at the people. They can not picture themselves living here, and they look at a hallway and say, "Oh my God! How can anybody live like this...." I like the idea of somebody being on the same floor and having their door on the same floor. It's a secure feeling knowing there's other people.

In addition to a sense of security, in knowing that there are people close by, the hallways remain to some extent, an important social organizing unit.
My neighbor has lived here about five years and I've lived here about six. She's probably been in here twice and I've probably been in her apartment twice. But I'd hate to tell you how many conversations we've had out in the hall in our house coats.

I'm friendliest with the girl upstairs and I'm sure that's because we're right up and down, it's bathrobe talk.... I throw the robe on to run upstairs. I'd think twice about throwing the robe on to run outside to run upstairs.

The change of the basic organization of apartments, individual entries and streets proposed in the CHA program is to an organization more like a typical residential neighborhood. Some of those in J.P. who have lived for a period "on the outside" have come to appreciate the opportunity for social interaction and support that they did not find on the outside.

I have a lot of friends outside. It doesn't seem like they have the friendships, or they don't know who their neighbor is next door or across the street.

After living so long in here, to go where your neighbors next door don't even say hello to you, I couldn't hack that at all.

There's no companionship when you live outside the project in middle-class America, there's just nobody to talk to.

The importance of the hallways as a social unit has been diluted over that which they had been in the past, with the rapid change of the composition of the tenant population in the last ten years and the shorter terms of tenancy. Rather than enabling social contact between people, the hallways have forced interaction between some people who would probably prefer not to have anything to do with each other. The social networks are less likely to be focused on individual doorways than they had been in
It's changed, it's a different place now than even 14 years ago when I first moved in here. It's a lot different, it's a lot more cliquier now. You have quite your little groups. And you've got a lot of Haitians and Puerto Ricans and everything.

The existing social networks in J.P. will probably adapt themselves to the new organizational changes, as they have adapted to other social and physical changes in the past. New tenants may find these important social support contacts more difficult to make. This is not to suggest that shared hallways are the only form in which these contacts can be made. However the CHA, in specifically dictating the housing model, for its own best interest and the perceived best interest of tenants, has eliminated the exploration of different models that might be of more long and short-term benefit to the tenants.

The most pervasive of the hallway problems is that of keeping them clean. The CHA position is that this is a problem of diffusion of responsibility, but the hallways used to be considerably better maintained than they are today.

People used to put curtains up in the windows in the hallways. You're lucky if you can get people to sweep them now.

Desperately poor people are no more likely to be slobs than any other category of people. The careless people in J.P. are a very disruptive but very small minority. It only takes one careless tenant on a hallway to ruin it for everyone else.

There's decent people in here.... There's some around here. You wouldn't walk in their apartment and yet there's others, you can eat off their floor.... It's just there are some people that care and some that just don't.
If the CHA had continued to be diligent in their screening efforts instead of abandoning them in the late '60s, they should have been able to select tenants who would not create problems or allow their kids to create problems in the hallways for other residents. The elimination of the hallways will not eliminate the careless people in J.P. The individuation of entries and outside space has been posited as a strategy for isolating those careless, disruptive people to give the authority more leverage in dealing with them. The problem of carelessness may become isolated to individual areas, but it may find a new arena, such as in the common outside public spaces.

The CHA and most housing authorities find themselves powerless to deal with tenants who make problems for management and other tenants.

You can't be cruel but you've got to draw the line somewhere. If you know who the families are, if they're nothing but slobs, and if their kids are the ones that are going around breaking everything, then do something. Don't feel sorry for them, they've asked for it themselves.

One strategy, eviction, is one that the Housing Authority is reluctant and often unable to pursue.

To enforce the lease other than for non-payment of rent is essentially impossible. It requires the manager to build a case much the way a District Attorney builds a criminal case, and the loser is the tenants. The Housing Authority is a marginal loser because you have some social problems that you prefer not to deal with. But the real losers are the tenants because they have to live with those social problems.¹

In trying to find architectural solutions to problems that are based in large part in social and administrative troubles, one runs the risk of inadvertently eliminating the

¹A CHA staff person.
few advantages that exist without solving the problem at hand, or perhaps creating new unanticipated problems.

Although the developer's packet and program focused on a number of problems, some problems were very conspicuous by their absence. Clare Cooper's research on a Richmond, California, public housing development points out the pervasiveness of the problem of the lack of children's play space in public housing.

In both a spatial and temporal sense, the chief users of the public areas in any residential neighborhood are the children who live there.... Designers of residential neighborhoods spend time worrying about where the cars will be parked, how the house facades will look, and how the garbage will be collected -- and think that children's needs will be taken care of by throwing in a few swings and sandboxes in left-over spaces.... In the Federal Housing Authority's handbook for designers of moderate-income housing, there are 495 pages of detailed design directives and just one sentence that refers to the needs of children.... Complaints about children's and teenage activities and the lack of varied and interesting facilities to keep them occupied figure importantly in virtually every documented case study of resident reactions to moderate- and high-density housing.²

The sentiments of residents confirm this problem in J.P.

There's a lot of kids and nothing for them to do.

The kids have to have some place to run and play. Children have always been the majority population in Jefferson Park and the extension with its many large apartments has had the largest proportion of children. With the unit mix proposed and when completely renovated there

will probably be over 500 kids in the extension and kids will probably outnumber adults by close to two to one. There are only a few sentences in the program that refer to kids' play space. Included in the program for the semi-private building space is the provision for a "recreation area for small children." The private backyards are also suited as play space for small children. Because of the close proximity of the new proposed city park and Russell Field to the northwest of J.P., the provision of a large play area for organized play, basketball, street hockey, was seen as unnecessary. The program prescribes outdoor space for "more passive activities, ... brief, small group activities, such as playing catch; just 'hanging-out' space for teens and pre-teens, bike and skateboard areas; and tot-lots." However, the play activities of children are by no means passive, the use of the outdoor space and their presence in it will be constant and continual rather than brief, and their group will in no way be small. Tot lots may be adequate for children under five and the city park may be useful for the organized recreation of teens and pre-teens. However, there is a significant group from five to ten years old whose play will be centered near their home or at least within Jefferson Park. The usefulness of the city park to J.P. and the adjacent neighborhood is at present in jeopardy. The city seems on the verge of substantially limiting the once extensive proposal for playfields and facilities at the park. The city is also questioning the appropriateness to the whole community of the location of a pedestrian bridge over the railroad tracks at Jefferson Park. Whether the bridge and the park are there or not, J.P. residents will still find a way to get across the tracks, the shortest pedestrian route to the shopping center, as they have done since the centered opened in 1965.
The problem of teens "hanging-out" in the outside space and hallways, particularly at night, has been a perennial problem since the late '60s. The attitude implicit in the program, strongly reinforced by the J.P. Steering Committee, was that the way to eliminate the problem of teens hanging out is to eliminate public spaces where they might hang out. Eliminating those places will most likely only move them to other areas that are perhaps even less desirable as hangouts.

The entrance to the big court, it's always been the same hangout. But it's funny, now, lately the past couple of months there's been a group of Puerto Rican women that come out and sit there with their chairs, so the kids back off. It's kind of like they're taking their space. I think that's how they're ending up out front.

The places where teens hang out now and where they have always hung out are on the fringes of the most public spaces, usually out of view of the watchful eyes of their own parents, but not necessarily out of view of other adults. Relatively small separate groups hang out at the north entrance to the courtyard, some in the court near the building corners, along the entry and exit roads, and at the edges of the big parking lot (see Figure 21). There have been problems with teens hanging out in some of the unlocked hallways, particularly in the cold months. There is little organized activity for the teens to alleviate their boredom or to act as an outlet for their energy.

They have nothing for kids around here and so all they can really expect from the kids around here is a lot of hanging around, and they learn to drink and the drugs and the destruction.... There's nothing for them to do, but to hang around and maybe get into trouble.

There is an actively used teen center in the basement of the walk-up building to the east of the big parking lot.
The renovation plans do not include any space for a new teen center, either in the extension or the front part.

I'll tell you right now, the one thing that's going to come back and haunt them is not providing any space for the teens. That's what all the trouble was over, were the teens. The babies weren't wrecking stuff and smoking dope. They need some place where they can drop in and be supervised somewhat.

The program for non-dwelling space includes very little allocation for space specifically used and organized by tenants. The original HUD authorization for non-dwelling space was for about 6000 square feet of space for management, maintenance, community use and child care, with 2272 square feet of community space. The CHA included space for health care, and more than doubled the total program for the needs in all areas, except for community space. The community space was to include space for the Tenant Council, a family activities center, and 550 square feet of tenant space in the six-decker. In fact, the developers were allowed to decrease the total amount of community space to 1750 square feet if they could meet the program within the lower limit. As stated in the program:

While the maximum allowable space under HUD regulations is 2,272 square feet for community space, developers may be able to satisfy the required functions utilizing less than the maximum space.

At the same time, the CHA's intent was to increase management space from the 755 square feet authorized by HUD to a maximum limit of 2000 square feet. Although some of this increase is for Tenant Services, a valuable tenant support service funded through the Authority, the CHA bias in the allocation of non-dwelling space is difficult to disregard.

The program did not directly address some of the
specific site and building difficulties and conflicts and how they were to be resolved within the dictates of the program. The developers' packet excluded a program appropriate to a large open space. The extension has two large open areas, the parking lot and the courtyard. The majority of the eight redevelopment proposals sited a new community building in the parking lot. Seven out of the eight proposals had roads with parking going into or through the courtyard, the only strategy to satisfy the program in a large open space, other than new building. Few tenants endorse the idea of having a road and cars in the courtyard.

If there was one beauty about that courtyard it was that your kid could play out there without getting hit by a car. That was the only advantage, you didn't have to worry about traffic in the courtyard.

I don't think there should be parking in the court. Granted there's a lot of space. You can't mix parking and playground, that just doesn't mix.

The use of an interior courtyard road was also reinforced by the building configuration. The shape of the building defines a corner space well suited to use as a semi-private building space associated with the front entries. Further, the longer building perimeter on the outside edge makes the clarity of individuation of private yards easier to achieve on this edge.

That the program seemed to preclude use of the courtyard for anything but roadway has implications for other goals of the program. The desired clarity of distinction between the public entry edge and the private yard edge is difficult to achieve with the public edge of the courtyard, and unit entries, focused on an interior street. Any solution that treats the interior edge of the courtyard as uniformly public will have difficulty in maintaining a uniform
hierarchy on the outside edge. The four courtyard build-
ings with exactly the same plan and configuration, have
very different conditions on their edges outside the court-
yard. The north and west edges will likely be perceived as
very public due to their proximity to the main pedestrian
and vehicular routes, undermining the privacy of the yards
along these edges. Entries on those edges are likely to
be perceived and used as front entries, further undermining
the desired distinction of front and back, public and pri-
ivate. The program did little to address the potential
problems, not restricted to the courtyard, when the most
private spaces abut the most public, except to advise the
use of a fence or wall with a lockable gate. The use of
basements for living space precludes the use of level
changes at the building edge of achieve adequate separation
of public and private functions. Focusing on this issue
may seem trivial, in that no J.P. residents now have pri-
ivate outside space. All individual or collective outside
activities are now conducted in very public space. However,
most of those activities are not usually conducted near
roadways or parking areas, except those of the teenagers,
for whom the program makes negligible provision, and who
usually hang out at the edges of the most public spaces.
If those edges also happen to be the edges of private yards,
the conflict is obvious.

The midrise building represents a special set of con-
cerns for unit and building organization. The strategies
for dealing with some of the special problems were largely
predetermined by the unit mix prescribed in the program.
The existing midrise has a total of 60 units, 12 three-
bedroom, 32 two-bedroom and 16 one-bedroom. Although the
program allowed for deviation from the prescribed number of
one-bedroom units, all to be accessed by elevator, the
desired range was between 19 and 35, with a limit of ten
elevator-accessed two-bedroom units.
The use of the first three floors and basement of the midrise for family walk-up units was allowed only if the desired mix of family units could not be accommodated in the lowrise structures or if the special needs of the handicapped dictated the use of this space. The CHA has difficulty in filling its one-bedroom units. These units are based suited to the elderly and childless couples or singles. The elderly however are now usually housed in separate elderly developments. It is understandable that the CHA would want to limit the total number of one-bedroom units. Larger family units predominate in the existing midrise. Unless the first three floors are used exclusively for walk-ups, which was not the intent of the program, it is inevitable that the one and two-bedroom units will be very large. The CHA program doesn't efficiently fill the space available in the building.

The program did not establish any priorities for the circulation within the elevator accessed parts of the building. The two halves of the existing building are completely independent of each other. The building is symmetrical about its east-west axis, with vertical circulation deep in the center of the building in each half. Circulation to the existing apartments is in a completely internal, dark core corridor.

It was dingy, so dingy in there. It was always dark and always like being in a dungeon.

The program did not establish the elimination of this undesirable, unsafe circulation as a goal.

The program offered little direction for the organization of apartment interiors. The priority goal was to increase the apartment size to the maximum possible, a goal wholeheartedly endorsed by tenants since all apartments are oppressively small.
At times it's like the place definitely is not big enough. You just can get away, you're right in the middle of everything. You can close doors but it just isn't big enough.

As prescribed in the program, the main circulation was to "attempt to pass the required living areas or at least leave each common living area with the maximum number of furnishable corners." The entry into the apartment was to be into a separate entry vestibule. Poor circulation within apartments in both parts of J.P. is a pervasive problem (Figure 30). The front apartment door enters from the hallway directly into the living room in about half of all walk-up apartments, with circulation through the living room. The consequence is obvious: kids running in and out through the living room all day long. The circulation effectively decreases the area of usable space in the living rooms. The circulation, window and door locations greatly limit the flexibility of furniture arrangements in the living rooms, and all other rooms as well.

I hate this room. This is the only way you can set it up and I'm a fanatic for switching furniture. I hate to have the same things in the same places. This room has been like this for six years and I hate it.

Many of the living rooms in the front section of J.P. are odd shaped triangular rooms, with the main circulation passing directly through the room from the point of the triangle.

My uncle and I, we painted this apartment six years ago. We emptied out this room and we stood there and laughed because of the shape of it. This wall is crooked, I mean it's useless. There's a lot of wasted space. It looks like such a big room until you start putting things in it.

A number of tenants commented on the inequity of the sizes
FIG. 30: EXISTING APARTMENTS
of the living rooms in different apartments in the front section, where many of the two-bedroom apartments have considerably larger living rooms than the three-bedroom apartments.

The thing I can't get over with any of these apartments is that the less rooms that you have, the bigger space you have. My sister has a five-room apartment and she's got like a two by four kitchen. And yet her bedroom on the other hand, you could hold a grand ball in there. It's ridiculous, her parlor is like half of this size. The kitchen and the parlor, the two rooms that are really necessary are the tiniest little places.

A women who moved from a two-bedroom to a three-bedroom states:

I have an extra bedroom, but they took half my living room.

Although there are some space inequities built into the original design, a more common inequity results from the way apartments are assigned to people, subject to state and federal directives. Although apartments are assigned based on double occupancy of bedrooms, children of different sex over the age of six are allowed separate bedrooms. A single mother with a boy and girl over six would be assigned the same size three-bedroom apartment as a mother and father with two boys and two girls or with four kids of the same sex. Where one family might have adequate space, the other is bound to be overcrowded.

The arrangement of common spaces, kitchen and living room, are of two different models in the two parts of Jefferson Park. In the front, the kitchen and living room are completely separate, adjacent rooms, with closable doors (most of which have been removed over the years). In the extension the adjacent common areas are open to each other, some with more separation than others, but none with
a closable opening between the two. Most people find that neither arrangement adequately meets the range of their needs. The variability of the need for separation and combination of the common spaces is usually a function of family life cycle stage. Since there is little play room in the small bedrooms, and mothers like to oversee their young children, most kids end up playing in the living room.

All their toys are in their rooms, books and things, but they bring them in the living room. We just put them away everyday, twenty times a day.

In the winter it's worse because now they can go out and play.

The focus of activity for most mothers is the kitchen.

The kids have more use of the living room than I do. But I don't care, because I want my kitchen that's it. I'm always in the kitchen, I never go into the living room to sit.... I'm a kitchen person that's it. When I go in the living room, that's it, I've had it for the day.

The arrangement of rooms in the extension is better suited to the particular need for supervision of small children. As kids become older and there is less need for conscientious supervision of their play, the need for separation of the common spaces becomes more important. This becomes particularly critical when different concurrent activities take place in the common spaces, adults talking in the kitchen and kids watching TV or playing in the living room. In the extension some people have put up dividers between the kitchen and living room to make a visual, if not acoustic, separation between the spaces. With older children the separation of the spaces becomes less critical. Pre-teens and teens spend much of their time outside of the house and when inside are most often in their bedrooms.
They spend most of their time in their rooms. They've got their TVs, their stereos, their games. Everything is in their rooms.

Of the people who have lived in both the front and back, most preferred the separated arrangement over the combined. Separation is much more difficult to achieve and more critical in the combined arrangement than connection in the separated one. Many people in the front part expressed a desire to have some kind of opening in the wall between the kitchen and living room, that could be opened or closed, to increase through ventilation, visual connection and size perception.

The kitchen and the living room are separated and I like it much better. I'd like a hole in this wall, just a little thing, just a half partition. They could make a little window there, with just like some shelves on it. When the kids are little you could see them if they were in there, see what they were doing. But I like it better than in the other buildings where it's too combined. This is better, if somebody's in there and you're out here talking, you're in two separate rooms.

Once the window was there, the opening, you could do almost anything with that opening. You could put a small door on it or sliding doors.

The program offered little guidance for the appropriate arrangement of the common spaces. The existing kitchens are all eat-in kitchens. The program allows for eat-in kitchens or for a separate dining area with "at least a snack counter" in the kitchen. The program dictated that "dining areas should be immediately adjacent to, but not necessarily part of the kitchen.... Dining areas in combination with living areas should be at least partially screened from kitchens." There is no mention of screening or separating dining from living rooms. The implicit priority for the organization of common areas represents
a formal interpretation of the use of the dining area, rather than the more utilitarian use that would be more in concert with the tenants' needs and desires.

I want my kitchen in my kitchen. I don't like the dining/kitchen thing at all. I just want my kitchen, never mind the dining room. When I make supper I want to throw it on the table. I don't want to walk around the corner to put it on the table. It's just an extra room you have to clean.

I don't like the living/dining together, that I don't like at all. Make the kitchen so that your table's in your kitchen and that's a totally separate room. For a family that's not a working arrangement.

Conflicts in the use of common space are in large part the result of lack of play space in the apartments. The small size of bedrooms makes their use as play space difficult.

I'm going to have to get bunkbeds when the kids get older, because for them to play, the beds are too big. I can't move them, they [the beds] have to be like this. The windows aren't centered, otherwise you could put them on either side of the windows.

We had three kids in a room. My mother had bunkbeds and a single bed, but you had no room to do anything. You're lucky you could get dressed.

The space deficiency in kids' bedrooms is a problem even though the largest bedroom, intended for the parents, is usually given to the children. The program made little allowance for kids' play space within the apartments. The goal in the bedrooms was to provide as much space as possible prescribing that secondary bedrooms should be "where practicable, in accordance with HUD standards for primary bedrooms." The program prescribed that space for two beds and two dressers and "a clear available floor area approximately 6' x 6' for children's play space should be
provided...." This is not a very generous allocation of play space for two kids, particularly if this space is also the circulation space for the room. Kids, particularly young ones, will likely still end up playing in the living rooms. Even though yard space is being provided for kids, there is still need for play space within the apartment for cold and wet days. In the past some families have made play rooms or dens by tripling-up the kids in the bedrooms, leaving a room available for kids' play and recreation.

Don't they understand that it's a family project? These kids need, even in the apartment, a place to play. They should have allowed for a den or a playroom.

But according to a CHA staff person:

It's one of those things where you're kind of constrained by the government. To tell the taxpayers of other communities that we're going to build townhouse apartments for the poor in Cambridge and we're going to build them with extra bedrooms or guest rooms and family rooms is a real hard sell. It just isn't going to get through the conservative legislature in this country. I'm not saying the poor don't deserve it, they do. I think it would improve the quality of their life, and really wouldn't add much to the cost of running the place once it was built. It would be a little more expensive to build.

It seems as though we haven't come very far in 30 or 40 years. As pointed out, the tenants' need and desire for private outside space was made clear by the government's own research in 1945, but it has taken almost 40 years to act on that need. The need for play space inside the apartment is no less now than it was 30 years ago when Maxim Duplex wrote his articles decrying the government policies that prohibited the inclusion of family rooms in public housing units. The program for the Jefferson Park extension could have been rewritten, and only slightly, to provide a family room separate from the living room. Since
allowance was made for a dining room, the program could have prescribed that in addition to a separated closed dining room connected to the kitchen, enough space should be provided in the kitchen for dining. Then, tenants would have the option of using the dining room as intended or eating in the kitchen and using the dining room as a play space, with a visual connection to the kitchen. This would have allowed for some of the flexibility within the apartments that is so clearly needed.

The program established goals of varying specificity. The program did not, however, establish a clear priority of those goals. There was little direction for the instances where those goals might have been incompatible or where the designers and developers might have had difficulty in satisfying all the goals with equal success. This is not to suggest that the CHA did not have clear priorities. However, in many instances those priorities were not clearly spelled out but were often obscured "between the lines" and in the language of the program. The clearest priorities that were spelled out were prohibitive ones: no large play space, "no no-man's-land," minimize common hallways.

There were a number of areas where the goals seemed to conflict. Was meeting the limit of 175 units more or less important than expanding unit size? Was the use of the duplex model with its inherent increase in internal circulation space more or less important than the expansion of unit sizes? Was the relationship of unit entry to the street and the preferred hierarchy of space on either side of the building more or less important than creating discontinuous vehicular circulation? Was establishing
connections to the community more or less important than establishing the clarity of connections within J.P.? These examples illustrate only a few areas where the lack of a hierarchy of concerns inherent in the program was bound to confound the efforts of the designers to meet all the goals of the program. As will be shown, the lack of priorities led to much divergence in the development of the different design proposals. Some schemes were considerably more successful than others in satisfying the goals of the program. However, not one was able to satisfy all of the goals completely.
THE DESIGN PROPOSALS

Of the eight submissions for the turnkey competition, presented here are four that show the range of diversity of the proposals and the variability of response to the program and to the specifics of the site and buildings. They will be evaluated in terms of compliance with the program or compliance with the context of the current and historical tenant needs, where the two may not be in accord. The architects of the four schemes were Gelardin, Bruner, Cott (GBC); Hugh Adams Russell (HAR); Lane, Frenchman (L/F); and the winners of the competition, Boston Architectural Team in conjunction with Comunitas (BAT/COM). The four schemes show very different attitudes and strategies relating to image, circulation networks, hierarchy of public and private spaces and edges, entries, and building and unit organization.

The question of image was left very broad in the program, saying that the institutional character of the buildings "detracts from the livability of the development." The tenants are considerably more direct in their assessment of the image: "It looks like a prison." Two of the schemes, GBC (Figure 31) and HAR (Figure 32), proposed the use of pitched roofs on the walk-up buildings, in, however, dramatically different contexts, to change the image of the building form. The developer's packet did make cursory reference to the possible use of pitched roofs. However, the two schemes were rejected, in part, because of an image that was perceived as "too suburban." The tenants at large, however, do not readily reject the image of the pitched roofs.

It would make it look less like a prison than it does now. It fits in more with the buildings in the area with the sloped roofs. I like the look of it, it looks
less like a prison and more like someplace
where people live.

I think sloped roofs would make them look
nice, more like a house.

But the appeal of the roofs was by no means seen as a
priority.

The money would be better spent some other
place.

If it means it would take away something
from the tenant within the apartment that
was necessary I would say let it go, but
if it was possible to do both things....

The buildings at J.P. are devoid of any detail or
ornament, except for minimal classical detailing at the
doorways. The HAR scheme used this reference quite liter-
ally and uniformly, making use of classical detailing at
the entryways and stoops in a consistent rowhouse-like
organization at the building edge (Figure 36). A few
tenants responded positively to the familiarity of the
image, but questioned its appropriateness.

It's nice, it doesn't look like it's
changing it much.

It looks like it should be in Back Bay.

The form of the existing detail at different doors varies
somewhat. The entablature above the doorway is either flat,
arched, or gabled. The L/F scheme used the classical
detailing and the different form of the various doorway
ornaments as a reference in an abstracted and extended
fashion "to break the institutional character of the build-
ing edge and to bring the edge out from the building"
(Figure 36). The difference between the existing doorway
detailing usually goes unnoticed and is not a feature that
tenants identify with. Although some tenants recognized
the reference to the existing doorway models, its use as an
organizing principle for otherwise unfamiliar forms of the facade and entryways was mostly unappreciated.

I don't know why I don't like that, I just don't like the looks of it.

The BAT/COM image for the buildings is more a use image than a form image, with a consistent rowhouse-like organization of entry stoops with shed roofs at the edge of the otherwise unembellished buildings (Figure 35). The BAT/COM proposal ultimately won the competition, in part because of this image which appealed to the CHA and to the tenants as well, with, however, some reservation about the translation of the image into a reality.

That looks nice is that's really what they intend to do with it.

The graphic representation of all the images is overly seductive and optimistic. Although tenants are generally disarmed by architectural drawings, they feel more comfortable in reacting to the renderings and perspective drawings (Figures 31-35). They are, however, often skeptical of the gap between the abstraction and the reality as they know it.

Oh that looks lovely. Are you sure that's the same place?

The four schemes demonstrate dramatically different interpretations and compliance with the intent of the program with respect to pedestrian and vehicular circulation. They show varying degrees of recognition of the realities of the social and site context. The program goal at the Rindge Ave. edge was to make the entrance less constricted than the existing (Figure 37) and to locate the health center along Rindge Ave. to encourage its use by the larger community. All four schemes sited the health center at the northeast corner along Rindge Ave. (see Figures 39-42). The HAR scheme reused the existing wood frame building. The BAT/COM and GBC plans, by removing the small walk-up
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building and the wood frame structure at the northeast corner of the site, were able to align the J.P. entrance to Jackson St., to make the entrance less constricted and as a gesture to connection with the neighborhood and existing street pattern. This effort went mostly unappreciated by the tenants that I spoke with, given the historical and social division between J.P. and the adjacent neighborhood and unlikelihood of diminishing this division by site planning strategies. Both schemes removed part of the long building at the east edge of the site to broaden the main entrance. The demolition of buildings and parts of buildings to broaden the opening and make the community connection had mixed reviews.

I don't really think it will ever connect with the community as far as I can see it, but it would make it easier for the people because it's kind of a little bottleneck there.

I can't understand why they want to tear down the building and build a building on the other side. They say supposedly they want to have the street on the same side as Jackson St. Is that an architect's dream to have the streets line up?

The HAR proposal, by demolition of part of the building adjacent to the original section, broadened the existing but now unused entrance between the extension and the original site, abandoning the existing main entrance. The L/F proposal maintained the existing entrance, with a secondary vehicular exit between the extension and the original section and removed only part of the long building at the east edge. The L/F strategy for making the connection to the community, instead of reaching out across to the community, was able to bring pieces of that community into Jefferson Park. They proposed moving two of the wood frame buildings on Rindge Ave. into J.P., reused as part of
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the community center "to recall the scale and character of the North Cambridge neighborhood." Tenants were more puzzled than impressed by this strategy.

The systems of vehicular circulation within the site show the markedly different approaches of the four proposals. The program called for a visually and physically clear path of travel which may, in fact, be inconsistent with another program directive, the avoidance of long straight "speedways." What the program implies is a discontinuous system of circulation. The circulation in the GBC proposal is nearly identical with the existing, with a single drive along the east edge and a continuous loop outside the courtyard with small areas of parking along the street edge. The HAR scheme gives the clearest but still discontinuous system of circulation of all four proposals. By broadening the entrance between the extension and the original site, the circulation of the "front" and "back" parts were unified into one clear system and some of the separation of the two by roadway was eliminated. Unfortunately, the clear unification in this case depends on using the public spaces within the front part as roadway and parking, a very unpopular move with the tenants of that part. The entire central area of the courtyard in this scheme was used as roadway and parking. The L/F scheme has the most continuous circulation of all four schemes, with a main vehicular drive on the east edge connected through the courtyard and at two other cross drives to an exit roadway along the east edge of the original site, with parking on most street edges. This scheme clearly contradicts the program intent to reduce dangerous through circulation, of particular concern to tenants. The parallel roads with connecting side streets made it look to some "like a maze." The BAT/COM scheme with a dead ended main drive on the east edge has side streets leading into a courtyard parking area and to dead ended parking
streets at the south and southeast edges of the front part. The discontinuity of the circulation ultimately resulted in some loss of clarity. "It's like a maze."

All schemes that had parking in the courtyard met with unanimous disapproval by tenants that I spoke with. This was particularly so for the L/F scheme with its through circulation, because of the conflict of cars and kids.

I never could see parking in the courtyard. Kids are kids, they're little kids and they know this is like their backyard. They're not going to be watching. I think it's dangerous.

I'm still thinking of kids and where would they play if you parked all these cars in here. I don't like cars in there. It's more convenient but I just don't like it.

The BAT/COM and HAR schemes by the location of new community facilities in the existing main parking location have essentially moved the large parking area from its current location to the inside of the courtyard.

Most of the schemes, with respect to their description of the main pedestrian circulation, seem to have forgotten the program caution to "offer a realistic shortest distance path, rather than a hoped for design. Tenants seem to have a clear understanding of the way people travel.

They're going to go whichever way is easiest. As the program stated:

The walks should focus toward the new site entry on Rindge Avenue; the proposed pedestrian railroad crossing bridge; the community facilities; and Russell Field, north of Rindge Ave.

The desire to make a clear, direct route of pedestrian travel from Rindge Ave. through the site to proposed bridge location led two of the proposals, the BAT/COM and L/F schemes to describe the north/south path they have defined
along the edge of the original site through the courtyard as the major pedestrian circulation (Figure 38). This path, at least from Rindge Ave. to the courtyard, will probably be the least used pedestrian route rather than the most used. Pedestrian routes should connect places where people are to places they want to go to. Designers don't decide what are the major pedestrian routes, pedestrians do. The obvious and most traveled existing routes enter and exit the site from the east and west corners along Rindge Ave. and at the southwest corner. The route at the northeast corner is the main route to the public school, the northwest corner leads to the neighborhood store and in the near future to the subway, and the southwest corner to the shopping center.

In both the BAT/COM and L/F schemes the central pedestrian route is projected as being an important connector for neighborhood pedestrian traffic collected from Clifton St. and Jackson St. going to the city park and shopping center. In all likelihood the constant flood of pedestrians from the neighborhood that the emphasis on this route implies will probably be only an occasional trickle. There are a number of reasons why this will likely be so. The new park will not likely be a significant draw to the neighborhood, particularly if the scope of the facilities there is reduced, since there exists a park just to the west of the neighborhood. Since Rindge Towers opened, the shortest, most traveled route by the neighborhood to the shopping center is through there. Even the bridge at J.P., the future of which is uncertain, will probably not entice the pedestrians to take the route that is significantly longer.

The HAR scheme proposed a system of pedestrian circulation that diagrammatically is more compatible with pedestrian priorities within and through the site. The paths lead from the corners of the site drawing people
primarily to a path through the courtyard to a bridge at the southwest corner, the priority being seen as the connection to the shopping center. The scheme removes the small walk-up building at the northeast corner of the site to reinforce this direction of travel and to create a public space along Rindge Ave. associated with the entry and the intersection with Jackson St. Similarly, the scheme proposes the removal of a portion of the southwest courtyard building to reinforce the direction of the path to the southwest corner. The removal of parts of buildings to reinforced pedestrian paths is a very curious priority. A secondary path along the west edge outside the courtyard connects the front part to the bridge.

In spite of the diagrammatic approach that may be more compatible with the reality of how people do move and will move through the site, there are some considerable problems. The hierarchy of the paths is unclear and the clarity of the curvilinear paths is further undermined by their discontinuity. The intersection and interruption of the main pedestrian circulation by the main vehicular access along the curved entry drive creates a conflict between pedestrian needs and safety and vehicular needs. One of the more important paths along the east edge is underemphasized to the point that the west side of the main road to the east abuts the backyard fences of the courtyard without an intervening sidewalk. The overall image of the site plan is decidedly non-urban.

It looks like Harvard Yard.

It looks out of place.

The major paths are edged by or pass through areas of unprotected lawn and planting. The conflict between the most traveled and public areas and the most vulnerable surfaces is apparent in this scheme as well as in the GBC scheme.
The GBC scheme displays the understanding of some of the major and obvious internal paths in J.P. by the criss-crossing of two important routes in a communal space in the existing parking lot. The hierarchy of the routes is otherwise unclear. The pedestrian circulation is very disjointed and discontinuous, most paths seeming to respond to a very localized need or condition. There is little demonstration of a concept for overall pedestrian circulation.

The four schemes show considerable divergence in the intended hierarchy of public and private spaces, uses, and boundaries both in overall site organization and at the building edges. The treatment at the Rindge Ave. edge varies greatly from one scheme to another. All four schemes placed the health center at the northeast corner on Rindge Ave., complying with the program directive to make it more accessible to the neighborhood. Otherwise the schemes diverge in the attitude to vitalizing this edge. The GBC plan gives the edge a fairly neutral treatment, with a small landscaped area of leftover space separating the street from a parking area. This approach misses the opportunity to enliven the most public edge, the only edge that J.P. shares with the neighborhood. All activity at this edge is focused in the health care/day care facility at the corner of the site. The HAR scheme creates a small formal public space at Rindge Ave. that is the terminus of two of the main pedestrian routes. This space provides a spatial joint between the vehicular site circulation and the neighborhood circulation, without creating a direct connection between the two. The L/F proposal shows some significant conflict of public and private use and space at this edge. By retaining the small walk-up building at Rindge Ave. and ringing it with roadway, the scheme creates a conflict with the main vehicular and proposed pedestrian routes with the private and semi-private uses at the
building edge. The proposed pedestrian "gateway" with the bus stop and path at the back of the building is in clear conflict with the private use of the backyard spaces of the building. The BAT/COM scheme reinforces its pedestrian and vehicular routes and the public nature of the edge by proposing new public facilities, day care and health care, that form a gateway to the vehicular site access. The active play space of the day care building enlivens the street edge and reinforces the activity and use of the proposed main pedestrian circulation. Although the play space does a great deal to vitalize the street edge and public zone, the traffic noise and activity of the edge may be incompatible with the use of the play space.

There was considerable uniformity in the location of public facilities and functions within the site. The majority of all eight schemes located the main community facilities in the existing parking area, both because of its central location within the site and between the two parts of J.P. and because it satisfies the program within the large open space. Three of the four schemes located the management, tenant services and community space in this area, and two, the day care space as well. The siting of the HAR community facility establishes it as the main focus of the curvilinear entry drive. The otherwise problematic intersection of pedestrian and vehicular circulation in this area does reinforce the focus of the most public routes on the most public functions. The tenant oriented functions are along the main path through the courtyard and management functions along the main drive. The attitude toward the activity space of the day care center was to protect it in a very closed, private space at the back of the community center. This is in contrast to the other schemes that used the play space to reinforce the activity of public areas.

The siting of the community facility in the BAT/COM
The GBC strategy is a departure from all other
proposals. Very generally, the plan attempts to turn the courtyard inside out, maintaining an outside perimeter drive, with front entries oriented to this drive, with private activities and spaces focused to the inside of the courtyard, free of parking or roadways. Most tenants that I spoke with preferred this general concept, for the ease of identification of entries and for safety and privacy, to the ones which had cars in the courtyard.

People know where you live.

The front door should be out on the street.

You'd rather the back yards inside, where you'd have more privacy.

However, there are several inherent difficulties in the GBC approach. The general concept of the GBC scheme with respect to the courtyard is severely diffused in the actual execution of the proposal. Rather than prescribing a clear public/outside edge and a private/inside edge, the distinction between the two is very unclear. More than half of the private yards are on the outside edge, and one third of the front entries are on the inside edge (see Figure 43). The association of the semi-private building space is primarily with the private back yards. Although in contradiction with the program intent of association of the building space with front entries, this seems a more compatible arrangement than private yards adjacent to a public street edge.

The relationship of apartments, entries and yards to the building space is very disorganized, unclear, and non-uniform. Some entries are at grade, some of those are rear entries and some are front entries. Some entries are one level above grade, some of those are rear entries and some are front entries. Some of the private yards are associated with ground level apartments entering at grade. Some of the yards are associated with the grade level rear
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entries of upper level apartments. Some of the yards are for upper apartments, associated with rear entries one level above grade. In other words, nearly every apartment has a different relationship to this space which would likely lead to conflicts and confusion of appropriate use of the space. The building space diffuses into a central communal space without a clear, strongly defined boundary between the two as prescribed in the program.

The GBC proposal recognizes the need for significant play space for the considerable child population of the courtyard. However the use of the central area of the courtyard as "passive communal space" contradicts the program prohibition against any large scale, large group activity space. The central area of the courtyard has always been a problem, even in the early days to some extent. In spite of this, many tenants prefer the use of the central area as play space.

The GBC plan provides for a passive communal space in the existing parking lot. The location of this space in the area that is the focus of teenage night-time activity provides a space for teenage hanging-out. However, the teens tend to gather in small separate groups at the fringes of public space. The provision of one space in the middle of the public area might be too collective and too public for the teens to restrict themselves to this space. The program did allow for small areas where teens might hang out. However, the approach of the program in most respects was to eliminate places where teens might congregate, rather than dealing more directly with their presence, their lack of activity, and lack of acceptable places for them to gather.

The L/F scheme shows a dramatically contrasting approach to the GBC scheme with respect to the hierarchy of space and circulation of the courtyard. The scheme proposes continuous vehicular circulation through the
The front entries of the northwest courtyard building are oriented to the streets outside the courtyard. There are small shared yards associated with these entries, with parking along the street edge. The geometry of the building precludes compliance with the program directive of having entries lead through a semi-private transition space. The priority expressed in this scheme is that of clearly defining public and private zones, avoiding the conflict of very public areas adjacent to very private ones. The "back" of the building inside the courtyard has a small collective space in the building corner. There are back yards for only a small number of units, adjacent to the collective building space. The back yards are separated from a small communal sitting and winter skating area in the center of the courtyard by landscaping, berms, and privacy walls.

The front entries of nearly all other courtyard units are oriented to the through street. There is a clear hierarchy of use, space, and circulation from the street edge to the building edge. A public sidewalk connects the street edge parking by feeder paths through a landscaped zone to a secondary pedestrian path. This secondary path along the shared front yards leads to most unit entries, and connects two of the corner building areas. The hierarchy of public/semi-private/private space along this path is not clearly defined. The intended collective building spaces in the corners are very small and have a clear association only with the grade level entries in the corners (see Figure 45). The association of all other entries to these spaces is very tenuous. Two thirds of all entries in each building are at grade and the others are a half level above grade. Some are shared entries, the others are individual. The scheme contradicts the program intent of having all entries lead through a semi-private transition space intended for collective use. It does, however,
provide a margin of small scale space associated with the unit entries more compatible with the tenants' priorities at the building edge. This also limits the conflicts of privacy between public areas and basement living space. In general this scheme was little appreciated by most tenants I spoke with because of the through circulation.

These are stupid things, they have tot lots here and they have people driving through. They're going to kill the kids. People don't drive slow.

One person, though, appreciated the perceived change of organizational image.

It looks like a neighborhood. It's not a courtyard anymore.

This scheme with its direct association of entries and street would have been well suited to an individual trash disposal system, the implicit program desire. However, the scheme proposes the use of a collective trash compactor in each building.

Overall this proposal goes further in allocating all peripheral site areas to private uses than the other three schemes. However, this allocation is far from uniformly equitable. Some units get very large individual back yards. Some yards are shared by up to three units. Contrary to the program goal of a private yard for every unit, some units in some buildings have no yard. The building adjacent to the community center has no private yards at all.

The HAR proposal employs a concept similar to that of a number of other schemes. This scheme proposes the use of a cul-de-sac roadway in the courtyard, with a central landscaped area. Parking is at the sidewalk edge. The relationship of building edge to the roadway is primarily one of direct association of unit front entry to the street edge, with an intervening zone of front yards (see Figure 44). All unit entries are a half level above grade, giving
a uniform relationship of entries to the street edge. The stoops are in some cases shared by two entries and are individual in others.

The collective building space in this scheme is quite minimal. In most cases it is more a part of the parking lot than part of the building territory, not complying with the program intent for this space. Nor does this satisfy the tendency of tenants to collectively relate to a public space directly associated with groups of units. Play space, even for very small children, is nearly absent throughout this scheme, with only a small tot lot near the community center. If the landscaped area in the center of the courtyard parking lot is intended as play space, it is certainly an inappropriate location for kid's play.

The scheme was not very successful in meeting the program intent of providing private yard space for all units, including upper units. In each of the courtyard buildings, three of the seven upper units have very small yards at the front of the building, one has a yard at the back of the building. All other individual yards at the back of the building are for lower units. Individual trash can storage is both at the sidewalk edge of the front yards and under the stoops.

The placement of the community building in this scheme, adjacent to the back yards on the north outer edge of the courtyard, avoids some of the conflict between private yard and public edge. However, the east and southeast edges of the courtyard back yards have a very curious clash of public and private, with a five-foot-high wooden privacy fence defining the street edge, with no intervening sidewalk. In general this scheme leaves considerable area of undefined peripheral "no-man's-land."

The BAT/COM proposal was the winner of the turnkey competition. Therefore their proposal can be compared to the other proposals and to their more developed design.
Like the HAR scheme, the BAT/COM scheme employs a cul-de-sac drive in the courtyard with a central green space, but with a considerably different relationship of street edge to the building edge. The strategy for the unit entries is remarkably similar to that of the HAR proposal, with stoops leading to unit entries, all at one half level above grade (see Figure 46). Most of the proposed stoops have side by side, separate stairs leading to individual apartment entries. Some are isolated stairs leading to individual entries and one stoop is shared by four unit entries. With all unit front doors entering the building at the first floor level, all units, whether upper or lower, have a uniform relationship to the building edge.

The BAT/COM scheme complies more to the program intent than the three other proposals with respect to the collective semi-private building space. However, as proposed, the building space is very strictly defined by the main building corner. It relates very strongly to the entries in that corner, and more tenuously to the one quarter of the building entries not in the corner. The relationship of the tot lot is to this corner building space. The units that don't relate directly to the building space have private yards on the entry edge. The private yards for all other units are at the back of the building.

The description of the collective space in the program was that of a semi-private building space, a transition space that the entries were to lead through. The program did not sufficiently incorporate the current and preceding priorities of individual and collective use at the building edge into the new organization of entries and outside space. The range of the collectivity of those uses is predominantly defined by the promixity to the entries and are not primarily defined by the association with individual
buildings as the program implies. Of the issues relating to this space that were not directly addressed, a primary one is that of the appropriate size of the space as evidenced by the great variability of size and deployment of this space in the different schemes. Although the BAT/COM scheme provides more space to this collective area than any of the other schemes, in the view of one tenant it doesn't provide enough space.

I think the picture is a little deceiving because it looks like there's much more room there than there actually is. (Figure 35)

One difficulty in having a collective space close to the building edge without an intervening margin of individual space is that of privacy for basement living areas. This problem becomes more aggravated when the basement windows are tucked between entry stoops, particularly where trash can storage is under those entry stoops, as in much of the BAT/COM scheme.

As proposed, access to the entries directly associated with the corner building space is controlled at two points on either side of the tot lot. Access to the other entries filters off the sidewalk parking edge. Other than the play spaces provided for in association with the building spaces, the only other collective play space for the courtyard is a green space in the center of the parking area, not very appropriate for kids' play. As pointed out a number of times, the strategy for dealing with the problematic central area of the courtyard of turning it into a parking area, met with much tenant disapproval.

It's kind of like ignoring the problem or making it a little, "we dealt with it, you see, that space is no longer there so we dealt with it."

This comment could apply to the majority of the proposals that treated the courtyard in a similar way.
As proposed all units have private yards, mainly at the back of the building. On the west edge of the courtyard is a service drive for trash collection and maintenance. This drive maintains what the program tried to eliminate, peripheral "no-man's-land."

The finalized design for collective building space is different than that in the proposal in some significant aspects. The finalized design places all private yards at the back of the building, eliminating them from the entry edge. The service drive is eliminated along the west edge, increasing the size of some back yards and providing some peripheral space that can be used as play space (see Figure 47). The definition of the edge of the collective spaces associated with individual buildings is made very distinct by fencing in the area (Figure 48). The gross area within this boundary is significantly larger than that of the proposal. Of this area there is about 500 square feet of common space. This space is directly associated with the entries at the corner and has only a very tenuous relationship with the other entries, which lead to the four largest units in the building. The fenced tot lot of about 500 square feet has controlled access from the adjacent collective space. The tot lot includes only a small wooden play structure and slide. The tot lot has a curious surface treatment of sod and asphalt, neither one of which seems appropriate to a tot lot, all other space is planted area or circulation space connecting the stoops. The side by side stairs of the proposal, serving individual entries, are consolidated into a single shared stair. The access to the entire building space is through one gate, opposite the tot lot, at the parking lot edge. The strictly limited access, although restricting casual intrusion by outsiders, makes for awkward circulation to the entries. It creates inconvenience in moving trash cans to the street, in those
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instances where they are stored under the stoops.

By eliminating the individual yards from the entry edge, the finalized scheme goes further than the proposal in establishing the distinct hierarchy of spaces at the opposite building edges. With respect to the buildings, the hierarchy of public and semi-private space at the front entry edge and individual, private space at the rear entry edge is very clear. However, with respect to the location of those buildings in the site, that hierarchy becomes significantly diluted. On the north and east exterior edges of the courtyard the private yards abut very public streets and spaces, not a very desirable organization in the view of most tenants that I spoke with.

Who would want their private back yard out there?

The proximity of these building edges to the main routes of pedestrian circulation gives those edges an image more public than the interior courtyard edges.

They should have the front door on the outside. I would think that all the private back yards would be in the court.

The lack of clarity of hierarchy and the clash of public and private uses will likely show effects on one side of the building or the other. The yards may be underused or undermaintained because people may feel uncomfortable or inhibited from using them by their proximity to public space. This is particularly likely where those yards belong to upper units, where the connection to the yard is tenuous. However, people tend to associate more directly with the space adjacent to their primary entry door. Since the intended rear entries are closer to the main routes of circulation and access to the front entries through the building space is strictly limited, the rear entries may become the primary entries. The vitality,
maintenance of and association with the collective building space may be diluted as a result.

The issues and strategies for public and private space and circulation pertaining to the courtyard apply to the other walk-up buildings in each proposal, to varying degrees. One building that represents a special set of concerns and priorities is the midrise. The strategy for the mix of walk-up and elevator-accessed units was largely pre-determined by the program. All schemes used either the first and ground floor or the first and second floor for family walk-up duplexes and/or flats, most with private yards at the back of the building. The use of the lower floors for family walk-up units was allowed only if the desired mix of family units could not be accommodated in the lowrise structures. The total number of proposed units in the four schemes is around 50 to 55. Three schemes have eight walk-up units and one has five. The remainder of the units are one and two-bedroom elevator-accessed units. Only nine or ten of those in each scheme are two-bedroom units. The CHA program for this building did not efficiently account for the available building space, since the existing six-decker has 60 units, mostly family units. As a result the one-bedroom units in all schemes have living areas as large or larger than those in the three-bedroom walk-ups of the lowrise buildings.

Although the strategies for unit mixing in the midrise are comparable in the four schemes, the strategies for access and circulation within the elevator portions of the building are significantly different. Neither the L/F scheme nor the HAR scheme deviate from the existing organization of access and circulation. Both maintain the existing elevator lobby entrances and core circulation to the units. The attempt to bring natural light into the elevator lobbies of the upper floors is minimal. The GBC scheme creates a new main lobby addition at the center of
the street edge of the building. The scheme maintains the existing elevator cores but connects them by a gallery corridor on the west edge of the building for access to the units on the upper floors. The BAT/COM scheme uses a similar strategy, with a new lobby addition at the center of the street edge, with gallery corridor access to the units on the upper floors. The BAT/COM scheme, however, abandoned the existing elevator cores, creating a new core near the center of the gallery corridor. The provision of a glazed elevator lobby, extending the full height of the building provides a highly visible, safe waiting area at the elevators. This strategy was unanimously endorsed by all tenants that I spoke with.

I think that's better because the elevators would be in a central area so you wouldn't be afraid to use them.

The basic organization of units within the walk-up units was largely pre-determined by the program. The CHA "strongly recommended" the use of duplex apartments in combination with the basement space that is one half level below grade, to increase unit sizes over the existing and to reduce the number of units on a common hall. This is the predominant organization of the buildings in these four schemes, with some differences in unit distribution, unit access, and relationships of zones within units to those in adjacent units. Of the 200 existing units there are 21 four-bedroom, 110 three-bedroom, 53 two-bedroom and 16 one-bedroom units. The program prescribed a range in the mix of unit sizes, the total to approach 175 units. The range allowed for 18 to 21 four-bedroom units, 89 to 100 three-bedroom, 33 to 36 two-bedroom, and 19 to 35 one-bedroom units. The largest proportional changes are in the one- and two-bedroom units. All of the one-bedroom and no more than ten of the two-bedroom units were to be elevator-accessed. All others were to be walk-ups.
The existing buildings in the extension are organized into modules that are repeated throughout all of the walk-up buildings. One module is made up of six three-bedroom flats. The other module is made up of three two-bedroom flats and three four-bedroom flats. The three-bedroom module outnumbers the other by two to one. The four courtyard buildings and the similar one at the southeast corner of the site are made up of two three-bedroom modules and one four- and two-bedroom module. The four schemes generally used a similar strategy, creating new modules within the envelope of the existing modules. They are deployed with varying degrees of deviation from those modules to respond to localized conditions and to meet the prescribed unit mix limits of the program.

In the GBC plan, the existing three-bedroom module is transformed into two pairs of stacked three-bedroom duplexes separated by a pair of stacked two-bedroom duplexes. All of these have individual front entries, but with two upper duplexes sharing a rear entry. The other module is made up of a pair of stacked four-bedroom duplexes and a four-bedroom duplex over two three-bedroom flats. Two units in this module share a front entry. What is very curious in these modules is that all of the lower duplexes and the two flats have but one means of egress. This clearly contradicts the specific directive of the program and the state building code as well.

The strategy in the stacked duplex modules of all schemes is to isolate the sleeping areas on the third and ground floors, separated by the living areas. In all modules in all schemes that do not adhere to a strict stacked duplex model, there is some conflict of overlap or adjacency of sleeping and living areas of different units. The five existing buildings of the courtyard type each have 18 units. The GBC and the BAT/COM proposals each have 16 units in this building type, the HAR and L/P
schemes each have 17 units.

The HAR proposal is less uniform than the other schemes in its employment of a modular strategy, developing two separate modules for the existing three-bedroom module. One of these modules contains a three-bedroom handicapped unit on the ground floor, two four-bedroom triplexes; one three-bedroom triplex; and one three-bedroom duplex. The jigsaw puzzle arrangement of units makes for long, jogged acoustic separation walls between units. There is some undesirable overlap of common and sleeping zones of different units. The other existing three-bedroom module and the four- and two-bedroom module are divided more simply into six stacked duplexes each, five three-bedroom duplexes and one two-bedroom lower duplex. All units have individual front entries. Two pairs of adjacent upper duplexes have shared exterior rear stairs.

The L/F scheme divides the existing three-bedroom module into five three-bedroom duplexes and one lower two-bedroom duplex. Two units have shared front entries and two, shared rear entries. The other module is divided into two four-bedroom duplexes, one three-bedroom duplex, and one two-bedroom flat. The two-bedroom duplex is on the first and second floors with portions of the two four-bedroom duplexes above and below it. Three units share one front entry, and two share a rear entry.

The BAT/C0M scheme has the clearest organization of units within the modules. The existing three-bedroom module is divided into six three-bedroom stacked duplexes. All units have individual front entries and two upper duplexes share a rear entry. The other module is divided into one four-bedroom handicapped flat on the ground floor with three four-bedroom triplexes above, with the inherent conflict that the sleeping areas of the flat are below the living areas of the triplexes. All units have individual front and rear entries. The straight, minimal length unit
separation walls that align from floor to floor minimize acoustic conflicts between units. This also eliminates vertical overlap of different units that is a problem to varying degrees in all other schemes.

Although a few tenants that I spoke with like the idea of duplexes and triplexes, the predominant unit organization in all schemes, most did not.

I don't like upstairs and downstairs anyway.

I wouldn't like three floors.

Most of the disapproval was for the reasons of more difficult housekeeping and child supervision. The multiple floor dwellings may be appropriate for families with older children and teens, who tend to use their rooms more than the common spaces. The separation on different floors of the bedrooms and common spaces may in these instances be advantageous. Multiple floors are less appropriate for families with young children who need closer supervision. Those children will continue to use the living room as the primary play space within the apartment as they do now in the existing flats. The use of the living room as play space may even be increased. In the existing flats, there is at least voice and sound contact between the common spaces and the bedrooms where some children may be playing. In duplexes and triplexes, voice and sound contact between common and bedroom areas are greatly reduced.

Beyond the basic model prescribed in the program, the organization of common spaces, entries, bedroom spaces and utilitarian functions show significant variability in the four schemes. The program provided little direction for priorities in the organization of units. As an illustration of the different approaches to unit organization, presented here are the plans for upper level three-bedroom duplexes as presented in the four proposals (Figures 49-52).
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The GBC proposal does not present a clear conceptual strategy for the organization of the units. The organization of units is different in each of the unit sizes and different within units of the same size. Although most units have eat-in kitchens, some have completely separate dining rooms, some dining rooms are continuous with the living rooms. Some units have laundry rooms on the main floor, some on the bedroom level. Some units have kitchens overlooking the private yard, others have the living room overlooking the private yard.

In private housing, where prospective tenants have more opportunity to select an apartment that is suited to their needs, providing a range of unit arrangements in a development might be beneficial. In public housing, however, tenants are assigned to available apartments based on family size, with little opportunity to select a unit that suits their specific needs. The provision for some flexibility or alterability in unit arrangement is an issue ignored in the program and therefore absent from the proposals. It therefore seems crucial to develop specific priorities for the arrangement of units that can accommodate the needs and desires of the most tenants.

The GBC three-bedroom duplex presented here has an eat-in kitchen, an arrangement more desired by tenants. However, it is only marginally larger than the existing kitchens in the three-bedroom units both in the extension and the original section, which are all perceived as inconveniently small. The living room is 50 percent larger than the ones in the existing units. However, its continuity with the circulation space and the arrangement relative to existing windows provide few easily furnishable corners. The diffusion of space between the two common areas, separated only by circulation space, is similar to that in the existing extension units. As noted, continuity between the spaces is more often a disruption than an asset. The
desire for a controllable connection between the common spaces was prevalent among tenants.

The variable location of laundry rooms in different units does not represent a clear notion for the best location of this service facility. In this three-bedroom duplex the laundry room is on the main floor. The minority opinion among tenants was that the laundry room should be on the main floor, close to the kitchen.

The laundry room should be near the kitchen because a woman spends the majority of her day in the kitchen. Everything she does is out of that kitchen and it doesn't make sense to have to run down stairs to have to do the laundry.

However, most tenants thought that the laundry room should be on the bedroom level, since that is where dirty laundry accumulates and where clean laundry is put away.

With the laundry room on the sleeping floor, you'd take the clothes in the room and fold them and put them right away. And you don't have the noise from the washer and dryer.

This three-bedroom duplex is one quarter to one third larger than existing three-bedroom apartments. However, the rooms, with the exception of the living room, are not significantly larger than those in the existing apartments. Most of the increase is in circulation space and in the provision of facilities not contained in existing apartments: a laundry room, storage room, and an extra half bath for three-bedroom apartments. The bedrooms are insignificantly larger than existing ones, with limited opportunity for variety of furniture arrangements. As represented, the plan consistently shows arrangements where beds are in front of windows, not a very desirable arrangement. In general, conflicts between bedroom arrangements and window locations are less severe in basement sleeping areas, where
the windows are well above the floor height.

In spite of the convoluted manner in which the units are deployed in the HAR proposal, the scheme is relatively successful in establishing a clear organization of functions within the common spaces. Nearly all units have a kitchen continuous with a generous dining area. In most cases there is clear establishment of two separate common zones within the living floor. In the cases where the kitchen/dining areas are adjacent to the living room, their connection is small and easily controlled, providing a degree of continuity/separation compatible with most tenants' needs.

In the three-bedroom unit represented here, the living room and kitchen/dining area are probably more separate than they need be. Although only about 25 percent larger than the living rooms in existing three-bedroom units, the living room provides a maximum of uninterrupted furnishable area. Overall, there is no clear notion for the appropriate location of laundry facilities. In half the units, it's on the main floor, in the other half on the bedroom level. The bedrooms in this three-bedroom duplex, which are insignificantly larger than those in the existing units, offer no flexibility in room arrangement. Arrangements with beds and furnishings in front of windows predominate. In many of the units in this scheme, too much of the space increase over the existing is devoted to circulation space.

The unit organization of the L/F scheme is constrained by the reuse of the existing interior stairs and plumbing chases. Because of this some of the three-bedroom duplexes have two full baths and some have one. Although the program prescribed that three-bedroom units have at least one and a half baths, very few units have one and a half baths. In most units the organization of the common spaces has a kitchen with adjacent dining area well separated from the
living room. In many units, the living room and the dining area have a common wall that, had the program specified, would have easily allowed for a controllable visual connection between the common spaces compatible with tenants' desires. The unit shown here is not one of those units. In this apartment the living room and kitchen/dining area are separated by the circulation and are visually separated. There is a conflict in the tight circulation through the dining room to the kitchen. Many of the living rooms for apartments of all sizes are very generous, although the furnishability in many is constrained by conflicts with circulation and windows. The living room here is one of the smallest, not much bigger than those in existing units and considerably smaller than even that of the two-bedroom duplex in the same module. It has some of the furnishability conflicts common in most schemes, limited uninterrupted wall space. Although the bedrooms are larger than existing ones, the awkward organization of space, circulation, windows, and closets greatly restrains the arrangement of furnishings in the rooms. The location of the bathrooms in this scheme is very curious, with the full bath and half bath directly opposite each other. The half bath has a minimum accommodation for laundry facilities.

There is some divergence between what the designers and tenants feel is the best location of the bathrooms. The program prescribed that four-bedroom units have two baths; three-bedroom units, one and a half baths; and two-bedroom units, one bath. In all schemes three-bedroom duplexes generally have a half bath on the main floor and a full bath on the bedroom level. Two-bedroom duplexes generally have a full bath on the bedroom level. Four-bedroom triplexes, where they exist, generally have a bathroom on each of the bedroom levels. Many tenants seem to prefer to have a bathroom on the main floor, even if excluding a bathroom from the bedroom level. This is
particularly so for families with young children.

It's better to have the bathroom where the living spaces are. You use it more during the day, with the kids running in and out. Some pointed out the special needs of pregnant women, mothers with infants, and children being toilet trained, that would make bathroom location on the main floor a priority.

The BAT/COM scheme has the clearest, most consistent organization of units within the buildings of all four schemes. This enables a clear and consistent organization within units. As proposed, the organization of the common spaces in most units conforms to the arrangement implied as appropriate in the program, that of a dining area as part of the living room, screened from the kitchen. As proposed, the organization of all walk-up units except the upper three-bedroom duplexes was based on this model. The proposed upper three-bedroom duplex has an organization more consistent with tenants' needs, that of kitchen and adjacent dining area separated from the large living room. In the lower three-bedroom duplex, the area corresponding to the dining area of the upper duplex is used as the entry areas for both units. In the lower duplex, therefore, the dining area is an undifferentiated part of the living room, decreasing the size of the otherwise generous living room. Although the proposed kitchens provide space for a small table, it is insufficient to serve as the primary dining area.

They're more or less saying that you can only have a certain size table if you want to eat in the kitchen and it's got to be almost in the middle of the floor.

The living room suffers from a problem common to those in other proposals, limited uninterrupted wall space for ease and variability of furniture arrangement. The use of
the winder stair in the scheme minimizes the amount of circulation space in the unit, on both floors. As proposed, the laundry room is on the bedroom level of all units except the four-bedroom triplex. The bedrooms in all of the three-bedroom duplexes are relatively small, allowing only very static furniture arrangements, often conflicting with window locations.

In this proposal there are great inequities in the allocation of space to different size units, due mainly to the module strategy used. Dividing the existing four and two-bedroom module into three four-bedroom triplexes and one four-bedroom handicapped flat produces units from 1500 to 1700 square feet. Dividing the existing three-bedroom module into six three-bedroom duplexes produces units of about 1000 square feet. Dividing that same module into six two-bedroom duplexes, as this plan does, produces units of about 1000 square feet. With the elimination of the half bath from the main level and one room from the bedroom level, all rooms and spaces in the two-bedroom duplexes are considerably larger than those in the three-bedroom duplexes. In the most extreme cases the three-bedroom units could have six occupants or more and the two-bedroom units only two. (At the other extreme, however, the two-bedroom units may have four occupants and the three-bedroom only three). This inequity is not pervasive since there are five times as many three-bedroom as two-bedroom units in the walk-ups.

Generosity in the provision of space to the four-bedroom units is justifiable since these units house the largest families, often with more than two children per bedroom. The gap between the size of the three-bedroom and four-bedroom units produces a more problematic inequity. The four- and three-bedroom units may well house families of the same size, since units are assigned based on double occupancy of the bedrooms except for children of different
sex over the age of six. A family with three boys and a girl might be assigned a four-bedroom unit and one with four boys a three-bedroom unit. The three-bedroom units outnumber the four-bedroom units by four to one. Any family that outgrows the prescribed occupancy limit in a three-bedroom unit must wait for a vacancy in the limited number of four bedroom units to open. In the past, many of the three-bedroom units became dramatically overcrowded for this reason. This problem may be less critical now than in the past, with the general reduction in family size. However, the large discrepancy in size between the four and three-bedroom units, and the similarity between the three and two-bedroom units seems unjustifiable and unfortunate. The MHFA minima, which the program offered as a guide for unit sizes, are 800 square feet for two-bedroom units, 1200 for three-bedroom units, and 1400 for four-bedroom units. The minimum for three-bedroom units is much closer to that of four-bedroom than two-bedroom units.

The unit plans underwent a number of modifications through the working drawing phase. It wasn't until well into the working drawing phase that the tenants on the Steering Committee focused their objections on the living/dining organization of the BAT/COM scheme. A subsequent reworking of the plans separated the living and dining areas in the two- and four-bedroom units. The three-bedroom lower duplexes remained unchanged due to the limited space available for reorganization. Later, the winder stair of the three-bedroom duplexes was eliminated for structural reasons, requiring complete reorganization of the units (Figure 53). This reorganization allowed for separation of the living and dining areas in the lower three-bedroom duplexes. The dining area was relocated in a loosely defined space adjacent to the entry door and kitchen, with awkward circulation through the work area of the kitchen. The originally well-defined kitchen/dining area of the
upper duplex followed the loose pattern of the lower duplex. The use of a straight run stair generally increased the proportion of circulation in the already space-stingy three-bedroom duplexes, particularly the lower ones. Some of the Steering Committee tenants who already felt their involvement in the process to be limited and perfunctory, felt less control in the general process of design adjustment.

I'm no architect, I'm no designer. But I can tell you what I would like. Then they agree, but then the next meeting they say, "Well, we had to change this."

You always feel as though they're gypping you.

The wide divergence in the redevelopment proposals in both meeting the goals of the program and adequately addressing tenants' priorities demonstrates some significant failures of the process. The most important of these failures is the manner in which tenants were involved in the process. The process was not designed to take the most advantage of their experience or to represent the diversity of their concerns. The GBC scheme in its general concept received the most positive response from the tenants that I spoke with. However, those elements that people responded to favorably were in direct contradiction to the dictates of the program. The other three schemes were considerably more successful in meeting the program than the GBC proposal. However, all had elements of site and/or unit organization that contradicted tenants' priorities.

The other main failure of the process was in not
establishing a clear hierarchy of the program goals. The BAT/COM proposal was the most successful in complying with the program intent, except for the expansion of size of many of the units and lack of clarity in the hierarchy of some building edges. The other three schemes in large part established their own priorities based on the program goals. The GBC and the L/F schemes focused on establishing a clear relationship between the main street edges and the entries, with a private zone at the back of the building. The L/F scheme was substantially more successful at achieving this end than the GBC scheme. However, the success of both schemes depended on maintaining, and in the L/F scheme, considerably increasing, the through circulation that the program attempted to avoid. The priority expressed in the HAR scheme was that of a substantial change of image both in the buildings and the site. The "too suburban" nature of this change and the investment of resources in making this change was considered inappropriate by tenants and the CHA.

The relationship of designer and developer specific to the turnkey process had a significant impact on some strategies in the proposals. The developer of the GBC scheme admonished that, "It still looks too much like a public housing project," even with the pitched roofs, and encouraged further "suburbanization" of the image. The image in the HAR scheme was one encouraged by the developer who had had success with the image in other housing contexts. The developer also dictated a decrease in the materials standards prescribed in the program, another element in its rejection by the CHA. The L/F developer dictated the maintenance of the existing interior stairways, kitchen and bathroom chases and bathroom fixtures. This made for convoluted unit plans, units not having the prescribed bathroom facilities, and units with shared
entries. Retaining the existing bathroom fixtures was soundly disapproved of by tenants and the CHA. The successful organization of the proposed BAT/COM three-bedroom duplexes depended a great deal on the winder stair. Late in the working drawing phase the developer dictated a change to a straight run stair for reasons of economy and structural considerations. The change greatly diluted the clear organization of the proposed units.

The process of tenant involvement and establishment of programmatic priorities are areas that the CHA had direct control over. They should have been coordinated more aggressively and directly. Difficulties arising from the architect/developer relationship are inherent in the turnkey process. These issues should have been recognized and confronted in the choice of this development strategy.
AFTERWORD

No matter how many dollars they're going to put in here, it's going to be a project just the same.

Public housing projects are dinosaurs left over from a time past when different needs and concerns prevailed. They proved to be relatively well suited to a specific controlled tenant population in specific periods of time. Most of the history of public housing, however, has been one of forced adaptation of people to outdated living environments.

I think it is very pompous of us to build for 100 years, as though we can look that far into the future to determine the kind of living that will take place then.¹

This sentiment written in 1950 is just as relevant today as it was then. The CHA, by locking itself into a set of intractable redevelopment strategies that may or may not be appropriate to current tenant populations may find that it has again produced an environment whose usefulness is short lived.

The inadequacies inherent in the process of redevelopment, process of involving the tenants and program development, as embodied in the design proposals, represent both errors of commission and omission by the CHA. Some important issues were simply ignored and the approach to some issues may have some unintended negative results. One must recognize the CHA's difficulties in what is an often untenable situation, satisfying the needs of tenants and the CHA in the framework of burdensome and often

anachronistic government regulation and ideology. However, the tenants and the CHA have different agendas, which are often incompatible. Implicit in the way that the CHA runs its operations and in the process for redevelopment is an undervaluing of tenants as a resource of precise and articulate information on the workings of their own environment. Much of the divergence of tenant and administration goals results simply from mutual ignorance of each other's untenable situations. The feeling among tenants is that the CHA, and all its staff, do not adequately understand the needs and problems that tenants have day and night, year after year. These are problems that they feel can only be fully appreciated by someone who experiences them first hand as an insider.

What they need to do is have somebody come in and take an apartment and live here and observe what goes on. But at 4:30 they're gone and all you see is the dust behind them.

This challenge is very common among tenants.

Implicit in the degree of control in decision making that the CHA maintains is the responsibility to comprehensively inform themselves and tenants of the different networks of complex issues. Gaining more clarity on the tenant perspective on issues would make their decision making process more relevant. Informing tenants in depth on the CHA perspective on issues would enable tenant involvement to be more meaningful. But to involve tenants more meaningfully is to increase their expectations for a role in decision making. Tenant management has had some significant success in some isolated instances in other housing authorities. I doubt that the CHA would be willing to empower its tenants to that degree.

The redevelopment that will soon be underway has focused tenant attention on their physical surroundings.
Ordinarily, though, those physical surroundings, which have changed relatively little in thirty years, are taken very much for granted by tenants. The tenant involvement in the program generation focused tenant reaction to changes in that environment, a difficult task for most tenants. Little comprehensive effort was made to understanding the way that tenants interact with and within their existing environment. Achieving a better understanding would have provided a more comprehensive model for the redevelopment of J.P. and would have made better use of tenants as a resource.

The nature of the physical environment has some powerfully deterministic effects on the way people interact with each other and with their environment. However, tenants' priorities do not tend to focus on issues of their physical surroundings. They are much more directly concerned with who their neighbors are, how the CHA does its job and how responsive the management and police are in providing the security that most people outside the projects take for granted. The CHA has been reluctant to deal head on with some of the toughest problems in J.P. and its other projects: no on-site security presence at the times when most needed; careless, disruptive tenants; lack of recreational and productive activities for kids of all ages and particularly for the teens. The CHA has tended to try to shift some of the responsibility for dealing with these tough problems to tenants.

All they're coming up with, all their ideas and experiments, are all at the tenants' expense. Which I don't think is fair because people that live in these places live in here because they have to.

The CHA has invested heavily in physical and architectural solutions to these problems. If they dealt solely and directly with the tough problems it would have more impact
on tenant satisfaction and the quality of their life than dealing with the physical environment alone. It is important to identify which problems can be addressed by architectural intervention and which are based in social and administrative troubles. The substantial investment of time, resources, and effort in the physical strategies has not been accompanied by a concurrent, equal investment of effort in administrative and managerial strategies.

Public housing is the largest enduring solution to the housing problems of low income people, primarily because the physical structures have endured. Public housing is treated as a catch-all strategy for housing of the poor. However, it only serves a small percentage of the poor and only works well for some of those that it reaches. The effort should be to identify those people for whom public housing works. Different housing strategies should be developed for those people for whom the current system does not work well. One existing alternative strategy is subsidized, leased private housing. In most housing authorities, this program is usually small and usually restricted to higher income tenants. The program might be expanded so that it is more available to the people for whom a highly collectively living environment is inappropriate. The expansion of the program might make it more of a stepping stone out of the projects for the many who want to leave. The projects would then again become the temporary housing solution that they were designed to be.

Although most of the tenants that I talked with, even the most cynical, are generally satisfied with living in Jefferson Park, most feel trapped. Their satisfaction is primarily derived from the economic benefits of public housing, realizing that they could not afford to live on the outside.

I would move out tomorrow if I could.
The majority of public housing tenants are not only part of a public housing system but also part of a public assistance system. Both systems, as they exist, inhibit rather than encourage upward and outward mobility and self sufficiency. The fear that the poor will receive undeserved benefits promotes systems that, in effect, penalize those self motivated people trying to make personal and economic gains.

The predominant national ideology tends to blame the poor for falling victim to circumstances that are often beyond their control. For this reason no natural policy on housing, health, or welfare of the poor has ever been firmly established. Changes in the national ideology and the systems it promotes would do more to alleviate the conditions of poverty than the piecemeal, uncoordinated efforts that have characterized the history of action on behalf of the poor. However, changes in this ideology are not likely to be forthcoming. The current national administration espouses a policy of survival of the fittest in a society where "fitness" is unevenly distributed and jealously hoarded by those who have it.
APPENDIX ON TENANTS

There exist in Jefferson Park many small networks of association of tenants. The opinions represented in this work are those of tenants in a few, often overlapping, networks of friends. These networks are ones that I had easy access to. I met some of these tenants through my involvement with one of the tenant Steering Committees. Others are friends of my family or people that I knew while growing up in Jefferson Park. There are some networks of tenants that I did not have easy access to. The special concerns of some of the more recent and minority tenants are underrepresented in this study.

I interviewed sixteen tenants. The opinions and information gained from the sixteen tenants that I extensively interviewed is the basis for much of this study. These tenants range in age from 17 to 60. Their length of tenancy ranges from two to thirty years, although only three have lived in Jefferson Park for five years or less. Most have lived there for at least ten years. Three of these people are former tenants who moved out in the early or middle seventies. All but two of these tenants are women and only one is a minority member.

The tenant opinions and evaluations of the redevelopment proposals are those of seven of the sixteen tenants. Some of these have at times been involved with the tenant Steering Committees.
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