SUBURBAN SUBSIDY HOUSING:
DISCOVERING THE DWELLER AND ABUTTER NEEDS
by
MARK VANDE
S.B., U.S. Air Force Academy
(1963)
Submitted In Partial Fulfillment
Of The Requirements For The
Degree Of Bachelor Of
Architecture
at the
Massachusetts Institute Of
Technology
June, 1970

Signature of Author

Certified by

Accepted by

Archives

MASS. INST. TECH.
NOV 16 1970
LIBRARIES
The need for suburban housing is as great as that in urban areas because over half of our country's population resides in suburbs. Prior to construction of these units the housing requirements of suburbia as distinguished from those of urban housing must be understood. These requirements are from two sources generally: an expert concerned with use and design and from technical information concerning structural, mechanical etc. information. A third source seldom used however, direct confrontation can be utilized. This method has some distinct advantages over the other systems: it aids the designer and it helps the community to adjust to the project through abutter participation and incremental change.

The Newton Community Development Foundation (NCDF) is currently designing and attempting to have the community of Newton, Massachusetts accept and rezone the necessary sites for low, moderate income and elderly housing. In Newton abutter participation and the resulting incremental change would: allow the abutter to become involved in the project, provide timely information to the designer, give time for the community to organize appropriate service programs, and would not have a negative impact on the community.

There are at least two methods in the direct confrontation system which NCDF could have employed to determine additional information. These two methods are: the use of a questionnaire and serious "gaming." The questionnaire can deal with many facets of suburbia but is unable to cope with any communication difficulties which may occur between a subject being tested and the questionnaire itself. A serious game attempts to alleviate this problem.

This confrontation method may be used in other projects as well but it is especially useful for housing units in which the design of the units closely affects the future dweller and the abutter.
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INTRODUCTION

The President's Committee on Urban housing (The Kaiser Committee) and the National Commission on Urban Problems (The Douglas Commission) estimate that to overcome the housing shortage in the United States, 2.25 through 2.6 million new dwellings will have to be built each year for the next ten years.

"While the problems of the inner city have been growing steadily greater, the city does not have enough money to solve these problems," explained Percy E. Sutton, black President of New York's Borough of Manhattan.

But the suburbs he suggested, do. By his estimates, suburbia now accounts for seventy per cent of all the new housing units, eighty per cent of new jobs and ninety per cent of vacant land in this Nation's metropolitan areas.1

The need for housing is well documented in many many sources. The need for and of suburban housing, however, is neither well documented nor well understood by architects builders or other supposedly knowledgeable people in the housing field. While the number of suburban housing units required can be estimated, the requirements and

---

considerations of housing for the would be occupants and abutters in the suburban community has had little study. While these items are just as important as the estimated numbers of housing required they are far more difficult to enumerate and design.

This thesis is an attempt to understand the requirements and considerations of suburban occupants and abutters to low income housing. It will try to find how a functional unit can be designed singly and collectively and it will use the Newton Community Development Foundation process as a model.

This thesis then will be in three parts:

1. A determination of specific factors which comprise a favorable "Suburbia" for both those housed in and abutting a project of low income, moderate income, and elderly housing. The abutters may be of the same or different economic conditions.

2. A more specific examination of the overall and unit design for low -- moderate income housing will be based on a pilot determination. The Newton Community Development Foundation (NCDF) will serve as the model for the supply currently becoming available.
3. An evaluation of this process and the possible application of this method to other projects.
DISCOVERING THE NEEDS OF DWELLER AND ABUTTER

"The Report of the Joint Committee on Urban Affairs Relative to Public Housing," (H-5000) states, "Currently there are about 260,000 families in Massachusetts living in substandard housing." According to this same report, in 1969 some 20,000 households were on waiting lists for state housing. Yet, it continues, public housing is currently a series of...

"...densely populated, unattractive buildings which are physically, and even psychologically, isolated from the community which exists outside of them. These public housing ghettos not only tend to limit the outlook of the tenants in them, but generate ill-feeling toward them from local residents living in the surrounding vicinity. Little consideration was given to the design of such units and to the need for open space. The needs of tenants to be near places of employment, shopping centers, public transportation, schools and recreational facilities were in many instances given scant attention if indeed at all."
The New Building Block, an encompassing study of new building methods, investigates more than thirty systems of wood, metal, concrete, and plastic. Even more important, it is only one of many such books and articles concerned with construction methods for supplying the necessary 2.5 million housing units each year in the United States. The emphasis of these publications rests entirely on exterior construction techniques. Thus, we as architects appear to have little concern with interior space, functions of the intended dwelling and with the desires of the occupants because so much of our information is based solely on methods of construction. In no way am I questioning the need for this technical knowledge; but can there be any doubt that we are too much taken by these remarkable mechanical aspects and too little concerned with the problems, habits and desires of the people who will be utilizing these very units? Architecturally, the relative ease of solving technical problems has allowed us to think that we have solved the entire problem of low cost housing.

Michael Brill, speaking before a conference on industrialized housing held by BRAB Building Research Institute in Washington warned...

"Don't confuse the concept of industrialization with the solution of the housing problem,..." Brill further pointed out that industrialization could become "a techno-
logical solution to providing space, without providing a humane environment. In this country we have not only a quantity-crisis, but also a quality-crisis as well."

As architects we are too easily satisfied by the neat technological solutions of "back to back plumbing," "parking in large, central above ground lots," and "common central entrance units." It is equally important that the developer be required to investigate completely, the functional and sociological problems and to relay this information to us so that as architects we can translate this feedback into spatial and functional forms. We must realize and extend our knowledge to the human being, his likes goals, desires and problems. We must design for the man who is going to inhabit these units.

Another factor which must be considered in depth is the acceptance of the project by those directly neighboring the housing, the abutters. These people often hold the power of approval or disapproval of a project and much of their judgement is based on whether or not the project satisfies their esthetic and social values. Too, it is the abutters who will provide the contact with, the friendly relationships to, the community and the project residents.

The most obvious information concerning project housing

---

and also the information most easy to obtain is that given by architect "experts." What this expertise actually means is an architect's actual experience in this given area of project housing development.

Other available expert knowledge would come from people working in a variety of related fields. These people would provide consultant service for schools, colleges, hospitals, and might also deal with acoustics, communications, electronic data systems, interior design and even space itself.

Architects and developers might also turn to other than the above for specific advice on a named community. For instance an architect might question political figures—council or ward members, mayors, who would know the community be it urban, suburban or rural. Other available advisors might be people working within a social or socio-political organization, i.e. neighborhood groups, social workers etc. These people might well be even more closely related to those most closely concerned with the project than any of the above.

The last area of available information would come from those directly concerned with the project. This information could be gathered through a variety of means, the most important of which would be the method of direct questioning through a personal confrontation. A verbal visual discussion with the client-user would best find out his explicit needs. A questionnaire is invaluable in de-
termining these feelings and beliefs, and even less tangible associations. Visual discussion with a future resident might include:

1. Observance by the interviewer of the subject's present dwelling—its site, exterior, interior, and alterations.

2. The use of serious games to communicate the subject's wants and desires (this will be explained later in this paper.)

All of the previously mentioned methods have distinct advantages and disadvantages. Technical methods are certainly necessary. They may reach the architect second or fifth hand but the information is none the less of the utmost value.

The use of an "expert" enables the architect to design with this valuable advice and aid. It also frees the architect from the time consuming act of researching the problems of the individual or unit by himself. The "expert has usually acquired his information through extensive reading, investigation and/or discussion. However it must be realized that this information, by going through the necessary filtering process may acquire a changed form by the time it reaches the desk of the actual architect for the project. Another weakness of this method of documentation may be the relative age of the expert's information especially in relation to people. If it is too outdated it may be totally inadequate.
The direct confrontation method if used between the architect/designer and the individual, be he possible dweller or abutter, may solve many of the problems inherent in the other systems. However, it must be realized that this method may be more costly and more time consuming. It is a difficult procedure to undergo and the results, although they are included in the ultimate design may not be visible to the uneducated eye.

It may be difficult too, to identify the dwellers and only a proxy method could be used to identify his general attitudes; hence only general design conditions could be altered. (It may be that some plan in which the dwellers would be known previous to final design much as a private home, should be considered.) However, the direct confrontation method does allow for a greater probability of acceptance by those directly related to the project than any of the other methods.

By the utilization of all three methods, technical construction knowledge, social experts and the direct confrontation between developer and or architect with project participants or abutters, better designs would result. It is therefore essential that an understanding of the advantages, disadvantages and the methods employed in the direct confrontation method become more clear.
SPECIFIC EXAMINATION -- NCDF

The Newton Community Development Foundation, (NCDF) a non-profit organization, is employing an exciting and interesting process to create suburban housing for the low and moderate income groups as well as for the elderly. NCDF's purpose was to increase the number of dwelling units of this type in Newton through a community organization. NCDF plans to build five hundred units of varying size on ten sites in different sectors of the town, each sector having a varied ethnic and economic structure. The program utilizes approximately sixty per cent land owned by NCDF and forty per cent land to be donated by the city. The entire package of ten sites was presented to the city on May 10, 1970. (See ill. 2) NCDF will now apply for simultaneous rezoning for all ten sites. A defeat of any part of the NCDF plan will assure a defeat for the entire program as the politics and economics of the program are tied very closely to the simultaneous development of all ten sites. Furthermore, if the units are built, tenant selection groups will be allowed to issue certain requirements for their site. These requirements will be considered and enacted, providing that they can meet the requirements of the financing agent (state or federal government whichever may be involved.)

NCDF consulted experts: various architectural firms, FHA and MHFA representatives, the mayor, aldermen and other communities interested in similar programs.

Interested architects were interviewed with their proposals and eventually the Pard Team was selected. Later engineers on the various sites were consulted for more specific information. In short effective use of the "expert" system to determine design parameters and conditions was employed to decide the conditions of the NCDF program. This total package program was then presented to the abutters as a relatively positive design. (See ill. 3, 4.)

The NCDF directors have realized the problems of making a low income housing program successful in a community which has a relatively high income level, tight zoning, large dwelling lots and an active articulate membership within the town. Thus it has aimed its program primarily at: (in order of importance)

1. Abutter resistance
2. Zoning
3. High land cost
4. High construction costs

At this date, May 25, 1970, the ten sites have been introduced simultaneously and each has had at least one abutter meeting. In one case of one site three abutter meetings have been held.

The NCDF also undertook an expensive campaign to advertise their impending project. It was evident, however, at the abutter meetings that the people who would be bordering each site knew little or nothing of the program. Since this was a suburban housing project for in
part low income housing there was early recognition that
great discussion of the NCDF program would occur. It
was also evident that since the Newton resident has a
higher educational status and income level than most other
suburban cities, the NCDF project could easily fail with-
out a firm, tight but at the same time just proposal.
(It should be mentioned at this time, that no developer
has been successful in locating multi-unit housing near
the proposed NCDF Newton sites although many have tried.
One of the major reasons for this failure was that the
abutters were able to stop each of the projects in its
earliest stages.)

NCDF, recognizing these factors, and in order to de-
velop a firm program, selected the sites and designed the
units without an abutter awareness. The actual abutters
were advised by personal interview only one day prior to
the proposed sites unveiling that there would be an NCDF
site announcement which would immediately concern them.

This lack of abutter inclusion has caused much dis-
sention. This dissention is evident in the local Newton
weekly, The Newton Graphic, where in articles and in let-
ters to the editor five major areas of objection have
appeared.

1. Site

Flood control problems
Lack of playgrounds
Poor choice of sites
1. Site (con't)
   Poor grounds maintenance
   Changes in plans after agreement
   Gift lands from community
   Use of valuable open land
   Poor scale of housing
   Private vs public developer

2. Dwellers
   Poor care of property by dwellers
   Too many units on site
   Poor mixture of 1, 2, 3, 4 bedroom units
   Newton outsiders may be allowed
   Racial problems generated
   Poor sites for elderly
   Abutters won't mix with residents

3. Abutters
   Reduction of land value
   Lack of protection in zoning
   Lower class abutters will be taken advantage of

4. Transportation
   Lack of parking
   Increase of traffic
   Lack of public transportation

5. Community Facilities
   Tax increase
   Expense to school system
   Special services required
"NCDF is a public organization and yet it's process is all secret, just like a private organization. That's why so many people are against it." This was the comment of one abutter made at the West Newton meeting. He was concerned with the housing problems and did want to do something about them. Another abutter, at the Auburdale meeting said,

If NCDF had gone to each community organization that they had located a site in and told them of their need for a site in that community, the organization would have found a better site.

Thinking the abutter was against NCDF and knew of a site that was distant from his particular community I asked why he was objecting to the site. He said the NCDF site was poor because it periodically flooded, it was distant from the shopping area and the elderly would be stuck there. He also commented on the poor traffic situation. (All of these factors were true.) He was certain these problems could be solved by his area of the community with another site choice.

These were not reactions of people who wished to erase the entire project. In fact both of the above abutters were decidedly for the principles of the project (one individual's father wished to live in an NCDF Project,). But, both were against the specific site choices. They both stated that they wanted more of this type of housing available in Newton.
If the abutters felt that NCDF was trying to "put one over on them," there was also much concern with the all to apparent speed of the NCDF process. Some of the abutters felt that NCDF was trying to make things go as quickly as possible to avoid the build up of previous abutter resistance. In defense of these tactics, Mr. Slotnick, Executive Director of NCDF feels that the tactics being employed are those necessary for the ultimate acceptance of the project. He may well be correct in his evaluation of Newton and its residents, however, there can be no question that this program will and has already caused much antagonism between the abutters, the NCDF, and in extension the future site dwellers.

The lack of participation and the lack of incremental change were the problem areas in which I felt the abutters found fault.

Participation is the involvement primarily psychological but also physical with the project. This could be by directly working on the project, being for or against it. Involvement could occur by being concerned with associated problems or by in some way becoming aware of the problems and/or decisions of the project.

Incremental change is the process of slow but recognizable and continuous growth of an idea into a realized project.
Participation implies incremental change because when someone is aware of a project like this and participates in it, one definitely sees the developments as incremental changes and actually is part of the change process.

In fact, at the abutter meetings no consideration of this incremental change was given. The presentation of data in a step by step progression from origins to solution of the housing needs in Newton was not given. The abutters, unless previously aware of the NCDF-process, could not see the need for nor could they participate in this program. They were not at all aware of the step-decision process which the NCDF had used. For example, the abutters were not presented with background material, nor other pertinent data. They only were shown the "finished design". Hence one can readily understand their feelings that the program was being "put over on them," that the project was being rushed through the one political phase in which they as abutters could take part.

The NCDF, using this strategy to escape early ruin bypassed advising the abutter of as much as possible of early procedures. It only directed itself to the abutters when the site announcement was made and of course then the design was nearly complete. The abutter who had no opportunity to voice his feelings saw this as a "fait accompli" with little opportunity for reaction left to him except through
the rezoning procedure.

The abutter then, had been unaware that anything that directly affected him was taking place. He might have been remotely aware of NCDF but was relatively unconcerned since the procedures wouldn't affect him directly. At present, it is entirely possible to see that the NCDF Plan, by carrying on so much of its procedures internally may ironically have defeated itself with this very plan of abutter secrecy.
It must be recognized then that in a suburban project plan, abutter participation is a necessity. An alternative which includes this element would yield a program with incremental change which would be of great benefit to the entire community. This concern of the project developers with the understanding of the abutters' problems, goals and interests should still go one more step into the community. The concern must extend from the abutters to an informed concern for and with the local low, moderate income groups and with the elderly. With the inclusion of this last group a completely relevant program could be drawn for all of the sites and units. These changes would be helpful to the NCDF (or another suburban group) the abutter and most important to the future residents of the housing project, and would be available in the plan of participation with incremental change.

Such a plan:

1. Allows the abutter to become involved in the project and thus allows him to participate in it. (It is important to remember that nearly everyone is against change and the more abruptly it occurs, the greater and the stronger the reaction is against it.)

2. Provides timely primary information to the designer. Thus it would help
to develop dwellings pleasurable and useful to the actual residents and a site pleasing to the abutters.

3. Allows time for various community service programs to be discussed and set up so that they will be in operation when the construction of the project is complete.

4. Would not have a negative impact on the community (as did the NCDF Plan) and therefore it would allow for another program to follow.

An attempt by the author to bring this understanding and acceptance about through direct confrontations with the "abutters" and the "dwellers" as located in Melrose, Mass., has met with considerable success. (See Appendix A and B concerning the questionnaires.) The subjects of the investigation were used as "dwellers" and "abutters". Only one person from each group, i.e. low income, moderate income and the elderly was analyzed so the evidence is in no way conclusive. These questionnaires allowed the subject tested to rate his connection between various aspects of suburbia i.e. the "Furthering of child" or the "Increased feeling of privacy" with the many elements of suburbia such as "Increased outdoor living" or "Better schools". A study of the answered questions follows illustrating the method of utilization.
The first investigation was done to determine how the individuals saw the ideal suburbia. The significance here is that those tested in all classes, low income, moderate income and the elderly, saw the general aspect of "Growth and development of the child" as being most important to life in suburbia. The number of "Friends," "Schools," "Playground," and the importance of "Living on the ground floor," "Out-door exposure," "Greenery," and "A large yard" were especially important to the subjects. Yet when these same reactions were measured under the NCDF Program, i.e. when subjects were asked to compare the NCDF Program with the ideal suburbia, these elements received mixed values indicating that the NCDF solution may not have adequately solved them. (See ill. 5, 6, 7, ______ portions.)

The element "Parks" received a continuing endorsement as the subject probably thought that their number would not be altered by the NCDF project. Also, significant to those tested was the feeling that "Grass and greenery" were important. (See ill. 5, 6, 7 ______ portion.) The NCDF maintained this within its plan. This was probably encouraged by the perspective and by my explanation that trees, etc. would be retained on the site as much as possible. All subjects also noted the lack of "Living on the ground floor" in the NCDF Plan as related to the "Child" and to the "Dwelling." 6 (See ill. 5, 6, 7 ______ portion).

6 See Appendix A for explanation of all NCDF ratings by Low Income.
How would these facts affect the NCDF Plan? The design method, of course, is still left to the architect, however, he would have certain additional facts to assist him in the design process. The program might now include:

Children are of highest regard to all the possible dwellers in these units as even the elderly consider children as a prime design element. All subjects are interested in providing whatever facility is necessary for the children's development. A large playground or yard with ample grass and trees is considered essential. The site should be located, if possible, near a larger open area where the energy of the older children will be allowed full reign.

Schools and other community facilities should also be made easily available to these children (as well as to all others in the community) to allow the educational and social aspects of their growth an equal opportunity to expand their interests in any direction.

This is of course, a general program statement. The weight, i.e. the relative importance of these items to other parts of the program, would be known by this information, and its consideration important to the designer.
The questionnaire might also reveal other things. By subtracting the "IDL" from the "NCDF", a number will be obtained ranging in value from +4 to -4. To classify the interaction, the sign of the number would be considered. A positive would mean that the NCDF Program had contributed to the Ideal in some way. The relative value would show how great the contribution of the NCDF was. Negative values would show a negative evaluation. Individual interactions would be looked at to determine the effect of various attitudes upon each other.

This subtraction method could also be tried using various NCDF proposals so that instead of an "Ideal" two varied NCDF plans could be analyzed. This comparison would be done in conjunction with the architect so that immediate information would be available to the designer on the different proposals.

These studies could also be surveyed singly, i.e. for the areas of most difference. For example, Senior Citizen, felt that in the Ideal Suburb the elements of "Man made community facilities" contributed throughout to the aspect "Mobility" on Questionaire A while both young Moderate Income and Low Income, disagreed with her. (See ill. 5, 6, 7 ... portions)

Possibly these areas of differences could alter the program as well:

The elderly must be involved in the fabric of the community. They must be welcome as willing participants in all matters:
social, educational and political. They are interested and capable with their knowledge of doing any extreme short of great physical exercise.

(It should also be kept in mind that these same values would apply if these people were abutters to this housing.)

The second questionnaire attempts to provide more specific information concerning the participants' ideas of a dwelling and its immediate surroundings. (See Appendix A) As with the previous questionnaire, it was first examined collectively for consistent values—either positive or negative, however there were so few that further investigation would reveal little. (See B 3 for discussion of values used)

What was significant was the range of differences which each individual registered. Almost two thirds of the questions rated a variation of five or more. Almost one third rated a variation of seven or more, or half the scale of fifteen. This might indicate that the first questionnaire, involved with broader issues may have elicited common values, however, the more easily the situation could be related to the participant's own situation, the wider the variance became.

For example, the values for "A large play ground nearby would make a yard unnecessary" in the "Natural facilities" category. Moderate Income rated this with
a plus seven value, probably because he has only one child who is not yet old enough to play outside by himself. He also lives on the third floor of a garden apartment where he is quite happy. (See ill. 9) Low Income, on the other hand, lives on the second floor of a duplex home. She has three children all of whom are old enough to run and play, by themselves in a yard. Her rating was eleven points from Moderate Income. The situation is then very much a deciding factor on how the person rates his answers. Senior Citizen was between the two extremes. (See ill. 8, 9, 10 portions) The NCDF program, by making the open land/dwelling almost twice that required by Newton Codes, has tried specifically to increase this green land. 7

The previous answers given by the subjects were based upon children. How does home ownership effect the judgement of these people? Senior Citizen lives with her retired husband in their single family house. She rated "A single family dwelling has tremendous advantage over a multi-family unit" in the "Exteriour dwelling facility" category a +10. Middle Income, from the third floor of his apartment unit did not see so many advantages to a single family dwelling and rated it as a +3. Low Income also was unable to see how this item would greatly benefit her and rated it +2. (See ill. 8, 9, 10 ___ portion)

The questionaires have provided some indication of a program for NCDF. The design for the entire program must be able to provide a great variance of dwellings as

indicated by the user's opinions and ideals. The design program might now include:

Units which would provide maximum flexibility of living conditions. A possible range of these units might include one and two story row houses, low rise apartments, high rise apartments, and extend to small distinct units having very defined edges or units combined with others to provide community space.

(These considerations might alter the original plans and then be readjusted with the considerations of the rest of the surveys.)

The importance of this survey method is to acquire a basic understanding of those who will be living near and in this housing. It is then up to the designer's ability to accommodate their attitudes and ideas into his design. When "The nicer single and multi'unit dwellings are built of wood" was presented in the "Exterior dwelling facility" a variation of answers again arose. Low Income and Senior Citizen live in wooden homes, Moderate Income perhaps because of his brick apartment or the feeling that wood is an impermanent or bad material placed a negative value on the material. (See ill. 8, 9, 10 ... portion) For whatever reasons, with whatever prior conceptions or misconceptions, and whether the person answering was an abutter or a future resident, his opinion of the dwelling would
relate to these values.

Of course I am not claiming that all of the people can be satisfied. The project is dealing with often high income abutters and low and moderate income groups as residents but a variation in dwelling materials etc. might relieve their antagonisms. Through a subsidy program in which cost is always such an immediate factor one can recognize the challenges this type of program presents.

The direct confrontation offers another means to achieve an understanding of the dwellers and abutters. Ideals and Desires. Rather than a questionnaire or survey, "Gaming" (the use of a model to some scale) may be used. "Gaming" has some distinct advantages:

1. It utilizes a visual communication instead of a verbal or written form.

2. It enables the "player" to be involved and also understood more easily.

3. It allows for a great variety of solutions which depend more upon the "player" than on the game.

4. It introduces easily into the format other aspects of the problem such as economics and/or social aspects.

(As mentioned in Appendix A there was great difficulty
in interviewing some people with the questionnaire method employed. For some the reasoning called for was just too detailed. A game might have eased this difficulty.)

It is difficult to foresee the objections which might occur from the use of the "gaming method" without actually devising the game. However, it is believed that some of the difficulties found when the questionnaires were used might be circumvented with a game. The problem as with Low Income of unanswered questions might not occur with the game. Low Income with her unanswered questions increased the relative value of those answered by Senior Citizen and Moderate Income. In fact I ignored the unanswered questions affecting the scoring of the questionnaire. In certain aspects Senior Citizen and Moderate Income effectively controlled the program. (See ill. 5 and Appendix A)

In reference to a game method Neal Mitchell Associates who have utilized such a system have stated:

It is an effective means of overcoming the communication barrier between the designer... and the poor urban resident who is keenly aware of the visual environment but is unskilled in verbal expression.8

Mitchell uses three scales in playing his game:

the large urban scale (transportation routes, shopping,)
the smaller scale (dwellings, fences, neighbors, garbage

---

cans, etc.,) and also the dwelling scale (kitchen, storage, etc.)

Judelson, when working with Newcastle Court/Saranac Project and the South End Advocacy project, used two scales of models to discuss dwelling design with future residents. He found that the use of a large model which included furniture, doors that worked and other realistic items was a great aid to communication with the people in the South End of Boston. He used color as realistically as possible. He also found that a larger model was better understood than a smaller one.

At the abutter meetings it was clear that the NCDF ignored the possibility of presenting background material and thus allowing for some abutter participation in their plans. NCDF also did not utilize models to help clarify their program to the abutters. As previously pointed out this lack of communication of the NCDF project may ultimately cause its failure. A visual presentation, often more effective than a verbal presentation might have aided them tremendously at these meetings.

---

9 D. Judelson, "Tenant Cooperative Rehabilitation Housing, MIT, unpublished paper."
OTHER APPLICATIONS

The use of the three methods available to obtain information for the suburban project design, that is:

1. Technical information on construction methods

2. Experts to provide social and human needs criteria

3. Direct confrontation with the concerned parties:
   1. Questionnaire
   2. Gaming

may also be used with other than subsidized housing.

An important element in any building project is the act of participation and incremental change which is a byproduct of the third tool of direct confrontation. An urban housing program may have businesses or factories for abutters. A confrontation is important here for the future dwellers but it might also help the factory workers and owners to understand their situation. This also would hold true with the introduction of an industrial complex or factory in a heretofore rural setting. Dwellers and abutters would perhaps no longer be appropriate terms and other questions and game forms might have to be devised, but the designer must undertake to learn the needs of the various people involved and the processes which they may control. The participation of the individuals concerned
no matter what the construction is to be would as a minimum help them to learn about and be aware of the design.
In conclusion, I have attempted to explain that the information gathered by the developer and his design team comes from at least two sources:

1. **Technical information** (concerning structural, mechanical, etc. engineering)

2. "**Expert**" information (concerning use and design)

To these two sources I have added a third, seldom employed but vitally important to the people most concerned with the project, the **direct confrontation method**. This measure has the added benefit of helping the designer while making the actual project acceptance within the community easier.

NCDF realized that they would have a problem with community acceptance of their program, therefore they chose to make it as firm and formidable as possible. By so doing, they have alienated the abutters, made it very difficult for the acceptance of the future project dwellers into the community, and, if the units do get built (or don't) have caused such ill feeling that more low income housing will probably not be built in Newton.

On the other hand, by utilizing the abutters and future dwellers to provide information to NCDF the entire community would have benefitted. The abutters and dwellers would be aware of the program and would be participating in it (whether for or against). The community at large
would be aware of and interested in the project. NCDF, since it was the basis for so much controversy would benefit from the additional information reaching it.

To paraphrase David Liederman, the "Anti-Snob Law" Chapter 774 is making the suburbs aware of their responsibilities. If the law does not succeed in a specific program it will provide the ground work for future laws which will succeed because of its precedent. So, with the inclusion of a direct confrontation system the NCDF could make Newton specifically aware of its difficulties and lay the ground work for future projects which would be successful.

The direct confrontation would activate participation through questionnaires and serious games. The information derived from these forms would enrich both the questioned and the questioner, and the data would most certainly be employed in the impending program. Too, although the direct confrontation method has been applied to suburban subsidy housing in the major portion of this paper variations could make it beneficial to any design project.

10 Interview with David Liederman, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Housing, Boston, Mass.
APPENDIX A

SUBURBIA AND WHAT IT OFFERS (QUESTIONNAIRE A)

I Questionaire Makeup, And Use

The "Suburbia and what it offers" Questionaire was made up to include:

1. My own attitudes regarding suburbia

2. Discussion of the topic with whomever I could find who might be knowledgable (and some who probably weren't)

3. Research into suburban living and how other authors saw it

From these sources I compiled a list of elements and rated them according to my own values. (See ill. 11) I found that I achieved little that was meaningful by rating these things from my point of view.

I further broke this list into categories and continually added to the elements so that I eventually was able to compile the present questionaire. At this point I wondered with whom I could use it and finally, after some consideration, realized that to be used effectively, it had to have the values
of the groups most concerned. I feel that as an architect it is extremely important to know and design utilizing this information however, it would have been of little value to spend the time interviewing a great number of people. Also, as an architect, I felt poorly equipped to proceed with this type of project. Therefore, I selected three people whom I shall refer to as Low Income, Moderate Income and Senior Citizen to provide a pilot cross section of the involved groups. These subjects would act, when rating their Ideal, as possible dwellers or abutters.
II Description Of The Questionnaire

The more important facets of suburban life include six aspects of suburbia. Suburban living:

1. **Contributes to the use of the dwelling**

   This set of elements causes us to react in a certain way towards our living unit, i.e. in the way that we live in it, the way that we entertain in it, the way that we can change it. The influences from outside the unit are those important here.

2. **Contributes to growth and development of the child**

   The child is mostly a product of the family but the importance of the world outside of his dwelling unit in his later life cannot be denied. The facilities as well as the social situation with which he is surrounded effect him very much.

3. **Contributes to the feeling of privacy of the family**

   This set of elements attempts to find what makes a family unit feel secure,
ie. freedom from those outside the family unit seeing, hearing or knowing of something privy to the family. This could be either a physical or a psychological thing.

4. Makes a more sociable, friendly community

A sociable friendly community is both of these things in the sense that the individual shows an interest in another and takes part in his ideas and goals.

5. Makes living in a suburb cost less than living in a city

This is not an attempt to find out what the costs are but what the suburbanite feels regarding this subject. Does he feel that certain things cost him money? Are they of value to him?

6. Contributes to the mobility of the individual and the family

Going to the grocery store, etc. means that greater distance is involved. The greater distance, the more experiences and an expanded psychological makeup results.
Elements of suburbia are grouped in five categories. Some elements may occur in more than one category. The intent was to narrow the interaction with an effect where identification would become easier. Some of the elements are contradictory, some are untrue, and some are a matter of opinion. These too form an important part of the questionnaire.
III METHOD

The interaction was rated between the aspects and the elements. In column "IDL" the subject was asked to rate his ideal suburb by using the scale shown at the top of the questionnaire. After completion of this the subject was shown the NCDF photographs (See ill. 2, 3, 4) and was briefly told about NCDF. Then the subject was asked to rate the NCDF site at Esty Farm as if it was built and was being occupied by the subject. The subject was to indicate his feelings in the column marked "NCDF". Any discrepancies which the subject saw or felt were to be noted at the bottom. Any questions which the subject had were answered (often fairly specific questions about the NCDF plans.)
IV Evaluation Of The Questionnaire

1. Questionaire

The suburbia questionaire took too long. The minimum subject time was an hour to complete the form. It was difficult to orient the subject as closely to the specific site as I would have liked. The difficulty rested in orienting questions and attitudes in this phase so that this understanding could be accomplished.

2. Subjects

My first attempt with the suburbia questionaire was with an elderly woman of approximately 75 years. She was extremely nice and wanted to help as well as she could with my project. I showed her the form and explained it but found that she wanted me to fill it out as it was difficult for her to see. I read the statements to her and if I smiled as I read them to her she would rate them positively. Otherwise she would rate them negatively. If this system didn't work, she would relate the question to a previous one and would end her response with, "Don't you agree?" or "What do you think?". Because of this the interview was especially difficult and I left when it was not yet complete.
My attempt to do the questionnaire with Low Income resulted in very little differentiation of the ideal suburban environment with the NCDF Program. I pointed one value out to her -- the "Grass, Greenery" which might have been less in the NCDF Plan but she replied "Those are playgrounds, aren't they? And these are grass and trees?" I went to interview Low Income on the second floor of a small two story house with no front or back yard. I noticed here three children playing on the steps, (there was no porch) and in the street. It may be very difficult for low income people living in rundown houses with leaking roofs to see anything but the most ideal in any project such as NCDF.

Low Income's answers altered the results of the questionnaire. (See p. 27) Her opinion was important but I was only able to use her value scores as an ideal. If I had done many welfare recipients the problem might not have occurred but the significance of Low Income's answers must be realized.

Granovetter found that the poor were weak with respect to their environment and this situation may have been underlined in the case of Low Income. She found anything better than

---

what she was living in. Within limits anything could be her ideal. This may be of importance. We must be careful not to take advantage of what a low income person's present living conditions might allow. This may be seen in the disastrous public housing programs initiated in the fifty's and early sixties.

I did not accomplish all that I wanted by this questionnaire. However it did allow some important considerations to be made. The very size of this questionnaire and its lack of specific questions which dwellers and abutters could easily relate to led to the second questionnaire.
APPENDIX B

THE SUBURBAN DWELLING -- QUESTIONNAIRE B

I Questionnaire Makeup and Use

After readying the first questionnaire for use I came to the conclusion that it was very general in nature and did not really examine the relationship of the individual to the suburban dwelling in as great detail as I desired.

I therefore chose a single family dwelling in Melrose, Mass., (a community with which I was familiar) and tried to determine some of the factors which led to its uses and alterations. (See ill. 12, 13) On this basis I was able to extend the previously questioned factors into a more general form which could be utilized within the NCDF context.

This questionnaire was then used in interviews with the same subjects questioned before.
II Description Of The Questionnaire

The immediate environment of a dwelling was examined to find various site, abutter, etc. influences. These were:

1. **The living environment form**: visual connections, entrance.

2. **Natural Environment**: trees, grass, sun.

3. **Community environment**: transportation, shopping.

4. **Automobile facilities**: garage, parking, etc.

Within this context the factors which might influence the larger category were then noted.
III Method

The importance of each of the factors was related to the individual through the rating system shown on a scale of +10 to -5 for the individual's ideal of a "Suburban Dwelling."
IV Evaluation Of The Questionaire

1. Questionaire

The questionaire was not as complete nor as short as was desireable. Some things were repeated and could have possibly been cut; other important items were not considered, ie. the different forms of multi-unit housing.

Another problem was that the suggestion of a positive approach implied something in the answers of the subjects. Another problem was apparent under "Community Facilities". This questionaire began to react with the "Suburbia" questionaire, indicating that in some areas the two forms might have been combined.

The major difference between this questionaire and the previous one was the method used in rating the answers given. The value range was made greater because it was felt that the subjects were more knowledgeable or opinionated about these items and the results seem to verify this theory.

The first subject was asked to fill in the Ideal, and then the NCDF as used in the previous questionaire. It was found that this was too difficult for the subjects because all they had to utilize were the NCDF photographs (See ill. 2, 3, 4) Unless these photos were explained in
detail they were too highly technical for the layman subjects to understand. Therefore, I omitted the attempt to examine the NCDF solution through their comparison in this questionnaire making this questionnaire less useful than it might have been.

2. Subjects

After dropping the NCDF rating the subjects were able to complete the questionnaires quite easily. In fact in two of the three cases it was done without my being present and no difficulties occurred.
Illustration 1

NCDF BROCHURE

newton...no ordinary suburb
Newton, Massachusetts, is no ordinary suburb. It cannot be typed as just a well-to-do bedroom town, nor as just an adjunct to the inner-city, sharing the enormously difficult problems of urban life. It is both.

It’s a city of nearly 100,000 persons, seven minutes from the heart of Boston, astride the major westward transit links, surrounded by a modern industrial-educational complex. It is called — deservedly — the “Garden City” for it has many beautiful homes, parks and tree-lined boulevards. But Newton also has its slum pockets, its major traffic problems, its expanding industrial areas, and a soaring tax rate which reflects the city’s pride and insistence on good schools and good community services.

Perhaps its school system typifies Newton — its spirit, its make-up — and its current problems. Newton schools are nationally famous for their quality and innovativeness. Their students are drawn from an extraordinary cross-section of American society: multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, spanning the entire economic range, from welfare recipient to millionaire. Whether the school system drew the people, or the people the system makes no difference. The point is that Newton has managed to strike a unique balance between maintaining a tradition of excellence and providing an affordable city for the widely divergent people who want to live here.

This balance is becoming harder and harder to achieve. Economic forces over which the city has no
control are conspiring to upset the traditional patterns, and cause changes which cannot be dealt with by traditional means.

One of the most compelling manifestations of these changes is the current and increasing shortage of housing for families of low and moderate income. Building economics coupled with Newton’s “Garden City” tradition have for the past two decades almost completely suspended construction of housing for those who have every reason for living in Newton — the young people who grew up here but cannot afford to bring their children up here, the breadwinner who provides our daily services (mail, sanitation etc.), the Metco family who has sampled Newton’s educational system, the parents of Newton people who want to be near their children as they grow up, the senior citizen to whom Newton has always been home — all these and many more find it increasingly difficult to find housing in Newton and to remain as residents. Without these people Newton will certainly change — and for the worse — as it loses the cross-section of population which has added vitality to the city for years.

Today’s answer to this pressing housing need cannot come from the traditional home-building complex. Subsidies are essential, whether in the form of low-cost land, tax concessions, rent supplements, mortgage financing, or any combination of these. Yet public subsidies alone will not be enough. To succeed, the effort to provide low and moderate income housing in Newton must be backed by the determination and commitment of its citizens to the ideals and character of our extraordinary suburb.

Newton has begun to recognize the problem and must now take important steps to bring about a significant solution to the housing shortage. As is the case with its school system, Newton will expect the housing concept to be intelligent and effective, and what this city produces may well become another national model.
the need

In the past few years our municipal officials and civic leaders have attempted to estimate the need for low and moderate income housing and to recommend a means for meeting that need. A 1967 study by a committee of the Board of Aldermen had concluded then that the absolute minimum need was for 200 units of low-income housing and added that "in all probability this figure is much higher". They did not attempt to estimate the moderate-income housing need. The committee urged that the city government pursue rent subsidy programs and that non-profit sponsors be especially encouraged to build small developments of 20–50 units each.

In 1968 a Planning Department report confirmed the earlier study and added statistical evidence of ways and means to accomplish the goals.\(^1\)

Further, in May of 1969 the Board of Aldermen

---

\(^1\) In October of 1968 the Newton Planning Department published an exhaustive study of low and moderate income housing needs. The report concurred with a previous finding that an absolute minimum of 200 low-income housing units were immediately needed. The Planning Department surveyed and evaluated over 200 sites, of which 42 were identified as potential areas suitable for low and moderate income housing.

The report urged non-profit and other developers to acquire these sites and build housing on a scattered site, low-density basis.
passed a resolution signed by the Mayor which stated in part:

...the City shall not release any of the city-owned property named in the report for other purposes unless the Board of Aldermen decides that the site is not suitable or available or required for low and moderate income housing and

That with respect to the private property named in the report the Board of Aldermen, when it considers a site for any purpose, shall include in its consideration the suitability of or need for the site for low and moderate income housing.

Finally, in May of 1969, a city-wide conference on low and moderate income housing sponsored by numerous civic organizations drew over 300 people indicating the profound concern of many citizens with the housing needs of Newton. Those who attended urged the creation of at least 400 low and moderate income units.

2 Participating organizations in the Newton Housing Conference, May 7, 1969 were: League of Women Voters of Newton; Newton Community Relations Commission; Housing Coordinating Committee of the City of Newton; Newton Chamber of Commerce; Newton Committee for Fair Housing and Equal Rights; Newton Community Council; Newton Community Development Foundation.
It was in recognition of this urgent community need that over two dozen priests, ministers and rabbis of Newton gathered in 1968 to form the Newton Community Development Foundation.

"to provide significant quantities of low and moderate income housing in Newton."

A Board of Directors representing the whole spectrum of the community was appointed, and in succeeding months it determined its broad objectives and defined the policies it would employ to attain them. The Board began to raise limited funds from individuals and religious organizations.

The tremendous success of the conference in 1969, the broad support of the city government, and the response of many Newton residents to the appeal from NCDF formed the background for the Board of Directors decision to become operational before the half-way point of the fund-raising drive.

In June of 1969 the Board of Directors appointed an Executive Director, and opened offices in Newton Centre in space made available by the Newton-Waltham Bank and Trust Company.

The Newton Community Development Foundation was now ready to make a substantial effort toward providing more low and moderate income housing to meet the needs of the community.
the program

A Plan for Development and Zoning Approval

The initial NCDF plan is to construct not less than 500 units scattered throughout Newton's villages on as many sites as are economically feasible. The Board has suggested that an optimum size might be about 50 units to avoid the concentration of housing developments.

Despite the demands for increased housing in Newton, the Directors of NCDF understand that even in a city such as Newton there will be a certain amount of both general and local opposition to the construction of low and moderate income housing in Newton. Therefore, the Board of Directors has established elaborate procedures to assure that the design and the construction of the units will be appropriate to each site and of a quality and standard acceptable to the city as a whole. Furthermore, the initial plan will be presented as a city-wide package for city-wide study, review and approval rather than a procession of discrete single site proposals, any or all of which might otherwise have floundered because of some neighborhood opposition.

NCDF is in the process of preparing such a plan and hopes to generate public support for it by early 1970. The immediate goal is to obtain zoning changes which will permit construction to begin. This goal can be reached only if broad citizen support is engendered. If accomplished, the building of such housing will be a major achievement in the growth of Newton and may well become a model in the national task of finding creative answers to the housing problem.

Volunteer Housing Assistance

Since any new housing cannot be available for some time, NCDF, along with its new approach to housing, also plans to assist low and moderate income families in finding adequate existing housing. The Foundation will train women volunteers to help a family determine whether it is eligible for leased public housing, for an FHA subsidized purchase, for NCDF low and moderate income housing (when built), or for any other available housing program.

The NCDF offices provide a central location where citizens can call to get housing assistance. In this manner, NCDF can broaden its communication with Newton's low and moderate income families and at the same time determine what kind of housing the future occupants would like NCDF to build.

Youth Organization

"Operation Awareness" is a youth group which was founded at the Eliot Church in Newton and has expanded to a city-wide organization interested in housing. The group, which has merged with NCDF, conducts workshops and tours of housing and is expanding its interviewing of Newton residents on housing attitudes.

Community Education

NCDF is providing community education to inform Newton residents of the need for low and moderate income housing and of the NCDF approach to meet that need. For this purpose, NCDF has prepared an audiovisual program which is being shown to business, civic, religious, and other organizations throughout the city.

Housing Reference Library

In the course of its work, NCDF is gathering a number of technical volumes on housing and housing programs, and a significant body of demographic data about Newton and the surrounding communities. This reference library will be available to anyone interested.

Governmental Agency Cooperation

NCDF is maintaining close contacts with governmental officials at the municipal, state and federal levels. It has already received gratifying expressions of support from these officials who seem equally desirous of having the Foundation assist them in beginning to solve the low and moderate income housing shortage in Newton.
how you can help

There are two ways in which you as an interested Newton citizen can help further this program:

First, you can participate in the very important task of informing the public of the problems and enlisting citizen support for NCDF’s program. This need increases as NCDF draws closer to final program resolution and presentation to the city. If you have even more time, you can become an NCDF volunteer. Our volunteers perform numerous tasks ranging from assisting the Director and his staff to helping a needy family get a subsidy or find a decent home.

Second, you can lend financial support which is desperately needed and which must come from Newton citizens. All of the money that has been invested so far to get NCDF in operation came from individuals and church groups in amounts ranging from $10 to $1000. More is needed to bring NCDF to the point where federal funds can be tapped for construction financing. If you care about NCDF’s goals, help reach them now by contributing as generously as you can. Contributions should be made payable to:

ncdf
93 Union Street
Newton Centre, Massachusetts 02159

Call (617) 244-7062 for further information.
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was Incorporated on June 19, 1968 by:

REV. WILLIAM S. BERNDT
St. Mary's Church

REV. ROSS CANNON
Second Church of Newton

REV. NEWELL H. CURTIS, JR.
First Church of Newton

REV. JOHN FEENEY
Corpus Christi Church

REV. HAROLD R. FRAY
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REV. ROBERT W. GOLLEDGE
Church of the Messiah

REV. ROBERT J. HARDING
Central Congregational Church

MRS. ELOISE HOUGHTON
Vice-Pres. Church Women United

REV. BOYD M. JOHNSON, JR.
Union Church of Waban

RABBI ISRAEL J. KAZIS
Temple Mishkan Tefila
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REV. JOHN R. LILLY
Newtonville United Methodist Church

MOST REV. ERIC F. MACKENZIE*
Sacred Heart Church, Newton

REV. HAROLD A. MALMBORG
First Baptist Church of Newton

REV. EUGENE W. MEYER
Auburndale Congregational Church

REV. ROLAND STAHL
United Methodist Church, Auburndale

REV. E. S. SUN DE
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MARC A. SLOTNICK, Executive Director

In June 1969, the Board of Directors appointed Marc A. Slotnick, an attorney, housing expert and life-long resident of Newton, as Executive Director of the Foundation.

Immediately prior to his appointment to the Foundation, Mr. Slotnick served as Executive Assistant to the Massachusetts Commissioner of Community Affairs. In this capacity, he was responsible for administration and policy development for the federally assisted agency that administers the Commonwealth's low-income housing, planning and anti-poverty programs.

Mr. Slotnick has had several years of experience with Cushman & Wakefield, Inc., a national real estate consulting firm. He acted as consultant to the Penn Central Railroad, Madison Square Garden Center, Inc. and Tishman Realty and Construction in the negotiations of over $10,000,000 in leases in their properties.

A graduate of Newton High School, Mr. Slotnick received his A.B. from Harvard College where he majored in government. He holds a Doctor of Laws degree from the New York University School of Law and is a member of the Massachusetts Bar.

MARYLYN LENTINE, Assistant to the Director

Miss Lentine, a native of Belmont, majored in political science at Goucher College. Since receiving her Bachelor of Arts degree, she served in an administrative capacity in the Massachusetts Governor’s Office researching and developing policy statements on housing and welfare for the Governor’s advisors. Her special assignments included the preparation, in 1967, of the first complete inventory of the agencies, departments, public authorities and commissions that are subject to the control of the Governor. Most recently, she acted as coordinator for the Governor’s Opportunity Program for disadvantaged youths.
DIRECTORS
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Mr. Robert C. Casselman, Chairman
Executive Secretary, State Government Modernization
Member, Newton Redevelopment Authority
Former Member of the Faculty, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Former Vice President, Polaroid Corporation

Mrs. Proctor Houghton, Clerk and Treasurer
Executive Director, Committee for Responsibility
Member, Newton Community Relations Commission
Vice President, Church Women United of Newton
Former President, League of Women Voters

Mr. Joseph Bennett
President, Joseph E. Bennett Construction Co.
Director, Newton Taxpayers’ Association, Inc.

Mrs. John S. Bliss
Chairman, Conference on Newton’s Need for Low and Moderate Income Housing, May, 1969
Human Resources Chairman, League of Women Voters of Newton
Former Social Worker, South End Family Relocation Program

Mr. William Carmen
President, Carmen Management Corporation
Treasurer, Interfaith Housing Corporation of Metropolitan Boston
Former Chairman, Newton Housing Authority Alderman 1961–1965; 1970–

Mr. Herbert Connolly
President, Herb Connolly Buick
Member of the Governor’s Council, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Mrs. Joseph Esposito
Member, Executive Board of Newton Community Action Council
Board of Directors of Western Metropolitan Boston Regional Opportunity Council

Mr. Jerrold Hickey
Editor, Boston Magazine

Dr. Charles Johnson
Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration
Director, Institute for Business Management, Roxbury

Mr. Norman Leventhal
President, Beacon Construction Company

Mr. Charles P. Olton
President, Charlescraft Press, Inc.

Mr. Edward Richmond
Partner, Bloom, Deutsch and Richmond
Member and Past Chairman, Newton Committee for Fair Housing and Equal Rights
New England Regional Chairman, Social Action Committee of Union of American Hebrew Congregations

Mr. William P. Ripley
Chairman, Board of Zoning Appeals of Newton
Trustee, Newton-Wellesley Hospital
Retired Assistant Treasurer and Investment Officer, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company

Rabbi Murray Rothman
Rabbi, Temple Shalom of Newton

Mr. Morris Rothstein
Member, Board of Governors, Jewish Theological Seminary
Retired President, Emerson Manufacturing Company
Past President, Temple Mishkan Tefila

Mr. Wellington Scott
Assistant Director, Waltham Hospital
Member of Massachusetts Bar

Mr. N. Ronald Silberstein
Vice President and General Counsel, Sheraton Corporation of America
Member of Massachusetts Bar

Mr. Tetsuo Takayanagi
Architect, Hugh Stubbins and Associates
Member, American Institute of Architects

Mr. Patrick J. Ullmark
Architect and Graphic Designer, Ullmark and Associated Architects
Formerly with Benjamin Thompson and Associates

Mr. Herbert Weiss
Executive Vice President, Retail Division, Phillips Van Heusen Corporation
President, Planned Management Company
Member of Massachusetts Bar

Mr. Robert M. Young
Engineer, Raytheon
Vice President, Newton Upper Falls Improvement Association
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NCDF HOUSING | NEWTON, MASS.

1. FLEX STREET - EAGLE STREET
2. DEERWOOD AVENUE
3. PRINCE STREET
4. ST. ANDREW STREET
5. EAGLE STREET - DEERWOOD AVENUE
6. DEERWOOD AVENUE - EAGLE STREET
7. EAGLE STREET - DEERWOOD AVENUE
8. DEERWOOD AVENUE - DEERWOOD AVENUE
9. DEERWOOD AVENUE - DEERWOOD AVENUE
10. DEERWOOD AVENUE - DEERWOOD AVENUE

NEWTON, MASS. MAP AND A PROPOSED SITE PLAN FOR NCDF
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PERSPECTIVES SHOWING UNITS
## Questionnaire A

### Illustration 5

**Environmental Change Effects on the Growth of Attitudes Towards Suburbanization:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Low Income</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Slight Importance</th>
<th>Keenly Noticeable</th>
<th>Slight Definitively Noticeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What They Affect</td>
<td>Contribute to the Use of the Home</td>
<td>Contribute to Feeling of Safety and Privacy</td>
<td>Make a More Acceptable Neighborhood</td>
<td>Contribute to the Stability of the Individual Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Elements</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with Others</td>
<td>Mutual aid-locating a job of choice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased number of friends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fertilization in community life</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased number of rental and economic problems areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More outdoor living</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased pockets of poverty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of psychological barriers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased number of schools and churches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number and intensity of social events</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger number of social organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Better schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of physical barrier of doors, windows, or glass doors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger number of children facilities, playgrounds, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to work and change paces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living on or near ground floor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of people and method of living</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence and availability of such as convenience stores, drugstores, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More parks, places for recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater distances involved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor exposure for children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trees, grassy-greenery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outdoor living</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large yard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Effect</td>
<td>Lack of psychological barrier to action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not arguing because of neighbors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More control of your family, home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>Higher taxes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionaire A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Elements</th>
<th>What they do not contribute to the use of the dwelling</th>
<th>Why do they contribute to growth of family life</th>
<th>Important factors for the development of friendly family</th>
<th>Mass a part of home life</th>
<th>Has less effect but is still significant</th>
<th>Definitely contribute to social life of the individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural aid-living a typical of floor</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of friends</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in community life</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased presence of racial and economic groups, etc.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More outdoor living</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintances-people near</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More men, women, girls, etc.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less of psychological barriers-letting TV play loudly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of aides and services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less of physical barriers-white screen door instead of solid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adults facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better schools and teachers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger number of social organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better schools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of physical barrier-marlin screen or glass door instead of solid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger number of children facilities, playgrounds, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to work and change yard and house</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living on or near crowded floor which has part you can use</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great variety of people and method of living</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River convenience facilities such as convenient structures, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home parks, places for recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater distances involved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor exposure for children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, grass, greenery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor living</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large yard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Effect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of psychological barrier &amp; action against because of neighbors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More control of your family, house</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Assets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Questionnaire A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity: Socialization</th>
<th>Possibility</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>Slightly Definite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very Slight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definite Slight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increases with others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual aid—leaving a top of floor</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of friends</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in community life</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased pockets of social and economic problem areas</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More outdoor living</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some activities—people near</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some type family, and, education, etc.</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of psychological barriers—leaving TV play loudly</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of close and amicable</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of physical barriers—leaving screen door instead of solid</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better adult facilities</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better schools &amp; teachers</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor social group facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger number of social organizations</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better schools</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of physical barriers—leaving screen door instead of solid</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased number of children's facilities, playgrounds, etc.</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to work and change yard and house</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lying on or near ground floor within the yard fence can use</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great variety of people and method of living</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer convenience facilities such as convenience stores, etc.</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More parks, places for recreation</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater distances involved</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor exposure for children</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, grass, greenery</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor living</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large yard</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of psychological barrier to action etc., not arising because of neighbors</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agribition</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better control of your family, house</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher taxes</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More services</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
<td>&amp;+</td>
<td>&amp;-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire B

#### Exterior Dwelling Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Low Income</th>
<th>very slight</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTerior Dwelling FACILITY</strong></td>
<td>important</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nicer single and multi-unit dwellings are built of wood</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dwelling should be close to the parking to provide a larger play area away from parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each dwelling should have a separate entrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main door of the dwelling should be visible from the road or the parking area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows should overlook the play area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's important to have a private exterior play space for children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The orientation for the dwelling should be towards sun and air</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fence should be used to protect property from being overrun by kids and pets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a suburb near two or three story homes it is important to maintain that height for multi-family dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only distant dwelling units should be seen from windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dwelling unit must have definite property lines so responsibility for taking care of it will be known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences are the best way of defining property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If run down housing is renovated it will provide housing as good as a new unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyone with kids of walking age should live on the first or second floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single family dwelling has tremendous advantage over a multi-family unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy rather than sun and air is most important for orientation of the dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mix of elderly, low income, middle income housing is the best solution to the housing problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mix of children and the elderly will cause a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use housing scattered throughout a suburb is the best solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Natural Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Low Income</th>
<th>very slight</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATURAL FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td>important</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees should surround a large open play area</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small private plot of land is important for baby or flowers etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every five or six units need a grassed area for the play of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees near a house are important for shade and climbing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A large playground nearby would make a yard unnecessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Accessibility Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Low Income</th>
<th>very slight</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCESSIBILITY FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td>important</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be possible to park a car close to your dwelling</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be a place to work on or wash your car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You should be able to get to your car quickly and easily in inclement weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Temporality Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Low Income</th>
<th>very slight</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEMPORALITY FACILITIES</strong></td>
<td>important</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A business should be within easy walking distance</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you don't have a car the shopping area should be within walking distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A small general shop can provide your necessities if the main shopping area is within a short drive or bus ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illustration 8
## Questionaire B

**THE SUBURBAN DWELLING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Moderate Income</th>
<th>single</th>
<th>multi-unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERIOR DWELLING FACILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The nicer single and multi-unit dwellings are built of wood</td>
<td><strong>-6</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dwelling should be close to the parking to provide a larger play area away from parking</td>
<td><strong>+5</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each dwelling should have a separate entrance</td>
<td><strong>+2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main door of the dwelling should be visible from the road or the parking area</td>
<td><strong>+2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows should overlook the play area</td>
<td><strong>+3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s important to have a private exterior playspace for children</td>
<td><strong>+3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The orientation for the dwelling should be towards sun and air</td>
<td><strong>+3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fence should be used to protect property from being overrun by kids and pets</td>
<td><strong>+7</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a suburb near two or three story homes it is important to maintain that height for multi-family dwellings</td>
<td><strong>+2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only distant dwelling units should be seen from windows</td>
<td><strong>+2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dwelling unit must have definite property lines so responsibility for taking care of it will be known</td>
<td><strong>+2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fences are the best way of defining property</td>
<td><strong>+2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If run down housing is renovated it will provide housing as good as a new unit</td>
<td><strong>+2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anyone with kids of walking age should live on the first or second floor</td>
<td><strong>+7</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single family dwelling has tremendous advantage over a multi-family unit</td>
<td><strong>+5</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy rather than sun and air is most important for orientation of the dwelling</td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mix of elderly, low income, middle income housing is the best solution to the housing problem</td>
<td><strong>-2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mix of children and the elderly will cause a problem</td>
<td><strong>-2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use housing scattered throughout a suburb is the best solution</td>
<td><strong>-10</strong></td>
<td><strong>-10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NATURAL FACILITIES**

| Trees should surround a large open play area | **-5** |
| A small private plot of land is important for baby or flowers etc. | **-5** |
| Every five or six units need a grassed area for the play of children | **-5** |
| Trees near a house are important for shade and climbing | **-5** |
| A large playground nearby would make a yard unnecessary | **-5** |

**AUTOMOBILE FACILITIES**

| It should be possible to park a car close to your dwelling | **+3** |
| There should be a place to wash your car | **+3** |
| You should be able to get to your car quickly and easily in inclement weather | **+3** |

**COMMERICAL FACILITIES**

| A business should be within easy walking distance | **+20** |
| If you don't have a car the shopping area should be within walking distance | **-20** |
| A small general shop can provide your necessities if the main shopping area is within a short drive or bus ride | **-20** |
**Questionaire B**

**THE SUBURBAN DWELLING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject: Senior Citizen</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Multi-unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### EXTerior Dwelling Facility

- The nicer single and multi-unit dwellings are built of wood. *0%
- The dwelling should be close to the parking to provide a larger play area away from parking. *10%
- Each dwelling should have a separate entrance. *-10%
- The main door of the dwelling should be visible from the road or the parking area. *-10%
- Windows should overlook the play area. *-10%
- It's important to have a private exterior playspace for children. *-10%
- The orientation for the dwelling should be towards sun and air. *-10%
- A fence should be used to protect property from being overrun by kids and pets. *-10%
- In a suburb near two or three story homes it is important to maintain that height for multi-family dwellings. *-10%
- Only distant dwelling units should be seen from windows. *-10%
- A dwelling unit must have definite property lines so responsibility for taking care of it will be known. *-10%
- Fences are the best way of defining property. *-10%
- If run down housing is renovated it will provide housing as good as a new unit. *-10%
- Anyone with kids of walking age should live on the first or second floor. *-10%
- A single family dwelling has tremendous advantage over a multi-family unit. *-10%
- Privacy rather than sun and air is most important for orientation of the dwelling. *-10%
- A mix of elderly, low income, middle income housing is the best solution to the housing problem. *-10%
- The mix of children and the elderly will cause a problem. *-10%
- Multi-use housing scattered throughout a suburb is the best solution. *-10%

### Natural Facilities

| Trees should surround a large open play area. *0%
| A small private plot of land is important for baby or flowers etc. *-10%
| Every five or six units needs a grassed area for the play of children. *-10%
| Trees near a house are important for shade and climbing. *-10%
| A large playground nearby would make a yard unnecessary. *-3%

### Accessory Facilities

| It should be possible to park a car close to your dwelling. *-4%
| There should be a place to work on or wash your car. *-8%
| You should be able to get to your car quickly and easily in inclement weather. *-10%

### Convenience Facilities

| A business should be within easy walking distance. *-4%
| If you don't have a car the shopping area should be within walking distance. *-10%
| A small general shop can provide your necessities if the main shopping area is within a short drive or bus ride. *-5%

---

**ILLUSTRATION 10**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Suburbia</th>
<th>Dwelling Orientation</th>
<th>Child Orientation</th>
<th>Privacy</th>
<th>Economic Aspects</th>
<th>Social Orientation</th>
<th>Physical Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Contact</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors, Friends</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs, Churches</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Facilities</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Barriers</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Segregation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied Solutions To Living</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Distances</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Outdoor Living</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Schools</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Taxes</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer Services</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living On Ground Floor</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Vegetation</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Outside Exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Shopping Facilities</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Freedom Of Action</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Control Of Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Site</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLAN - MELROSE, MASS.
SITE CONDITIONS - MELROSE, MASS.
PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROBABLY
NOT OFTEN ENOUGH, TOO FAR AWAY,
OR IN WRONG DIRECTION TO BE
FREQUENTLY USED

THIRD STREET BUT DOESN'T
GO ANYWHERE SO USE
LITTLE TRAFFIC, HAP-
PENING

FAR FROM TOWN AND
SHOPPING - MUST RELY
ON NEIGHBORS
FOR FRIENDS, ETC.
TRANSIT OR WALK
OR CAR

IF HOME KIDS PROBABLY
SOME ADDITIONAL CON-
TACT WITH PEOPLE BE-
TWEEN PARK AND DWELLING
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