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ABSTRACT

This study attempts to explore ways in which a poorly function-
ing housing project can be improved. The objective is to restructure
the community so as to create an environment which is conducive to the
social and economic betterment of the residents. The reasons behind
the present shortcomings of this public housing project are examined
and plans for the redesign of the project are proposed out of a de-
tailed analysis of the needs of the residents. This approach only
recommends physical improvements when they can be shown to further
the basic goal of social advance and the elimination of social dis-
organization within the project.
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Introduction

The public housing program in the United States has been widely criticized for its failure to create satisfactory communities. Low income housing projects have been described as institutional, one-class ghettos by people such as Jane Jacobs and Albert Mayer who proclaim that these existing projects need to be "salvaged" and "rejuvenated". Suggestions have been made for diversifying projects, integrating them with their surrounding neighborhoods and redesigning their physical facilities. However, such proposals often do not stem from a clear understanding of the problems and needs of the residents of these public housing developments. 'Middle class values' as well as a preoccupation with architecture and aesthetics have obscured basic social and economic considerations. Much of this recent literature discussing public housing is rich in ideas but these ideas tend to be oversimplified for they have failed to examine the problem in depth.

This thesis attempts to study one housing project in detail and to formulate proposals based on an analysis of the population's needs. Orchard Park, located in Lower Roxbury is the particular project used in this study. It functions poorly and is clearly in the need of help yet its problems are typical of those found in most public housing. This development was chosen because it has the liabilities of being poorly designed, it is located in a declining area and has social problems due to racial conflict and a high proportion of welfare dependent families. Eighty percent of the families in Orchard Park have incomes below $4,000 dollars. This study attempts to show that the project environment hinders rather than aids the residents in their
struggle against poverty.

The major objective of the proposals of this study is to restructure the community to create an environment conducive to the economic and social betterment of the residents. The planning that is proposed will become a process of rehabilitating the people and the community. Physical improvements are designed to be an integral part of social advance.

---

I - The Historical Setting

Roxbury was one of the earliest places of settlement in the Thirteen Colonies. Tax records go back as far as the year 1630. The main body of settlers was English, and this strain continued to define the population for two centuries.¹

By the first half of the 19th century the northern part of Roxbury developed as a New England mill town. It contained textile mills, printing establishments, foundries, rope walks, lumber and stone yards, along with workers' housing and housing for the other townspeople.

In the 1840's Irish, Germans, Scandinavians, and Canadians migrated to Roxbury. By 1850 the middle class started to desert the old town and move to Roxbury's Highlands and to Jamaica Plain. These population shifts were facilitated by the development of the street railway system.² Upper Roxbury became the prototypical suburb. Lower Roxbury, because of its proximity to downtown Boston and the South End, became the entry-point for low-income families; the hilly southern part of Roxbury evolved as a middle-class community. From 1880 to 1920 Jewish migrants joined the population. Then, in the mid-twenties, Negroes began moving into Roxbury. This pattern accelerated after World War II.

Most of Roxbury's housing was built between 1850 and 1890. The lower income groups' limited means forced them to adopt extremely pinched forms of building. Houses were jammed upon small lots, and rows upon rows


of three-deckers, two-families and brick row houses were built. Even in their day, these houses were cheap and considered below standard.³ Shortsighted initial planning as well as changes in living standards made rapid obsolescence inevitable. By 1912 observers noted that the old mill section was in need of substantial rebuilding. In 1934 the W.P.A. inventory showed all of Lower Roxbury to be an area of sub-standard housing.

In December, 1940 the Boston Housing Authority cleared some of the most dilapidated housing in the northern tip of Lower Roxbury in order to build the Lenox Street project. In 1942 the Orchard/Public Housing Project was ready for occupancy. This project site was also chosen so that the run-down buildings which were condemned as slums could be demolished.

Despite this rebuilding, Lower Roxbury continued to be an area of physical deterioration. From 1950 to 1960 this section experienced an unprecedented amount of demolition and massive abandonment of housing. Today a large part of the area looks like a war-scarred battlefield. The landscape is defined by broken buildings, vacant rubble filled lots, run-down factories, junkyards, warehouses and public housing projects.

II - The Present Characteristics of the Roxbury Community

For planning purposes, the Boston Redevelopment Authority has placed Lower Roxbury together with Upper Roxbury and a small part of Dorchester. These neighborhoods have been designated the Roxbury-North Dorchester General Neighborhood Renewal Area. Map I shows this GNRA area as it is located in the geographical center of the city of Boston. This planning area, although varied in topography, housing conditions, land uses and social organization nevertheless has common problems due to a widespread departure of the middle class and the immigration of low income and minority families.

Within the past ten years major transformations have occurred in the Roxbury GNRA. One of the most dramatic of these changes has been the Negro influx. The racial composition of the Roxbury-North Dorchester area moved from 17.5% non-white in 1950 to 50.4% non-white in 1960. This represented a 54% decline in the white population and a 119% increase in the number of Negroes. If this rate of change has continued it is estimated that 63% of Roxbury GNRA is non-white in 1964.

In 1960 this community housed over 60 percent of the city of Boston's Negro population. Boston's Negro ghetto has spread from the South End into Lower and Upper Roxbury. The Orchard Park project is located within an area which was roughly 50% non-white in 1960. (see map 2) If the tipping point theory holds true, this area will eventually become all Negro occupied. However, the movement toward complete segregation may occur slowly if the existing white population encounters difficulties in relocating itself.

Although Roxbury is rapidly becoming an area of all-Negro residency,
Map 2 - Percent of Non-Whites by Census Tracts 1960

[Map showing the percentage of non-whites in each census tract, with varying numbers such as 23, 84, 50, 52, 78, etc.]
the community still has a polarity of middle class neighborhoods in the South and lower class neighborhoods in the North. (see map 3 of median incomes) Class differences among Negroes have often been a source of internal conflict within the community. In recent years middle income Roxburyites have protested the movement of lower class Negroes into their neighborhoods. Relocates from Boston's Highway construction and Urban Renewal Projects have added to the steady influx of Southern migrants putting heavy pressures on the Negro housing market. Inasmuch as most low income neighborhoods in Boston are still relatively intolerant of Negroes, lower class Negro newcomers have been doubling up and moving into middle class Negro neighborhoods.

The population of the Roxbury-North Dorchester GNRP has declined from 108,913 persons in 1950 to 82,247 persons in 1960. This 24 percent rate of population loss is almost double the city-wide rate of 13.7 percent. Roxbury lost over 2,300 housing units, primarily due to demolition activity. Lower Roxbury had the heaviest losses (see map 4).

Between 1950 and 1960 the two census tracts directly north of the Orchard Park project lost more than half of their population. The northern area around the project lost 60% of its inhabitants. The southern area around the project only shows a 29% decrease in population. These figures correlate with the vast amount of vacant land north of the project while south of the project the smaller population losses are related to better housing conditions.

The northeastern part of the GNRP in which Orchard Park is located

---

4Banfield and Wilson, City Politics (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1963) p. 298.
Map 3 - Median Income in the Roxbury Area according to Census Tracts 1960
lost more than 40% of its residents. This area suffers from industrial blight and has had a high percentage of deteriorated and dilapidated housing. The proposed inner belt highway for Boston is designed to cut through this section of Roxbury. The anticipation of this highway construction may have been a major factor in the extraordinary attrition of these neighborhoods. Other reasons for the population losses in Roxbury are the following:

1. The easing of the housing shortage in Boston has reduced the demand for accommodations in less desirable housing. In 1950 Boston had a vacancy rate of 1.6%. By 1960 the vacancies for the city climbed to 5.7% of all the housing units. In 1960 the Roxbury-North Dorchester area had a vacancy rate of 9.4% and parts of lower Roxbury have vacancy rates as high as 25%. The highest rate of vacancies is found in housing which is not for rent or sale but probably dilapidated.

2. The racial shifts from the area in the GNRP have resulted in an exodus of white residents and a neglect of property. The Boston Redevelopment Authority referred to this phenomena in their analyses of the GNRP stated

...figures indicate a massive abandonment of the area on the part of many of its white occupants and a disinclination or inability of property owners to maintain their properties out of the rent proceeds obtainable from the new predominantly low-income and minority housing market. The conditions of poorly maintained and abandoned buildings and low market demand have made fire insurance virtually unobtainable, except at excessive rates, and home improvement loans difficult to obtain. Hundreds of properties have been foreclosed upon the non-payment of taxes and hundreds of buildings have had to be demolished under the Mayor's demolition program for failure to meet minimum safety and sanitary requirements.5

---

5 Roxbury-North Dorchester G.N.R.P., Land Use Plan: Existing Condition Boston Redevelopment Authority (Boston: 1964) p. 5 of 34.
Map 4 - Population Loss between 1950 and 1960 in Roxbury Census Tracts
3. It is possible that irresponsibility, lack of respect for private property and very destructive behavior on the part of some low class tenants may have accelerated the decay of Lower Roxbury's housing supply. The tenants themselves have in past destroyed their own housing.
III - The Planning of the Orchard Park Project

By 1942 Boston's public housing program was well along on its way. The Boston Housing Authority had already built Old Harbor Village, Old Colony, Charlestown, Mission Hill and the Lenox Street projects. The Federally-Aided Orchard Park project was built at the same time as the East Boston and Heath Street projects. This group of developments was designed to have a larger proportion of large sized apartments than the earlier projects.

The Boston Housing Authority, typical of public housing authorities in the U. S. was engaged in slum clearance. The site of the Orchard Park project was chosen because the area was determined to be a slum. The second major reason for the choice of this site was that the costs of acquisition were below the federally stipulated maximum allowance of $1.50 per square foot. The site had to have a "reasonable degree" of transportation, shopping, schools and other public facilities but such considerations remained far subordinate to all matters affecting the costs of constructing the project. 6

Early studies conducted by the Housing Authority concluded that a large part of the Lower Roxbury area should be "cleaned out". But since funds for such an undertaking were not forthcoming, the Orchard Park project was built in the midst of much substandard housing and industrial blight. However, the Boston Housing Authority tried to place the project so that existing residential housing would act as "natural buffers" between the project and the nearby industrial and commercial land uses.

6The reasons behind the original planning of the project are my interpretations based on interviews with Mr. Milrick, Boston Housing Authority Development Director, and Mr. Charles Cooper, former manager of the Orchard Park project, June, 1964.
Map -5 - The Orchard Park Project Site Plan and the Adjacent Neighborhood
The shape of the project is unusual in that the boundaries form two wedges which meet corner to corner. It is likely that the selection of such a shape was related to the costs of the land rather than to design, social or planning considerations. The density and number of dwelling units in the project was chosen so that the maximum number of apartments (774) could be fit into three story structures with a 30% land coverage. This design was not governed by the later adopted rule of equivalent elimination, yet, the three decker slum housing of the site was replaced with housing of comparable densities. Of course this new housing was far superior in condition than the old slum dwellings.

The Orchard Park project typifies public housing in respect to its poor location and low quality of design. The drabness, uniformity and institutional character of the Orchard Park project is not so much the product of incompetence on the part of the architect but rather the result of conforming to the objectives of the Public Housing Authority. The Public Housing Authority's criteria for planning a project were actually antithetical to thoughtful and imaginative design. Cost limitations on land acquisition as well as minimum room costs were the real designers of the project. The recommendations of the Federal Manuals, linked with cost restrictions as well as the concept of slum clearance formed a tight bind. The Orchard Park project is unusual in that it included two schools and a park within its boundaries. An official 1946 publication of the Federal Public Housing Authority entitled "Public Housing Design" used the Orchard Park project site layout as an illustration of imaginative design which integrated park and playground into a project.7

7Public Housing Design - A Review of Experience in Low Rent Housing
In 1964 this integration is very unconvincing. Although the idea is sound, its execution has been poorly carried out. The school playgrounds are nothing more than fenced-in blacktop and calling the large open space in the center of the southern part of the project a "park" is a misnomer. This open space is a playground and large playfield, bleak, and treeless, but with ample chain link fencing. All of these recreational facilities are poorly maintained. These facilities do not relate well visually to the project housing and do not fulfill the dynamic roles that such play areas might serve in the Orchard Park project. The housing was placed around these facilities which were spared from demolition, yet the design of the project did not create functional and visual links between the new housing and the old facilities. The unsuccessful juxtaposition is most clearly evident by the tall, old, leavy looking baroque schools which stand isolated from the housing by large areas of fenced-in paving. (A more detailed analyses of recreational facilities is made in Chapter V).

The illustrations in the book "Public Housing Design" are characteristic of the planning of that period for the adjacent non-public housing areas are never shown in the plans. It appears that no attempt was made to relate the project to the outside neighborhood. The project was looked upon as a self contained neighborhood creating its own environment. The outside slum area was considered to be of a "creeping", blighting nature against which only a large, inward looking, contiguous project could stand up, as a fortress in the midst of a raging storm. Orchard Park was designed to be insular.

However, it appears that cost cutting was one of the highest priority objectives in the construction of Orchard Park project. The super-block contiguous-neighborhood unit concept was sacrificed in the selection
of wedge shaped areas solely in order to save costs. The economies of the Authority are also all too evident in the design of the housing itself. Twelve apartments have been crowded into each claustrophobic stairhall of the project buildings. Boston's building code required that each apartment have two means of egress. Other shortsighted savings were made through the use of small wooden windows in place of steel ones and small room sizes cut costs. Low foundations might have reduced the quantities of concrete and formwork required in the original construction, however, the result is that many of the first floor apartments have windows only two to three feet above the ground level. These low windows reduce the privacy of the first floor apartments as well as exposing the apartments to the vandalism of three-year olds and up. The spartan architecture, identical building plans, a common boiler plant, low ceilings, and few changes in grade elevation were additional means of cutting costs.

The planning for the Orchard Park project predated World War II, but since the project was built during the war it was rushed to completion and war workers were housed in the dwellings regardless of their income.

Upon its opening three buildings in the project were segregated for Negro occupancy. At this time it was only considered natural to separate Negroes from Whites.
The Social Composition of the Project

1. The Racial Composition of the Project

Table I shows the extremely rapid pace at which the Negro influx is occurring in the Orchard Park project. In 1957 only 12 percent of the project families were non-white. By 1963, only seven years later, 52.6% of the families in the project were non-white. In April, 1964 58% of the residents were Negro.

TABLE I -- Percentage of Non-White Families in the Orchard Park Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Non-White</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1964</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Boston Public Housing Authority

The Orchard Park project has a unique history in terms of racial composition. Up until 1958 Negroes were segregated in three buildings in the northeastern corner of the project. These buildings were physically separated by the park and the Dearborn School from the rest of the project housing. This cluster of buildings contained 90 dwelling units and accounted for 12.1 percent of the total population of the project.

The Housing Authority reversed its discriminatory policies in 1958 and freed the Orchard Park project for open occupancy. As soon as
Negro families began to move into what were formerly all white buildings. The white residents began to panic. As more Negroes moved into the project fewer whites applied for residence in Orchard Park. Thus the change in the racial balance accelerated. In 1963 a five month sample of the turnover of the project revealed that 81% of the total moveouts were White and only 19% were Negro. Simultaneously, 84% of the new families moving into the project were Negro and only 16% were White. (Table II)

TABLE II -- Five-month Sample, April 10, 1963 to September 10, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Moveouts</th>
<th>89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>17 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>72 (81%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Moveins</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>48 (84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population Breakdown by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The White residents of the project felt overwhelmed by the Negro move-ins even at the time when the Negro population only occupied 14% of the project's dwelling units. The Housing Authority made no efforts to
alleviate the fears of the tenants and the racial shifts occurring in the neighborhood surrounding the project accentuated the Whites' feelings that their community was being invaded. The past tradition of rigid segregation within the project negated the possibility of more harmonious race relations.

Many of the low income white tenants felt they had their backs up against a wall. These families could hardly afford to leave the project and felt threatened by the newcomers. These lower class White tenants were mostly Irish and tended to be very clannish and intolerant.

Many of the incoming tenants were southern Negroes and had had unhealthy interracial experiences. Thus the White and Negroes did not mix socially and racial tensions mounted. In fact these tensions have flared up into physical violence on a few occasions. Last year Boston's newspapers played up a melee on the project grounds as a race riot. This incident was actually sparked by some drunken young men insulting a project tenant and the racial issue was not the primary cause of the disturbance. Nevertheless, two years ago serious clashes between White and Negro teenage gangs did have obvious racial overtones.

When interviewed, white tenants blame the "colored" families for the vandalism and delinquency of the area. White children in the project claim that the older Negro boys beat them up and extort money from the smaller kids. These racial conflicts are explosive, however, recent attempts at community organization by a local settlement house seems to have eased some of these tensions. Furthermore as the project gets more heavily non-white, the racial tensions are decreasing. The young children of the project play together regardless of race. Teenagers and adults are less likely to socialize across racial lines.
2. Income Distribution

In 1963 over eighty percent of Orchard Park project's families had incomes below $4,000. The median income of the project was $2,650 per family. In 1960 Boston's median family income was $5,747 - more than double that of the project. This wide income disparity is to be expected since Orchard Park is a low income project. However, Orchard Park has a concentration of families with incomes which are lower than those in other Boston public housing projects. For example, only 67% of the families in Old Colony, a project located in South Boston, have incomes below 4,000 dollars as compared to the 80% figure of Orchard Park.

The extent of the poverty of Orchard Park's tenants can be seen most clearly when income is related to family size. Scattergram #1 was drawn from a sample of 150 families in Orchard Park. This scattergram illustrates how larger families tend to have larger incomes and smaller families smaller incomes. However, as the family size increase, income increases at a decreasing rate. This means that large families, especially those with five members or more, tend to be relatively poorer than middle sized families.

The bulk of the single member families in the project receive incomes below $1,500. These individuals have such limited means due to the fact that they are generally over 65 years of age and are dependent on pensions, social security and welfare. Larger family sizes include families on relief as well as families whose Heads are employed. This accounts for the wider range of incomes of these family sizes. Take four-member families for example; some of these units receive as little as $1,500 while others earn as much as $6,500. The majority of
four member family incomes fall between 2,000 and 4,000 dollars.

The red line superimposed on the scattergram marks the incomes which have been determined to satisfy minimal family budget needs as estimated by the Community Council of Greater New York. Based on these criteria more than two-thirds of the sample families had insufficient funds to purchase the goods and services that are needed for an "adequate standard of living". The two groups with the highest proportions of inadequate incomes are the single elderly individuals and the large families.

A dollar level of poverty was defined by a study of the Joint Economic Council of Congress to mean a person "with an income equivalent to that of a member of a four-person family with a total income of not more than $2,500 in 1957 dollars." Using the committee's estimate (about $2,740 in 1963) a black line has been plotted on the scattergram. Approximately one-third of the project families fall below this "poverty line".

No matter which measure of poverty we choose to use, it is evident that a large proportion of the project families are poverty stricken. Fifty-four percent of these families are receiving public assistance and public assistance levels actually fall below the poverty level stipulated by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress.

---


Scattergram #1 - Income Distribution According to Family Size in Orchard Park

**Code**
- • = 1 Family
- ○ = 2 Families
- △ = 3 Families
- □ = 4 Families
- ■ = 5 Families

* based on sample of 150 families
September 1963
TABLE III -- Families Receiving Welfare in Orchard Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>Feb., 1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D.C. - Aid to Dependent Children</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.A.A. - Old Age Assistance</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.A. - Medical Aid to Aged</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.A. - Disability Assistance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.R. - General Relief</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Welfare Dept. 1964

The causes of the impoverishment of the tenants of the project are closely linked with the type of families they are. The following factors have led to their low earning power: The aged have retired and are unable to find work or are limited in their ability to work. As of February 1964 there were 135 elderly persons in the project receiving Old Age Assistance and 23 receiving Medical Aid to the Aged.

Thirty-nine project families receive disability assistance. These disabled have severe physical limitations; thus, they are unable to work.

Single adult heads of families have the double burden of raising children and earning a living. Inability to arrange for child care may keep these family heads from working. In Orchard Park 220 families are receiving public aid to families with dependent children.

Unemployment is an obvious explanation of low income. However, this report was unable to determine the extent of unemployment in the project.

Approximately half of the project is non-white. Non-white persons may suffer from severe discrimination so that their earning power is
limited. Some of these tenants have migrated to Boston from the South. The detrimental southern environment probably impaired the development of their employment skills.

Although the above mentioned causes of poverty are situational and involuntary, other factors such as poor education, psychological dependency, lack of motivation, and lack of intelligency may underly the poverty of the tenants.

This poverty does not appear to be of a temporary nature. In 1963 approximately 1½ of the families in the project moved due to over-income while 7½ of the families were evicted for non-payment of rent. The upward mobility concept which is part of our American tradition seems to be moving at a snail's pace in Orchard Park.

A recent study of another Boston Public Housing project concluded that the real income of the tenants (actually the project) had decreased since the opening of the project.\textsuperscript{10} It is likely that Orchard Park has had a similar experience. The rapid increase in the number of families receiving welfare within the project from 131 cases in 1955 to 431 cases in 1964 indicates that lower low income people now occupy the project than before. (See Table III)

Elizabeth Wood believes that a change in the "cultural level" of public housing tenants has occurred since the inception of the public housing program. She states:

The early tenants of public housing included many families who were middle class as to living standards, but were caught in the Depression with low income. These families used the projects well and happily. Today these families have moved up the economic ladder and have been replaced with tenants of a lower cultural level.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{10}Cornelius Conners, \textit{The Low Rent Public Housing Program in Boston} (Boston Housing Authority, 1959) p. 15.

\textsuperscript{11}Elizabeth Wood, \textit{A Comprehensive Program for Family Relocation} (Boston: Redevelopment Authority, Dec. 1962)
In the Orchard Park project, a breakdown of income between white and Negro families revealed a Negro family median which was higher than the white family median. This does not mean that the recent immigrant Negro families are better off than the whites. Rather the larger family size of Negro families accounts for their higher incomes. It is probable that both Negro and Whites now living in the project have lower real incomes than previous tenants.

TABLE IV -- The Income Distribution of the Families in the Orchard Park Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Total Families</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>below $2,000</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 3000</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000 - 4000</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000 - 5000</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000 - 6000</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 6000</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$2650</td>
<td>$2438</td>
<td>$2905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The White families who have been leaving the project are predominantly young families who have had the financial and social flexibility to move. The elderly and poorer whites have been less mobile and have remained in the project. This pattern, typical of neighborhoods in racial transition has resulted in a lowering of the real income of the community. For when the more mobile Whites abandoned the project a process of natural selection occurred under which the so-called "hard core" problem and dependent
families stayed in the project and their ranks were swelled by the incoming problem families.

3. Rents and their Payment

The cost of construction and amortization of the Orchard Park project are subsidized by the Federal Government, but operating costs of the project must be covered by tenant's rents. The Boston Housing Authority fixes rents according to the income of each tenant family. These rents account for approximately 20% of tenant's income. However, in the attempt to remain financially solvent the Authority sets minimal rents for those families receiving public assistance. In 1963 the lowest rents of the project were $40 a month. People entirely dependent on social security or on General Relief were charged this minimal rent. Families receiving other forms of welfare paid a minimum of $47 a month for apartments up to two bedrooms in size and $55 monthly for larger apartments. One consequence of these minimal rent levels has been that many of the elderly families in Orchard Park end up using approximately one-third of their incomes for rent. This rent-income ratio of the elderly far exceeds the recommended family expenditure of 20 - 25% of income for rent purposes.

The rents in Orchard Park are constantly adjusted to correspond to the income fluctuations of the residents. During the year of 1963 222 families had their rents adjusted.
TABLE V -- Rent Adjustments in Orchard Park - 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Adjustment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of adjustments</td>
<td>222 families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreases</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The adjustment of $1.00 monthly rent is based on a $60 change in yearly income.

One hundred twenty eight of these tenants had their rent increased on the average by $15.87 per month. Ninety four families had decreases averaging $16.03. These average rent adjustments represent a $960 increase or decrease in income. These large income fluctuations are most likely due to a change in the employment status of one family member. A teenager may enter the job market and raise the total family income or a family member may become unemployed and have to go on relief.

The large average shift in family incomes covers up the fact that rent adjustments varied from $3 to $50. The families with small rent adjustments are the ones most likely to have employed members who received raises in their salary. The fact that almost as many families in the project lost income as gained income in 1963 shows the unstable economic position of the residents.

The manner in which tenants pay their rents is an additional by-product of their poor financial straits. A large number of the families in Orchard Park do not pay their rents on time for these households seem to be unable to manage their budgets in a responsible fashion. In 1963 fifty families were evicted from the project for non-payment of rent.
This amounts to an annual rate of approximately 7% of the project's population forced to leave the project because of rent defaults.

TABLE VI -- Evictions in the Orchard Park Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Non-Payment of Rent</th>
<th>Nuisance</th>
<th>Ineligible</th>
<th>Removal by Constable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The extremely high proportion of tenants evicted by management demonstrates that many difficult and irresponsible families live in the project. In 1963 six families had to be evicted by constable. In this year Orchard Park had rent arrears amounting to $21,612. This record of default was only greater in the Columbia Point public housing project in Boston ($30,735). Yet Columbia Point has almost twice as many residents as Orchard Park.

TABLE VII -- The Largest Rent Arrears of Boston's Public Housing Projects in 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacated Rent Arrears</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30,735</td>
<td>Columbia Point</td>
<td>1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$21,613</td>
<td>Orchard Park</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,366</td>
<td>Bromley Park</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,583</td>
<td>Charlestown</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,175</td>
<td>Mission Hill</td>
<td>1023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,340</td>
<td>Old Colony</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Family Size and Age

In June 1963 the average family in the Orchard Park project had 3.64 members. Table VIII gives a detailed description of the varying sizes of the project's families. One of the most striking features of this distribution is the unusually high proportion of one parent families with children. Almost half of the families living in the project with children only have one parent. These heads of these families are women who receive their financial support from the A.D.C. welfare program. These women are either widowed, divorced or separated from their spouses, and illegitimate children are not uncommon. There are 600 children in the project who belong to these female-headed households. The remainder of the 1559 children in the project have two parents. It is interesting to note that the average A.D.C. mother has more children than the average normal two-parent family.

Slightly more than 20 percent of the families in the Orchard Park project have six members or more. In the city of Boston as a whole only 9.6 percent of the family units have six or more members. Obviously the project has an unusually high concentration of large families. While larger middle class families tend to live in the suburbs only 10.7% have more than five members of the households in the Boston Metropolitan Area. An average suburb rarely has more than 12% of such large families.\(^{12}\)

It is evident that public housing projects such as Orchard Park have population compositions which are at variance to the demographic trends within American cities. In metropolitan areas families with child-

\(^{12}\)Eleven percent of the families in Revere, Beverly, Lynn and Peabody had 6 members or more. U. S. Census, 1960.
TABLE VIII -- Sample Family Size Distribution in Orchard Park  September, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>No. of Families</th>
<th>Percent of Families</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 person family</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 person adult family</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adult &amp; child</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 person adult family</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 1 child</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 2 child</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 person with 1 child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 2 child</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 3 child</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 person with 3 child</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 4 child</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 person with 3 child</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 4 child</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 5 child</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 person with 4 child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 5 child</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 6 child</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 person with 5 child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 6 child</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 7 child</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 person with 7 child</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 8 child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 person with 8 child</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 person with 8 child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with 9 child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 person with 10 child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 person with 11 child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 person with 12 child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 person with 13 child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>*726 families</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2640</td>
<td>1081</td>
<td>1599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Family size - 3.64
Median Family size - 3.42
Number of 1 Parent Families - 222 (46.8% of families with children)
Number of children with one parent - 600

*Note: sample did not include all 774 units in project
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ren tend to live in the outer, less densely populated areas. Boston's median family size is 2.5 persons as compared to 3.4 of the project. This means that the project has been designed so that large families with numerous children live in a dense urban area. If market forces were free to operate and low income families were given the means to live in outlying areas, families with children might choose to live in suburbia. As it is now, low income project families must not only live in the central city but they also must live in high density dwellings (see section V-2 on Density).

The Orchard Park project has a smaller proportion of two and three person families than the Boston average. The project families are skewed towards larger sizes, with the exception of an average proportion of single person units. The project consequently has an abundance of children (59% of the population) and a relative scarcity of adults. Middle aged adults are in shortest supply. Almost all of the single person families are over 65 years old and two person adult families tend to be elderly couples generally over 50 years of age. The scarcity of adults between 30 and 45 years of age (especially males) has created an undesirable social situation. There are too few adults to properly supervise and control the scads of children. Many of these children do not have fathers nor are there many other male models with whom they could have meaningful and healthy relationships.

The racial split within the project has produced additional distortions in the social structure of the project. A breakdown of the age of the heads of households by race (Table IX) shows that Negro family Heads are generally much younger than whites.
TABLE IX - Age of Heads of Household by Race as of August 10, 1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th>NEGRO</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 plus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22--25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26--30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31--45</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 and up</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost 20% of Negro families are headed by persons less than 25 years old and 50% of Negro Household Heads are between 26 and 45 years of age. Only 8% of the white families have Heads younger than 25 and only 35% are middle aged (26 - 45 years old). Almost 60% of the white adults are over 46 years old and the whites constitute the majority of elderly families within the project. Mr. Howard, the new project manager reports that the small number of incoming whites tend to be elderly persons so that even these move-ins reinforce the overall trends of the project's social composition. The age disparities between the racial groups of Orchard Park creates an added complication in interracial relations.

5. Delinquency, Property Destruction and Community Disorganization

There is an incredible amount of property destruction in the Orchard Park area. Vandalism ranges from breaking windows and marking up mailboxes to burning and destroying automobiles. A common "playsculpture" to be found
within and without the project are car hulks, tireless, windowless, motorless and unbelievably battered.

The open spaces of the project are often littered with broken glass, ripped up plants and twisted fencing. The entranceways into the project's buildings and the ground floor apartments have taken the most heavy delinquent abuse. The exterior entrance doors are badly beat up. Ground floor apartment windows frequently have damaged screens and broken panes.

The long time residents of the area remark about how the project wasn't like this years ago. Somehow the former tenants had more respect for property and were a less rowdy bunch. The increase in ADC families is often pointed to as the cause of some of these changes. There is a correlation between ADC families and "problem families" who exhibit antisocial behavior.

Lest we paint a picture which is too black we must keep in mind that the project has various sections, some of which are handsomely maintained and undamaged. It would also be a mistake to consider all ADC families as delinquent families. Some of the vandalism is caused by children from normal families and by outsiders coming into the project.

Furthermore, the deterioration of the project cannot be viewed independently from the forces in the surrounding neighborhood. Orchard Park is located in the center of a declining neighborhood. Although the project is immune from the physical obsolescence and dilapidation characteristic of the surrounding land uses, the project has not been in itself a community vibrant enough to generate a countertrend of renewal and neighborhood rejuvenation.
The racial transition as well as the growing concentration of dependent and problem families has added to the demoralization of the community. In 1959 a report on the Orchard Park project underscored their impression of the negative changes in the neighborhood. The report claimed that the:

...rapidly shifting population and deterioration of the physical environment had resulted in a withdrawn, frustrated, frightened and hostile populace. Anonymity had become a way of life...  

This finding can be supported by a close study of the project during the nighttime as well as the day. The nighttime in particular is when much of the pathology of the area becomes most vivid. For at night it is dangerous to walk around the project. Outsiders tend to be especially frightened as residential and industrial lower Roxbury merge in the darkness. One gets the sensation of being in a dim, dark, desolate place. There are few people on the streets and the project has an eerie silence for such a dense residential area. The dullness and uniformity of the project is accentuated by the nighttime. The lighting in the project is dim and virtually no lighted stores border the project. Gangs of teenagers may roam around the site but this is a source of little comfort to most people.

6. Turnover and Tenant Selection Procedures

The Orchard Park project has one of the highest turnover rates of all of Boston's public housing projects. In 1963 18% of the project's units changed occupants while the city-wide project turnover was 11.3%. The main, all too obvious reason for the turnover is the racial transition.

---

13 United Community Services Committee on Recreation Health & Welfare Services to Housing Development Neighborhoods "Report on the Orchard Park Development Program", (Boston: May 25, 1959)

14 This is an impressionistic statement supported by the real fears of some of the tenants.
TABLE X - Turnover in the Orchard Park Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vacated During Year</th>
<th>Percent Vacated</th>
<th>Moved in Boston</th>
<th>Moved Outside Boston</th>
<th>1-Person Info. Family Died</th>
<th>Info. Not Own Avail.</th>
<th>Purchased Own Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Boston Housing Authority

The reason responsible for almost half of the turnover is the evictions for non-payment of rent. Some of these evictions may be related to racial factors. Families who decide to leave the project because of the changing racial balance may let their rent bills pile up thereby enriching themselves in the process of moving. Nevertheless, irresponsible and nuisance families who live in the project tend to move or be moved. Turnover due to overincome is very slight.

Other reasons for the turnover are harder to determine. Tenant dissatisfaction is undoubtedly a factor. The project has been physically deteriorating due to vandalism and neglect. Furthermore the influx of more "problem families" has made the project less desirable for many tenants.

One would think that the Public Housing Authority, which can control tenant selection would not have allowed this state of affairs to have developed. On the other hand the Authority may have intentionally directed Negroes and problem families to Orchard Park. The NAACP has accused the Authority of practicing segregation\textsuperscript{15} so perhaps the B.H.A. segregates good and bad tenants into good and bad projects respectively.

\textsuperscript{15}Figures cited in the April 1963 complaint by NAACP against the Boston Housing Authority, filed with the Massachusetts Committee Against Discrimination, shows that 98\% of the Negroes in Boston's public housing live in less than half the projects.
This conspiratorial explanation for the population patterns of Boston's projects is not easily substantiated by fact. It is likely that placement procedures have encouraged tenants to choose the projects they prefer to live in. There have been instances where local management has attempted to segregate their projects but this has been the exception rather than the rule. But segregation does exist and the Authority has done little about it.

7. Former Residence

Approximately eighty percent of the tenants in the project formerly resided in Roxbury and Dorchester. Most of the remaining twenty percent left the South End of Boston to move into the project. This contiguous inter-neighborhood movement is a pattern common to most of Boston's public housing projects.

TABLE XI - Former Residence of Orchard Park Tenants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roxbury</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica Plain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Point</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>306</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It appears that low income tenants naturally choose to live in a project in a neighborhood with which they are already familiar. Information about vacancies and opportunities within a project may spread by word of mouth to friends of project families living in nearby areas. Placement of tenants through political influence (which is very common) also has caused these parochial movement patterns.\(^{16}\)

Boston's public housing projects are defacto segregated in ethnic as well as racial patterns. Few clear cut rules governed the Authority's placement of tenants yet projects can be identified with ethnic and racial groupings. There are Jewish projects - Franklin Field, Italian projects - East Boston, Irish projects - Charlestown, Mission Hill, Negro projects - Lenox Street, Whittier Street, Bromley and now Orchard Park. These patterns have been significantly determined by the location of the project. Orchard Park, as other projects, has racial and ethnic traits which closely resemble those of the surrounding neighborhood.

\(^{16}\)The competition for getting admitted to Boston's recently constructed housing units for the elderly has been very intense. References from John F. Kennedy, Governor Peabody, and other high level politicians were not uncommon.
V - The Site Plan

1. The Project's Environs

The Orchard Park project has the shortcomings typical of public housing yet it still stands out in almost pleasant relief to the deteriorating environs. Decaying industrial, residential and commercial land-uses surround the project.

The heaviest industrial areas lie east of the project. Boston Edison Company's main plant, a baking company, leadpipe manufacturing facilities, ice plants, motor freight stations, large foundries and other manufacturing works are located in this eastern district known as South Bay. The topography is flat and some of the factories give off odors and fumes which pollute the air. To the northeast of the project is a smaller grouping of industrial and automotive land-uses. Recently due to the abundance of cheap space junkyards, gas stations, plumbing supply facilities and other marginal types of businesses are found here. These enterprises developed in between clusters of residential buildings. Much of this housing has been torn down and replaced with parking lots or turned into vacant rubble-filled lots.

South of the project is an attractive residential section. However, the buildings immediately bordering the southern edge of the project are in poor condition. The western end of the Orchard Park project abuts the major shopping district of Roxbury - Dudley Station. The shopping area extends along Warren, Dudley and Washington Streets. The elevated rapid transit line along Washington Street, the traffic congestion near Dudley Station and the deteriorating quality of some of the stores in the area (especially the bars) have added to the blight of Lower Roxbury.
There are very abrupt transitions between the industrial or commercial areas and the Orchard Park project itself. In the past, thin strips of residential housing, mostly three deckers and brick row houses served as a barrier between the project and the non-residential land- uses. But as many of these houses have been demolished and others continue to deteriorate. The project is increasingly exposed to the industrial and commercial areas. At the same time the losses of population and the removal of dwelling units in these nearby areas has intensified the isolation of the project.

The precedent may have been set by the Whittier Street public housing project. This project located in the northern edge of Lower Roxbury now stands completely isolated in the midst of vacant lots and a few boarded-up houses. Orchard Park may be in danger of becoming similarly isolated. The inner belt is scheduled to pass through the northeastern corner of the GNRP only two blocks east of the Orchard Park project. This expressway would cut a wide swath separating most of the industry in the area from the project. The only residential area that is likely to remain standing is south of the project above Dudley Street and beyond it. At present the tenants of Orchard Park use Dudley Street for its stores and as a roadway towards Dudley Station but the hilly topography south of Dudley Street tends to set that neighborhood apart from the project. The tenants of Orchard Park are oriented towards Dudley Station. This station is a major shopping resource as well as the key point for commuting throughout Boston. Dudley Station is the central MTA terminal of Roxbury. This station on the Forest Hill rapid transit line is the most heavily used station other than those in Downtown Boston. Twelve bus lines converge at Dudley Station so that its develop-
ment as the central shopping area for Roxbury is natural. Furniture stores, clothes stores, 5 & 10 cent stores, entertainment places and restaurants are to be found here. Of special importance to residents of the Orchard Park project is Blairs, an enormous shopping market that has the character of a department store. Tenants shop at Blairs, however, a second food market is conveniently located on the corner of Zeigler and Dearborn Streets, the geographic center of the project. Other stores along Washington and Warren Streets are also in walking distance from the project. It is interesting to note that the project does have corner grocery stores. Three incredibly battered combination grocery-candy stores are located along the edges of the project.

2. The Project Density and Lack of Privacy

Approximately twenty seven hundred people live in the Orchard Park project. These residents occupy three story walkups at a density of 170 person/net acre or 47 DU's/net acre. This density exceeds that recommended by the APHA for 3 story buildings (42 DU/acre). The houses of the Orchard Park project only cover 31.4% of the site yet one still feels that the project is overcrowded.

Some overcrowding exists despite the fact that this is public housing. If we match up the distribution of apartment sizes in Orchard Park with the family size distribution, we can see that at least 10% of the families are overcrowded. Overcrowding is defined as a density of 1.01 persons per room or greater. 

Half of the families with six members or more are living in overcrowded accommodations.

———

17 Overcrowding is defined as a density of 1.01 persons per room or greater.
TABLE XII--Comparison between Family Size and Apartment Size in Orchard Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment Size</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bedroom</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>1 person</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>2 persons</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>3 persons</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4 persons</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bedrooms</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5 persons</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 persons</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Boston Housing Authority

Although sociologists maintain that privacy is less important to lower class families than middle class families, the Orchard Park project does not even have clearly defined public spaces which might at least be identified with each house or a group of contiguous houses. Low income tenants who have middle class values may be discouraged from living in the project because of this lack of privacy.

The placement of 12 apartments on one minimal sized stairhall has been a source of conflict among tenants. Children often choose to play in hallways on cold and rainy days causing disturbances. The placement of small apartments next to large ones has resulted in elderly residents being mixed in with large families. Common complaints are of leaving the radio on loud and into the late hours. Noise from children is also disturbing to the elderly.

Boston's public housing tenants are required to clean their own hallways. Each tenant takes his turn in maintaining the halls for a month. This regulation often aggravates any tensions that may exist. The Davis
Elementary School is located across the street from the project on Yeoman Street. This is one of the oldest schools in Roxbury with a capacity of 265 pupils. This school is in worse shape than Palmer and should be abandoned as soon as possible.

Many of the Catholics in the project (mainly the white Catholics) attend the St. Patrick's Elementary and High School.

The only community centers in the area is the Roxbury Service Center in the project and the Roxbury Neighborhood House on Albany Street and a YMCA. The Service Center of the Neighborhood House is located on the second floor of the administration building. This facility consists of a large meeting room unsuited for play activities. The Roxbury Neighborhood House has more extensive facilities. (The programs of these settlement houses will be described under community organization.

3. Circulation and Parking

The Orchard Park project is basically two superblocks. The two streets that run through the eastern half carry almost no traffic. The lane in the western half is similarly of such a local nature as to only be used for parking purposes. The Orchard Park project has numerous parking areas. These tend to be small bays which are relatively unused. The percentage of car ownership within the development is very low and there are enough streets around the project for parking cars. The parking bays are unsightly as no planting or barrier separate them from the housing. The automobiles parked in these bays are often old jalopies and stolen or abandoned cars. These parking lots are rarely more than 50% full.
4. The Site Design

The basic layout of the project is that of long rectangular buildings placed parallel to each other. The project grounds are physically divided into two parts. The western half is a triangular section with corridors of housing. These corridors end at the edge of the project and do not act as visual links or passageways to the outside neighborhood. The eastern half of the project is irregularly shaped and contains the park after which the project was named. The housing here maintains the corridor pattern except that it is strung around the park. Two streets traverse this segment but only one of these carries any through traffic.

The two halves of the project are placed corner to corner so that outsiders often think there are two separate developments. The street patterns around the project are very confusing. Streets twist and turn in this area which was once the old town of Roxbury. One must orient one's self by landmarks rather than street paths.

The open spaces between the project buildings are approximately \( \frac{1}{3} \) times the height of the structures thus allowing adequate light and air into the dwelling units. These open spaces are covered with blacktop, fenced-in lawns, clothes drying areas and parking lots. These land uses leave the spaces visually open if not barren looking. The effect is that of long corridors with wall to wall blacktop. The harshness of the monotonous red brick housing with its small windows is intensified by the institutional wire mesh fencing and the black bituminous. In the summer months a few shrubs and skinny trees add spots of greenery to sections of the project. A garish touch has recently been added to
this fairly dismal scene. The meagre entrances to the housing have been painted in colors ranging from maroon to purple and turquoise blue.

The visual boredom is a reflection of the lack of variety and individual expression. Tenants don't even hang wash out of their windows but must put their laundry in the designated fenced in drying areas.

**Landscaping**

The landscaping of the project is dull and unimaginative. The terrain is flat and all the planting fenced in. Fenced in lawn areas actually become ideal play lots for young children who destroy the greenery. The fencing itself takes a beating from the children and looks shabby and unattractive. Planting does not flourish well when abused by innumerable children but the less intensively used parts of the project do have some successful foliage growth. The eastern corner of the project and the areas east of Adams Street are all well maintained. These areas abut industrial land uses yet are close to the park. The Adams Street section is notable in that there is an attractive change of ground level. Steps lead from one level to the other enlivening the terrain. This area also has the distinction of having fenced-in laundry areas which are pleasantly covered with ivy.

A few other spots in the project have successful planting. These places are usually next to houses where elderly families live or where the tenants have been organized. The local settlement house has organized the western portion of the project into Block Groups who meet and participate in community activities. The manager of the development has also attempted to work with these tenants and obtain their
cooperation in maintaining the grounds. These efforts have led to a measure of improvement and plans are underway to allow tenants to plant their own flower gardens. The improvement in the condition of the ground (which still leaves much to be desired) is also a result of having two policemen patrolling the project during the evening hours.

Recreational Facilities

The project has a park as well as two schools within its grounds. The park is the only area with play equipment. This equipment consists of a slide, monkey bars, two large concrete pipes, a handball court, a basketball court and a wading pool. The park also has a large grass playfield which is used for baseball and other sports. The park and the field are enclosed with double fencing - one 7 feet high, and other 3 feet. The school yards are simply blacktop and these are fenced in and rarely used after school hours.

These facilities are grossly inadequate for the project. Fifteen hundred project children need more than one playground and there are no nearby playgrounds outside of the project. The existing facilities are poorly maintained and they are rarely supervised by adults. No organized recreational programs go on, other than in the two summer months and at the Roxbury Neighborhood House's central building on Albany Street outside of the project.

No indoor play areas exist in the project. No outdoor recreational facilities have been designed for adults.

Community Facilities

The Palmer Elementary School on the project grounds was built in
1895 and has a capacity of 190. It is in poor condition with obsolete plumbing and heating. The school is three stories high and its design is outdated. The school’s wooden interior constitutes a fire hazard and the small seating capacity falls below the 300 pupil size which is now considered minimal for efficient operation in an urban area.

The Dearborn Elementary School also located on the project grounds is in better shape. Built in 1906 with an annex added in 1921, the total capacity equals 840 pupils. Children from grade three to eight attend these fireproof structures. While the Palmer Elementary School is outdated and should be torn down, the Dearborn School can be renovated and the site improved.
VI -- The Functional Use of the Project

1. Actual Land Use

The children in the project ingenuously use every inch of the site for their games. If the ten acres of open space in the development is divided by the child population (1559), there is only 133 square feet of exterior space per child. This area may be used for lawns, planting, parking, blacktop, walks, laundry racks and for other non-play purposes. But children tend to ignore this fact and use all these areas as part of their grounds. They may also play on the roofs, in the hallways and in the streets of the neighborhood.

Certain play patterns are evident and they tend to vary according to age group. The tiny tots and young children ranging from one to twelve years old spend most of their playtime right in front of their own houses. Most mothers prefer this, so that they can keep an eye on their children. Kids naturally tend to play outside or in the hallways of their own or nearby buildings. The importance of this pattern cannot be emphasized enough. Mothers complain that there are no benches in front of their houses where they can sit out near their children. Many mothers find it inconvenient to take their children to the one playground in Orchard Park. This playground tends to be unsupervised and used by the older and often rougher children. Inasmuch as the spaces near the housing were not designed for child play, children make the best of what is there.

The difficulties in maintaining lawns and hallways are inevitable when children have no place else to go.

The new manager of the project is aware of these patterns and has begun to set aside certain lawns for tot lots. Plans are also underway
CHILDREN PLAY NEAR BUILDING ENTRANCES
to put some play equipment close to the houses.

The teenage population of the project is relatively small accounting for 13% of the children (161 persons between the ages of 15-18). Teenage boys use the park for basketball and baseball (basketball being most popular). Some of these youngsters participate in the activities of the Roxbury Neighborhood House outside the project. Many of the teenagers hang out in gangs and much of the costly property destruction is caused by a few of these young toughs showing off to their friends at the late hours of the night. The most frequent nuisance complaints result from the adolescent behavior of this group. Teenage alcoholism and brawling cause many disturbances. Teenagers may do their drinking in hallways or gather on the grounds and throw their empty bottles. A more innocent and less harmful cause of complaint is of teenagers removing the light bulbs in the hallways so that they can have a place to neck and socialize with the opposite sex.

During the day, mothers in the project are to be found in or outside their homes with their children, going shopping or doing household chores. While some mothers closely supervise their children, others let their kids run wild.

Men are rarely seen on the project grounds. The few that may be visible are likely to be elderly men or maintenance men and salesmen. Men have notably little to do in the project. Kurt Back's study of Puerto Rican public housing as compared to slum housing found that:

management had taken over the control of neighborhood affairs which was largely in the hands of the men of shanty town. Since public housing belongs to the government most men feel it is up to management or the police to settle disputes between neighbors.18

In Orchard Park the traditional roles of men as the providers of income and making physical repairs in the home have largely been taken over by the state. Men may have become vestigial, except for their sexual and psychological prowess.

Surprisingly few elderly occupants sit outside of their apartments during the hot summer months. Many of the elderly remain indoors most of the time, although, the recent organization of the "seniors" has encouraged these people to become active in the local settlement house. (see Chapter VII) No outside facilities other than the three or four benches in the project are designed so that the elderly may use them.

2. The Maintenance of the Project over the Years

Long before the construction of the project Orchard Park was an attractive neighborhood park with large elm trees, a wading pool and a little house for children to play in. Although Mr. Milrick, the development director of the B.H.A., recalls that the character of the park was deteriorating as far back as prohibition. Supposedly the bootleggers of that era used the rotted out areas of some of the elms to store their booty. In 1938 a hurricane knocked down many of the attractive elms and in later years elm blight attacked the trees. Meanwhile the park was enclosed by the new housing project. This led to some jurisdictional disputes in terms of the park supervision. The Boston Park Department had been lax in their maintenance of the park and the Housing Authority unsuccessfully attempted to get funds to rehabilitate the park. Finally due to the influence of citizen's groups as well as the EHA the Park Department put new equipment in the playground of the park and turned the remainder of the park into a baseball field. Thus the placement of this

---

19 Interview with Mr. Milrick, Director of Project Development, Boston Housing Authority, June 5, 1964.
park into the project eventually changed its use from a neighborhood park to a play area for the project's children.

The project grounds as originally designed divided the open courts between the buildings into "play areas", "sitting areas", "drying yards" (for hanging laundry) and "service areas" (for parking). (See map 6) The sitting areas were placed near the entrances to the buildings and simply consisted of a few benches. The play areas were placed in the center of the corridors between the buildings. Swings, sliding ponds and see-saws were put in many of these areas designated for child play.

The benches were constructed with concrete bases and wooden slats. Vandals often broke the slats and even the bases; although the weather wore down the concrete so that the bases often looked as if someone hit them with a sledge-hammer. 20 It was difficult for the management to maintain the benches and eventually almost all of them were removed. Some tenants complained about the teenagers who sat on these benches and "used foul language". At night the benches were allegedly used for "immoral purposes". 21 The final removal of the benches was the manager's reaction to these complaints.

The movable play equipment (swings and see-saws) in the court-yards were broken by the children and also resulted in a number of accidents. The management removed this equipment "for safety reasons". 22

20 Ibid.

21 Interview with Charles Cooper, former manager of the Orchard Park project, June, 1964.

22 Ibid.
Early in the history of the project attempts were made to organize the mothers to supervise the play areas. Mothers were to take turns monitoring the areas near their homes. After a week or so this system broke down as many of the mothers didn't keep to their schedule.

One of the most amusing aspects of the evolution in the design and facilities within the project is that of the sand boxes. Dogs from the outside neighborhood often used the sand pits to urinate in. Boston's Board of Health looked at this in askance. But when a decomposed cat was found in a sand box in the Heath Street project the Housing Authority removed all the sandboxes from their projects.

Of course grass was impossible to cultivate in the project. The Authority blacktopped some grass areas, especially the narrow strips between the walks and the houses. Other areas were fenced in so that they wouldn't look like "McPhadens Flats." Yet one wonders how the authority can consider fenced in grass an amenity, although blacktop is also not a very attractive landscape feature.

In its efforts to maintain order the Authority was never flexible enough to redesign facilities to meet the tenants' needs. Instead, a philosophy developed which designs out all opportunities for misbehavior and creating nuisances. The price to pay was to strip the project of those few amenities that were still possible under the restricted budget. Furthermore, the solution of the maintenance problem by the removal of the facilities destroyed the informal social controls which design can influence. This lack of facilities created peopleless places. Vacuums open to the public and so public that no one feels responsible for their

23 Ibid.
surveillance. When informal social controls do not exist policemen and hired watchmen must fill in the vacuum.

The inability of the Authority to reshape the project to suit the residents' needs illustrates how the middle class values of the management prevented their understanding of lower class values and way of life. As one mother in the Orchard Park project put it,

Why don't they (the maintenance men) stop wasting money on keeping up the grass and use the money for something useful like playgrounds for my kids. Those skinny looking trees don't mean anything to me. 24

24 Interview with young mother in Orchard Park project.
VII -- Tenant-Management Relations and Social Services

1. Social Services

The Orchard Park project is fortunate in having both an excellent manager and one of the best project community service centers in Boston. Two years ago the project had neither. When David Liederman, the director of the settlement house, arrived two years ago he described conditions as follows:

At the outset, based on many door-to-door visits, talks with local officials and public and private agency personnel, we found far too much apathy and disorganization in the project community. The development was physically neglected to the point where windows would remain broken for periods up to a year, apartments were not painted for as many as 15 years, broken glass and litter were present on the grounds in vast quantities. In addition, the white group was panic stricken by the rapid influx of Negroes. There were no programs specifically geared toward bringing people together to work for a better community; and except for the activity programs of the Neighborhood House, Emanuel House and the Boys Club, each serving a small group, the young people were not being worked with at their level. It was also obvious that a number of agencies provided individual services, but there was a real absence of co-ordination.

Liederman set out to implement, what he calls a "generic" method of fighting neighborhood disorganization. This approach was to combine the use of community work, case work and group work. The following set of priorities were set in order to best utilize the limited funds of the Settlement House:

1. Combating Neighborhood Disorganization
2. Development of Good Tenant to Management and Agency to Management Relations
3. Initiating Program and Tenant Education
4. Integration of Services


26 Ibid., p. 6-36.
5. Stimulation of Private Service Agencies to Assume their Duties Relating to the Special Needs of the Neighborhood

6. Work with "Dependent" families

7. Integration of the Development Neighborhood with the Surrounding Community

These objectives are far more comprehensive than the usual "band aid" approach of social workers. Too often social workers have limited themselves to recreational programs and case work.

The Roxbury Service Center is attempting to attack social problems on many levels. By now more than half of the project have been organized into Block Groups. Each Block Group consists of tenants from 7 buildings (a building being defined as a stairhall usually with 12 dwelling units). The tenants first meet in one of their neighbor's apartments and discuss common problems. The manager of the project in an effort to cooperate with and encourage these groups will attend meetings if his presence is requested. In this manner effective communication is established between tenants and management. Tenants also have the opportunity to get together by themselves and thrash out disagreements and decide on various forms of action, be it better maintenance of their hallways or electing representatives from among themselves.

In addition to organizing tenant groups Liederman and his staff (mainly one other full time social worker) work with the teenagers of the project. These efforts have been largely restricted to working with two teenage gangs. The gangs play basketball two times a week at the Roxbury Neighborhood House. The Vols, a white group of 25-30 teenage boys hang out in the western half of the project. The Chargers, a group of 15 Negro teenagers spend most of their time in the eastern half. Most of the members of these gangs have had at least one appearance in court for various offenses. Working with these groups has proven to be an effective way of
reaching other teenagers in the project as well as preventing racial conflict. A program for the teenage girls is being conducted by the Big Sister Association.

The most outstanding success of the Service Center's program has been in the organization of the elderly in the community. There are approximately 260 persons in the project over the age of 60. There was a total absence of activities for this group until the formation of the "Seniors" of the settlement house. The "Seniors" now have a dues paying membership of over 85. This group has developed a number of committees, print its own newsletter and has had trips, movies, speakers, parties, game nights, suppers and a banquet. Especially notable is the Visiting Friends Committee whose members visit "shut-ins" (elderly persons unable to participate in activities because of physical limitations. The "Seniors" serve the vital function of encouraging the elderly to become active, contributing members of the community. Loneliness and inactivity is reduced and the group has progressed as far as to serve meals two times a week.

The "Seniors" have been one of the few groups to develop real community leadership. Through their efforts the city of Boston was pressured into placing two full time foot patrolmen on the project between the hours of 6 p.m. to 12 p.m. at night.

Developing leadership and community participation among low income tenants is difficult. David Liederman's work is in many respects a new frontier. The low income segment of the American population has often been held to be apathetic and unable to participate in community affairs. Without the guidance of Liederman and his staff the tenants of Orchard Park would not have developed their leadership potentials. Perhaps Liederman's own evaluation best describes the effectiveness of the work of the Orchard Park Service Center:
...our approach is still to be measured. Organizing tenants into neighborhood groups is time consuming as well as tricky. It requires a great deal of leg work, patience and skill. Finding and developing leadership is rough mainly because, as pointed out earlier, this is a very young and a very old community. Many times in the young families personal problems block the focusing on neighborhood problems. As workers, we frequently have to spend a half hour or so with a co-chairman or representative around a personal concern before we can move on to the business at hand...The systematic way of reporting problems to management has resulted in progress and improvement. However, this alone will not hold groups together and it behooves us to move into new areas, such as programs of a social and educational nature...Opportunities for citizen action on the part of our tenant leadership is growing, particularly through the newly formed citywide Tenant Association Council...What we have tried to do with teenagers is pick up on those groups causing trouble in the areas in which we are working. This has been a slow process...To be sure, all is not rosy, but we do think our approach is sound and that things are better between tenants as they are forced to share this joint responsibility.27

27 Ibid., p. 6-10
2. Ownership and Management

Tenants lack a real sense of tenure, no less any possibility of owning their own apartment, under the public housing program. Each year every public housing tenant in the United States is subjected to an eligibility review. If a tenant has increased his income he is penalized by a rent increase. If a family has been fortunate enough to have secured a great improvement in their financial position, they run the risk of being evicted for overincome. If a tenant has lost income, the rent is reduced. If a tenant has been found to be paying less than he should be according to regulations, he is backcharged.

This annual ritual of investigating each and every tenant, takes management approximately six months to process. The Authority's staff is not expanded for this work, but may often work overtime, as they conscientiously "get the facts". Managers have been known to check every car located on the project grounds, to discover whether tenants have honestly been reporting their incomes.

This "means test" and subsequent rent adjustments are generally resented by tenants. Not only is financial information compiled, but tenant records contain a great deal of personal information. These records are handled by the local staff, in the site office, of each project. Thus, when a tenant enters public housing, he gets a "record" which contains some obviously irrelevant information for the purposes of rent determination. His privacy is further violated by the fact that the local management of the project he lives in is thoroughly familiar with this information. It is no wonder that some tenants cheat in their reporting of income, and management snoops. This is understandable behavior in reaction to the humiliating structural ar-
rangement for rent assessments. The incentives for tenants to co-
operate are negative, while talebearing, suspicions and distrust is
part of the requisite behavior of management.

The management of Orchard Park is actually of a high quality
despite the Authority's regulations. Tenants of the project generally
think well of the management and rules are flexibly and sensitively
applied. Nevertheless, public housing residents take little pride in
their neighborhood no less their own dwelling unit. The project manager
tries to convince tenants that they should think of the project as "their
home". But the tenants may lack a sense of security and cannot iden-
tify with the institutional structure of the project. The rules and
regulations of the Authority are one of the reasons for tenant anomie.
These regulations explicitly forbid, what in most rental situations, are
implicitly tenant rights. Furthermore, in a private situation one can
change landlords more easily than in public housing. One of the most
unbearable situations people may find themselves in is to live in a
dwelling under a nosey or imposing landlord. Public housing tenants
have to live in such a situation without meaningful alternatives.
Sociologists have referred to the rules of public housing as the im-
position of middle class values on lower class tenants. In Chapter X
these rules will be examined in detail and proposals will be made for
their revision.

---

28 Interview with Mr. Lloyd Howard, manager of the Orchard Park
project, June, 1964.
Summary

Our analysis shows that a poverty circle exists in the Orchard Park project. The tenants are poverty stricken and the environment is such that it seems to perpetuate the poverty. We can roughly break down the causes of poverty into two types. First there are the internalized and situational causes; age, race, family composition, intelligence, skills, aspirations and the general psychological outlook of the residents. These factors are social in nature. Some of these causes such as age and race are not amenable to change and society must create more opportunities for people with these characteristics. Other causes such as the widespread negativism of the residents and their irresponsible behavior can be eliminated by education and other processes through which the tenants themselves must change.

The second group of causes underlying the poverty are those which are mainly environmental. The project's institutionalism as well as the compositional structure of the community is such that the internalized and situational causes of poverty are reinforced. This is the great failure of Orchard Park. The government has had the opportunity to shape an environment which should have helped the poor break out of their poverty chains. Instead the project now appears to strengthen the links of the poverty cycle.

Poverty as we are using the term is more inclusive than just economic privation. Social disorganization, vandalism, dependency and the lack of individual expression and self-fulfillment is also part of the impoverishment in the lives of the people in this area.

We have seen that the social and physical design of the Orchard
Park project reflects a philosophy that underlies the American public housing program. This philosophy looks upon the program as "charity for the poor" and this charity is doled out in a frugal manner so that dollars become more important than people. Cost limitations and rules and regulations have quickly lead to institutionalism, rigidity, and bureaucracy. Short sighted savings have led to long standing poor design and inconvenience. Public housing with its peculiar brand of begrudging generosity has developed to the point that projects now have a stigma attached to them.

Jo Ann Ross, a tenant in the Columbia Point housing project feels that the public housing of Boston is the product of an "uncaring society". Property priorities have superseded human priorities. 29 Up until the present day the Boston Public Housing Authority has not considered what is needed to create viable communities. The human and neighborhood considerations have been an afterthought of economic and efficient operations. This has had disastrous affects and the Authority has been unable to cope with changing times. As the United States experienced increased prosperity public housing lost its middle class (see chapter IV) and a new tenancy of Negroes and welfare families of a lower cultural level began to occupy the projects. The inner city neighborhoods continued to deteriorate yet the Authority has practically done nothing to adopt its old projects to new challenges.

The public housing program was largely shaped by the politics of the time. Authorities would rarely be imaginative and consider social problems adequately for fear of the old bugaboo of "socialism" being tacked

on to the program. This political climate although no longer prevalent, has left its scars and projects such as Orchard Park now stand crippled, anemic and in need of improvement.

The structural framework of the public housing program itself is seen to have had adverse affects in the Orchard Park situation. Income limits have impaired the social strength of the community. Similar restrictions on the age of single person families and the excess of large apartments in the project have caused compositional distortions in the population of the project. Mechanisms for individual expression and initiative have been hampered by the monolithic ownership and control of the project by the Authority. Poor design, lack of adequate facilities, and a lack of privacy have also hurt the development. One of the most serious weaknesses of the project has been an excessive number of problem families. Furthermore the rapid racial transition severely disrupted the social fabric of the community.
Basic Objectives

This thesis sets out to explore the possibilities of improving the Orchard Park project. At this point, after having examined the history, the character and the trends of the project and its neighborhood we should be able to clearly see what kinds of improvements may be desirable.

The most serious problems of the area are social in nature. Low income, welfare dependency, old age, female headed households, vandalism, social disorganization and racial conflict. The physical deterioration of the nearby land uses, poor schools as well as the poor design and inadequacies of the project are also causes of community decline. However, the central issues are still socio-economic.

Physical improvements without simultaneous social changes are futile. The Housing Authority has had the experience of finding most of the physical improvements for Orchard Park, be they new shrubbery or park benches destroyed by the tenants. What is called for is a comprehensive approach and physical improvement may well be secondary in importance to social, economic and political changes within the area.

The following overall objective is proposed:

To turn the Orchard Park project and its environs into a community in which the economic and social position of the population can be improved.

The ideal to be striven for is of a neighborhood so structured as to act as a vehicle for social change. The environment should contain institutions and mechanisms that can enrich the lives of its inhabitants. The setting should encourage individual expression, and
at the same time a productive use of its citizens, and the neighborhood must be designed so as to satisfy the needs of all its members be they large families or small, young or old, problem families or normal families.

One of the most important functions of the community is as a place for the rearing of children. This process is a priority item and children must be brought up in a manner that will inculcate those values that are shared by the larger society (such as a belief in opportunity and self advancement). The environment must help develop psychologically secure individuals. Persons should be able to acquire the necessary abilities and skills for successful urban living. The present patterns of self-destructive, anti-social behavior on the part of some residents must be replaced with positive and self fulfilling behavior. Similarly the social disorganization of the project must be replaced with healthy social controls.

For all of this to occur genuine opportunities for advancement must be created and dynamic, incisive programs for the reformation of present conditions must be formulated.

The Planning Process and its Clients

We are planning for the existing population of both the project and the neighborhood. These people are the clients. Any physical changes which are recommended must be reflective of the needs and desires of this population. Planning should actually be done in consultation with these people. And the plans should be, to the greatest extent possible, implemented by these same residents. For changes which are intended to have an effect on the existing population should not come from the out-
side. Improvement in the conditions of the people must be internalized. The most significant reforms come from within and cannot be imposed from without. Consequently the key to this planning approach is citizen involvement. This involvement must be more than token. It must take the form of strong commitment, and if no such commitment is forthcoming, meaningful changes will not be feasible.

An illustration will clarify this point. To plant new trees in the project without having obtained the cooperation of the tenants to maintain the trees, would spell destruction for the plants. The trees should only be planted when their protection by tenants is assured. The process of getting residents to participate in the upkeep of the improvement is the most significant consequent of good planning.

By this definition, the planning process is an educational one whereby persons are encouraged and assisted in initiating and implementing their own betterment. The level of the skill and determination of the participants should define the pace and extent of the change.
The Proposals

Restructuring the Community

The suggestions made in this report can be grouped into two main types. First are those which attempt to reshape the social structure of the project area. The population mix will be redefined so that a more successful, combination of family sizes, racial composition, age distribution and public welfare levels can ensue. What is desired is a mixture of residents from whom sufficient leadership will be forthcoming and where social disorganization is eliminated. The population composition of the project is closely related to the maintenance of constructive social controls. The supervision of children in the project must be improved and a healthy child/adult ratio must be established. Compositional distortions such as the excessive number of problem families, elderly persons and the shortage of middle age adult men must be remedied. For these present imbalances impair the viability of the project and the ability of the environment to be a medium for social improvement.

Included in this concept of a balanced community is the necessity for mechanisms which enable families to improve their status. Home ownership, and job opportunities must be provided so that as the community matures it can find outlets for its self expression.

Design for Social Control

The second concept used to achieve our major objective is to design physical improvements for the project which will enhance social controls. Through the redesign of spaces, community facilities and housing facilities, a social structure will be established by means of which people can create their own social controls as well as fulfill their own needs. More spe-
cifically spaces will be designed for natural groups to come into existence. Shops and stores can be established for their value as social nodes. Play areas will be placed so that active sports will be distant from the housing while young children and tot areas will be close to the dwellings where mothers can supervise their children. Areas for adult and teenage activity will be so designed as to minimize conflicts between these groups yet encourage natural interaction and social exchange. Design will facilitate healthy social contact as well as creating opportunity for individual expression and privacy.
VIII -- Cutting Down the Imbalances

1. Quotas on the Number of Welfare Cases

As was shown in Chapter IV Fifty-four percent of the tenants in the Orchard Park project are receiving public assistance. The average proportion of tenants receiving welfare in the federally assisted public housing projects in Boston is 40%. In Boston's state aided public housing projects only 20% of the residents are on welfare.

TABLE XIII - Welfare Levels in Orchard Park Compared to All of Boston's Federally Aided Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare</th>
<th>Orchard Park</th>
<th>Federally Aided Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Age Assistance</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Assistance</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Aid to the Aged</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Relief</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dept. of Welfare, 1964

Table XIII shows the comparative distribution of the various types of welfare the tenants are receiving in Orchard Park and in the average federally aided Boston public housing project. The disparity is greatest in the number of Aid to Dependent Children cases (ADC). If the Orchard Park project were to have an average proportion of such cases, 129 ADC families would have to be replaced by normal families. Such a change would reduce the adult-child ratio and thus improve the supervision of
all of the children in the project. Such an adjustment would naturally entail an increase in the number of adult males in the project for the additional normal families would have male heads. Another reason why a quota limiting the number of ADC cases is recommended is that the correlation between ADC and problem families is high. If the most troublesome ADC families could be kept out of the project, two birds would be killed with one stone. The number of unsupervised children in the project would be reduced and the families who have had such a destructive effect on the project might be screened out.

Although problem and ADC families may be in great need of housing, there is no reason why the Public Housing Authority should place an excessive number of them in the Orchard Park project to the detriment of the project and the entire neighborhood. A moral point might even be made in that these families do not deserve a public housing rent subsidy if they cannot respect property and have an adverse affect on the development. Public housing can be expected to handle some of these cases but as their numbers increase it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the natural controls which a large stable population can exercise on a small unstable element within the society. The injustice of placing a large number of troublesome families with poor but responsible and well behaved families is evident. Special programs should be formulated for the problem families but the improvement of the condition of such families should not occur at the expense of imposed hardships on an entire community.

Of course the problem arises as to what should happen to the families we propose to prevent from getting into the project. For one thing we cannot remove the excessive number of problem families living
in the project presently. We must simply prevent additional families of this type to raise the proportion that is now excessive.

The exact number of ADC cases that Orchard Park can successfully house is difficult to determine. The average for all the Federally Aided Projects is not necessarily a desirable proportion. Furthermore market demand may be such that the project will not be able to rent a large proportion of its large sized apartments to 2-parent families. We must remember that one of the reasons Orchard Park has so many ADC cases is that the project has a high percentage of large sized dwelling units. This proportion of large apartments (and consequently large families) can only be offset by adding new smaller sized units or remodeling the large ones.

2. Micro Distribution

Some of the difficulties caused by ADC and problem families can be ameliorated by their careful placement within the project. Prior to the recent change in Management and the establishment of the Social Service Center, Orchard Park had so called "Trouble Areas". These geographically located trouble spots were usually caused by clusterings of problem families. Adams Street in the project had the reputation of being one of these problem areas where many "roughneck families were concentrated". The new manager has eliminated these groupings by carefully dispersing problem families throughout the project. Thus that the micro-placement of families within the development is an important aspect of controlling their impact on the community.

3. Increasing the Number of Adult Males between the Ages of 30 to 50

The shortage of adult men within the project has been noted. This shortage is partly due to the Authority's policies (See Chapter IV) and
partly due to the socio-economic class of the tenancy. The B.H.A. only allows single individuals into the project if they are 65 or over. This policy which has its merits based on housing shortages for the elderly has some unintended undesirable consequences for the community. This policy is an example of so many of the authority's rules which have been based on economic and housing supply considerations while insufficient thought was given to the necessity of creating viable communities within public housing. The restrictions on single occupancies should be eliminated so as to allow responsible adults of all ages to occupy the one bedroom apartments in the project. Younger adults would be more likely to be able to pitch in and help keep the children of the project in hand. These adults are also more likely than the elderly to act as models for some of the children. Removing the age restriction for single occupancy in the project would also reduce the high proportion of the tenants receiving O.A.A. (see Table X).

4. The Racial Balance

If the present turnover rates continue the Orchard Park project will become a Negro ghetto with 100% non-white occupancy in 1956. How can integration within the project be maintained? The Housing Authority can attempt to impose a racial quota limiting the number of additional Negroes placed in the project. Such a quota system has been unofficially used in New York City's public housing but has had limited success. Quotas themselves cannot stem racial tides and major ecological patterns. Furthermore there is some doubt as to the legality of such quotas. Although the goal of such quotas may be integration the means for the achievement of this goal is discriminatory.
It appears that one of the main reasons the authority reversed its original segregation policies governing the Orchard Park project was that the number of Negro applicants for residency in the project began to exceed the number of white applications. As the proportion of Negroes applying for occupancy in the project is even greater today (see Table II) quotas cannot change these market demand forces. Furthermore Negro families may well have the greatest need for public housing accommodations, since they are discriminated against by the private housing market.

Here again is an example of economic-citywide considerations coming into conflict with local-considerations. What Boston's Negro population needs in general, is not the same as what is best for the Orchard Park project neighborhood in particular. While Negroes need more housing, Orchard Park needs a better balanced community composition. We believe that the micro-considerations must prevail in the design of Orchard Park. No one project can be expected to solve the housing problems and racial problems of the city. If the project effectively creates a neighborhood which is beneficial to its constituents, this is a successful fulfillment of its role. Better tackle small parts of the world's problems at a time than try to do everything at once and get nothing done well.

In view of the unlikely success of racial quotas the Housing Authority should direct its energies towards creating a balanced community (as we have defined it). The white persons who are willing to live in Orchard Park and who are likely to have a good racial relationship with the Negroes are few indeed. One group that might move into
the Orchard Park area and have successful interracial experiences are white students, teachers and other middle class whites who could serve the project residents in a professional or semi-professional function. (See Chapter X on Meaningful Diversity). But the ultimate answer to the racial segregation of the Orchard Park project lies in the larger changes of our society.

The City-wide Problem

The racial problems of Orchard Park cannot be viewed in isolation. The influence of the surrounding Negro Roxbury community is evident. Furthermore there are changes occurring in the whole racial composition of the public housing program in Boston. In 1960 approximately 21% of the families moving into federally aided housing developments were non-white. By 1963 33% of the move-ins were Negro. In 1963 16.9% of all the federally aided projects were occupied by Negroes. Only 9.1% of Boston's population was Negro in 1960. The fact that a higher proportion of Negroes are in public housing than in the general population is not surprising since Negro income is roughly two-thirds that of whites. The nature of public housing (restricted to low income) is such that it segregates according to income. The low income housing program may consequently become a Negro housing program. The danger of defacto segregated government sponsored housing is increasing.

The Boston Housing Authority must adopt vigorous policies for the dispersal of Negro occupants throughout all of its projects. City-wide patterns of segregation and prejudice must similarly be attacked so as to relieve the pressure on Roxbury and the Orchard Park project which beckons ghettoism.
IX -- Eliminate Income Ceilings and Allow Private Ownership

Under the regulations of the Boston Housing Authority program an average family of four must leave a project if their income exceeds $4,950. In the Orchard Park project only 7 tenants were over-income in 1963. Of the tenants who left the project, 4 families reported that they were buying their own homes. Although the over-income move-outs account for less than 1% of the project population, it might be beneficial to the community if they were allowed to remain in the project if they chose to. These families, who have succeeded in raising their incomes, may serve the valuable function of providing leadership for the community.

We propose that tenants should be permitted to remain in the project beyond any income limit. These residents should have the additional option of paying the economic rent for their dwelling or owning the unit on a condominium or cooperative basis. Such ownership has the advantages of giving tenants a vested interest in the project and through private ownership the occupant may receive income tax advantages (savings).

Furthermore, provisions for the purchase of units by families are of particular importance for Negro and other minority families and older groups, who are greatly disadvantaged in obtaining mortgages in the real estate market.

Low income home ownership has always existed in the United States. Charles Abrams reports that when New York City's public housing authority began to tear down slums and replace them with rental developments, approximately 25% of the demolished housing was home owned.30 The virtues

of home ownership are well known and the type of family that owns its
own dwelling generally tends to be more stable and responsible than rent-
ers. Now Orchard Park project excludes any family that might wish to
own their own dwellings, yet 16% of the units in the census tracts sur-
rounding the project are home owned.

1. Rent Adjustments

One of the most demoralizing aspects of the public housing pro-
gram in the United States as it is now conducted is the eligibility re-
views and rent adjustments. The procedures are humiliating both to the
tenant and to management. As soon as a tenant has a change of income
he is supposed to report it to the Authority and his rent is immediately
adjusted. Tenants naturally report losses of income more accurately
than gains. The Authority is constantly "checking up" on the residents.
Letters are sent out to employers and various other means of verifying
and assessing the income of tenants are used. In the Orchard Park pro-
ject one of the most common ways in which the Authority finds out about
the true income of certain tenants is through "stool pigeons". Some
tenants snitch on their neighbors.31 A frequent difficulty in this
rent-income checkup is determining the wages of self-employed tenants
and those whose wages are variable. Cab-drivers and waitresses may
often argue with the Authority as to what their actual earnings are.

In the Orchard Park project the annual eligibility review is con-
ducted so that tenants are required to come into the office and sign a
new lease for each year. This process (the income investigation) is
a source of irritation to tenants and creates a great deal of adminis-

____________________
31 Interview with management staff, June, 1964.
trative work.

The worst feature of rent adjustments is that they act as a negative incentive for increased earnings. If a tenant knows that he will have to forfeit 20% of all his additional earnings to rent, this knowledge acts as a damper on his aspirations.

We propose that the Authority's present procedures should be liberalized. The annual eligibility review should be changed to a 2 year span if not longer and rent increase should not be charged until the end of a two or three year lease. Extending the time period for rent adjustments would reduce the frequency of investigations as well as allow tenants to keep all their additional earnings until a new lease is drawn up. Such a procedure would be more in keeping with private real estate transactions. Furthermore, those tenants who pay higher rents should receive additional amenities for their money. Apartments with balconies, private yards or other special features should rent for more money than those without these advantages. Differential amenities would become an incentive for increasing earnings and tenants would feel they were getting something extra for their higher rents. There is no reason why a certain amount of natural prestige and status differences cannot be introduced into the public housing program.
X -- Meaningful Residential Diversity

The difficulties of introducing new housing and thereby diversifying the occupancy of the project area are twofold. First of all new residents must be compatible with the existing residents. The second obstacle is the very limited space within the project suitable for new dwelling units.

It is difficult to know in advance what type of housing and family types will prove compatible but through the process of elimination some tentative conclusions can be drawn. Obviously high income luxury apartments for the area are out of the question. Similarly middle income families with children do not want to live in Lower Roxbury. While planners and social critics often have espoused the desirability of placing low income with middle income families, it is doubtful that this is possible in the Orchard Park area. Perhaps the one exception might be middle class students and young adults. However, even among this group most students prefer to live near Harvard Square or in Back Bay and similar locations. The few students that might be willing to live in a public housing project such as Orchard Park would probably do so for special reasons related to their studies. If a college and student residences were placed near or within the project, a fruitful interchange between the students and the project occupants might ensue. If the arrangements were structured so that both groups could benefit from each other's presence, the juxtaposition of these populations would be a success. Students might best be in the social work and social science fields. Manpower training centers, Vocational Schools and Teachers' Colleges would also be logical institutions that could enrich
their curriculums by being in the midst of the Orchard Park area. Students could supervise youth activities as well as do tutoring and other services for the residents of the neighborhood. Living in a low income area will in itself be a worthwhile experience for students. And ideally a symbiotic relationship could develop in which the tenants raise their cultural level while the students obtain an invaluable educational and living experience. Many of the middle class students will probably be white. Thus their activity in the neighborhood would provide opportunities for healthy interracial contacts.

Live-In Janitors

Janitors and maintenance men of the Orchard Park project are only on the grounds from nine to five, five days a week. The private pattern of janitors living in the building or near the buildings which they maintain has many advantages over the Public Housing setup. Simply by his presence in the project after hours, a janitor may prevent tenant carelessness. The question does arise as to whether it is fair to the janitor to be required to live in his place of work 24 hours a day. This is a moot point, but as practical policy for the benefit of the project, janitors who are willing to live in the project in which they are working should be preferred over those who will not.
XI -- Planning for Privacy and Self-Expression

The most ideal way in which improvements can be made in the project is to get tenants to make them themselves. However, it is generally unusual for groups of people to organize and work together to fix up their neighborhoods. If a private landlord of an apartment house asked his tenants to plant trees, the tenants would surely refuse. After all why should they do this extra work when they're paying rent. It's logical for the landlord to make such improvements. So too in Public Housing people will not donate their time and energy to improving the neighborhood when there is no immediate self gain and little feeling that the neighborhood is "theirs". On the other hand it is natural for people to maintain and improve their own property. If tenants were given their own back yards, for example, they will utilize these areas for their own purposes and leave a physical imprint of their usage. Creating private spaces can eliminate many of the problems of public maintenance and allow people to express themselves. Furthermore the responsibility and initiative that is needed in the upkeep of private space is related to the ability of individuals to be productive members of society.

Therefore we propose that some private spaces be allotted to the tenants. Apartments with such privacy should rent for more money than apartments without this amenity.
1. Rear Yards

Scheme 1 and 2 show two different ways in which private yards can be created in the Orchard Park project. Both schemes have been designed so that ground floor apartments will have direct access to individual yards (doors will have to be broken through into these apartments).

Scheme 1 has the advantage of completely closing in the yards. Such an enclosure increases the privacy of the yards. In scheme 2 the private yards are less private in that the backs of the yards are adjacent to public space. However the advantage of this arrangement is that the trees in the private areas can shade and beautify the public space and the public space is supervisable from the windows of the buildings. (See sketch 1)

The private yards can be enclosed with 6 foot high concrete or concrete block walls. These walls can be textured and indented for visual variety as well as structural strength.
General principles governing the creation of rear yards are the following:

1. Yards will be most successful when placed in areas which are not intensively used by the public.

2. Tenants should be given assistance in maintaining their yards inasmuch as the yards should be partially paved and plants should not require excessive care. (See Chapter on Planting)

3. Pilot programs and a great deal of tenant cooperation will be needed to construct the yards.

4. Children will have to be trained to respect private property.

5. The number of tenants willing to maintain such yards and their finances will determine the extent to which yards can be created.

The advantages of private yards is that they solve the privacy problem of the low windows of ground floor apartments. They encourage tenants to plant their own greenery and give families places for their children to play. Opportunities for the enjoyment of the outdoors is enhanced by such yards as these areas can become an extension of the living space of the ground floor apartments.

2. Balconies

The only way that upper floor apartments can be given private outdoor space is to build balconies for them. These balconies could be bracketed onto the walls or a structure with posts supporting the balconies can be constructed. Building balconies may be expensive but they would add living space to apartments and enliven the facade of the project buildings.
3. **Architectural Ornaments**

Tenants should be able to decorate the outside of their apartments as well as the inside. Awnings, windowboxes and window-shutters are three different types of ornaments which tenants could use to make their apartments visually identifiable. If tenants desired to place ornaments such as these on their windows they should be encouraged to do so. The Authority could supply these ornaments for a small fee. Or better yet, work projects for teenagers and other groups could build windowboxes and shutters and sell them to the tenants or the authority. Shutters which are movable may be particularly desirable in that they can be closed sometimes preventing broken windows.
The basic weakness of the present site design of the project is its public-institutional nature. The project is a series of corridors open to everyone but difficult for anyone to use. The pedestrian circulation through these spaces is so fluid that every space is in effect a public street. Through traffic is heavy but loitering and social contact is inhibited. Even the traditional distinction between the front and back of a house now does not exist in the project. There are two exterior entrances to each stairhall. The front door and the back door are identical so that it is impossible to tell which is which.

We propose to divide the space of the project into public vs. private and socializing vs. passage space. In addition we will subdivide spaces in terms of their use by the different age groups.

1. The Entranceways (Sitting Areas for Tots and Mothers)

The courtyards in front of the entrances to each building are presently heavily used by small children and mothers (See Chapter VI). We propose to put benches back into this area so mothers and elderly people can sit and supervise the little children. However, we will set the benches far enough away from the housing so that at night if the benches are used by teenagers this will not disturb the residents. The benches should be built entirely out of concrete and they can be informally grouped. If these sitting areas had overhead shelter they could be used in strong sunlight or when it rains and draw children away from the hallways where they now play during inclement weather.

The following two schemes for the redesign of courtyards is proposed:
Both schemes close one of the two entrances to each hallway. (see existing plan) Scheme 1 redesigns the courts so that there will only be one hallway entrance in each courtyard. Scheme 2 has placed the entrances to the two stairhalls on one side of the building so that the building has a distinct front and back. In scheme 2 the backs can be screened off for private yards (see Chapter VII) or used for sitting or play areas.

2. Play Areas for the 5 to 12 Year Olds

Play equipment which is non-movable and not suited for sports should be strung along the corridors of housing. This equipment should be so designed as to provide a chain of varied play activity. Each equipment area should offer something dramatically different so that children can go from one to the other without getting bored. The play areas need not be elaborate. They each might consist of one or two
pieces of play equipment which in themselves are versatile enough to be used in different ways. This equipment should lend itself to climbing, jumping, hiding, playing house and other such games. 32

Open space for games such as skip rope, potsy and skully must also be designed. Patterns for such games can be painted onto the ground. Such patterns will be useful as suggestions to direct children's play and at the same time be decorative. Grassed areas specifically designed for children to play in are also desirable. Dirt is a material in which children can dig, shoot marbles or even vent hostility against. Children need this type of pliable material which they can manipulate.

3. Adult Recreation

Play and relaxation areas should be designed for adults as well as children. Concrete benches and tables can be built to use for playing chess, checkers, cards or dominoes. Facilities for games such as bocci, shuffleboard, horseshoe throwing or even ping-pong might be built if these games are popular. Adult facilities can replace some of the underutilized and unsightly parking bays. A bay such as the one on Eustis Street, for example, can become a focal point of activity if it is redesigned as a miniature neighborhood park. Facilities for mothers with their little children should become part of such an area.

Street parking could accommodate the cars which would be displaced by the redesign of a few of the bays. At the present time street parking could accommodate the cars which would be displaced by the redesign of a few of the bays. At the present time street

32 Abandoned cars in the neighborhood are presently used as toys by the children (See Chapter IV-5). Automobile tires are used by the children to spin and play with. Play equipment might capitalize on such resources by building racks for storing old tires or stripping down old cars or tractors or similar vehicles and using them as play sculptures. (These cars can playfully be painted and made to look attractive).
parking is prohibited on many of the streets in the area. These regulations should be changed since parking on local streets should be permitted even if it entails a slight slowing down of through traffic.

4. Teenage Recreation and Loitering

The teenage boys of the Orchard Park project play basketball in the park or just hang around during their free time. The handball courts in the park have been converted into basketball courts by fastening hoops to the walls. This is a sign of inadequate basketball facilities. The vacant land adjacent to the project would be well used if sport facilities were developed there. The school yards on the project should also include better sport equipment which can be used during school hours as well as after hours.

Elizabeth Wood in a pamphlet entitled Housing Design - A Social Theory described her experience with teenagers in public housing as follows:

Teenagers want to hang around where they can get soft drinks, and where there is no formal supervision. They like to be able to use a phonograph and play their records either for dancing or as background to their talking.33

She suggests that one of the best locations for teenage loitering is the candy store at a shopping area (provided the candy store owner is the right kind of person).

Not being too familiar with the teenage behavior in Orchard Park, it is difficult to know whether Mrs. Wood's suggestions are appropriate to this particular project. Nevertheless, if a community center and

stores and commercial recreation were part of a shopping area, teenagers might choose to loiter near such facilities.

We propose that the possibilities of developing a shopping center in the vacant land north of the project between Albany and Eustis Streets be investigated. (See Chapter XI). Such a center could act as a community wide focal point encouraging greater social contact and healthy social controls. The micro design of this center will be very important for the stores and facilities should be designed so that they serve the various age groups yet avoid conflict.

Presently some teenagers loiter in the park of the project and have been the source of tenant complaints (see Chapter VI). Some residents have felt that the park was inadequately policed. One possible way in which more public supervision can be brought into the park is by extending Orchard Park Street. The street can cut through the edge of the park and connects into Yoeman Street. Such a cross street would enable more people to pass through the park area. If an adult recreation area was placed in this park, more supervision and better use could be made of the area. This would entail cutting down the size of the baseball field but it is felt that the benefits derived would be worth this cost. Large sport area can be established on the vacant land surrounding the project.

5. Work Projects

This vacant land presents some of the most exciting challenges for the planning of the area. Junk playgrounds, playfields, shopping areas and landscaped parking areas could be built out of this present eyesore. Vacant land lends itself to experimental work groups and tenant participation. Many other suggestions of this report also can be imple-
mented through self-help. However we cannot expect group involvement
to be entirely voluntary. Tenants must know that there is "something
in it for them" and these benefits cannot be abstract. We suggest
that the residents should be paid (even if it is minimal pay) for their
work.

Teenagers can be trained to develop skills while making physical
improvements on the project. Tenants can be taught how to build window-
boxes, shutters, play equipment, etc. They can be shown how to work
with concrete, build the fences for the private yards and construct the
balconies. Painting, repaving, planting, and other skills can be de-
veloped. Teaching while trying to make improvements may in the long
run cost more than to have the work done by skilled professionals. But
the educational value of a self-help program may be worth the extra cost.
Furthermore, if the tenants have been working on the improvements them-
selves they will try to make sure that their work is maintained and not
vandalized.
XIII -- Liberalizing the Rules and Regulations of the Authority

Decorating One's Own Apartment

The Boston Public Housing Authority presently restricts residents from painting their own apartments. The Housing Authority also limits the choice of colors which the apartments can be painted.

It is proposed that tenants be permitted to paint their own apartments if they desire to. The Authority might even encourage such painting. The painting materials as well as a small fee for the labor costs saved by the Authority could be given to the tenants as an incentive.

Tenants should be free to decorate their apartments in the manner they see fit, for such decoration is a means of self-expression and the development of the feeling that "this is my home".

The price the Authority might have to pay for eliminating the present unreasonable restrictions is that some tenants may do a poor job if not a little damage to the walls of the apartments. However, this type of tenant will probably damage apartments with or without the regulations. It is far more important for all the tenants to develop a sense of freedom and security than for the Authority to get some dubious advantage from the present inflexible rules.

Pets

The Boston Housing Authority prohibits the ownership of "cats, dogs or other animals or birds within the project". The restrictions on birds and cats are entirely unjustified. The only possible reason for such a rule is to prevent such house-bound animals from dirtying the apartments. This reasoning is disrespectful and insulting to the
the tenant's ability to clean his own dwelling. The ban on dogs may have a slightly sounder basis. The Authority cites the sanitary problem on the grounds, the noise and the possible danger of dog bites. The high density of the project does make dog ownership a problem; nevertheless, solutions can be found. Dogs can be required to be leashed in public and any dog that has bitten anyone should not be permitted in the project. Tenants could also be liable to fines if their dog defecates on project grounds and if the waste is not cleaned up. The Authority could even issue licenses for the dogs so as to keep a close control over them. Although these are new regulations, they are reasonable ones, while the Pet Ban is not.

Pets can be wonderful companions to both adults and children. People may find a channel of exit for their emotions by giving love to a dog or cat and the responsibility of pet ownership may be an excellent experience for young children. Pets are also important to older tenants left alone by the death of their spouses and dogs are very valuable in high crime areas.

The pet ban as it is now formulated discriminates against the poor and denies a basic right, the pursuit of happiness.
Jane Jacobs has attacked projects as lacking the "primary diversity" essential for urban neighborhoods. By primary she refers to basic land uses such as residential and commercial uses. She feels that projects have low vitality. Her point about the need for the generation of diversity is well taken in that social controls in urban areas are to a degree closely linked with the intensity and variety of uses. Primary diversity also contributes to the amenity and economic viability of a neighborhood.

Shops and small stores can do a great deal to liven up projects. Some shopkeepers have a propensity for law and order and are valuable as public characters who keep an eye on the street. Stores themselves bring adult activity to their vicinity.

As desirable as such stores may be for the Orchard Park project the feasibility of their construction is limited by the substantial shopping areas nearby. The marketability of stores in the area is also impaired by the recent depopulation of Lower Roxbury. Many of the existing shops in the neighborhood are already vacant and there are ample signs that business is not prospering the way it used to. Nevertheless certain very special and localized stores may lend themselves to placement within or near the Orchard Park project. It is proposed that the feasibility of constructing the following establishments be investigated:

1. A club house for teenagers or other organized groups.

---

2. A restaurant especially for "seniors". This group's present twice-a-week dinners could be expanded into a full time kitchen.

3. Churches: churches may wish to locate near the project. These church groups may be store front pente-costal or wealthier congregations.

4. A Bar: Elizabeth Wood has suggested that Public Housing in the United States should develop a native counterpart to the English Pub (the first community facility to be provided in connection with any housing development in that country).

5. Commercial Recreation, e.g. bowling alleys, movies, etc. There is no functioning movie house in the Lower Roxbury area.

6. Candy stores, Drug stores, or grocery and laundromats although plentiful in the area may wish to move into new quarters.

7. Vendors who use carts are commonly seen in the area. These vendors may wish to have a more permanent market place (even for one or two days a week). One of the major obstacles in the development of new commercial facilities in the project is the high overhead cost of new construction. Vendor stands is one way of cutting down the overhead.

8. Small businesses especially doctor, dental and other service offices should be allowed in the project. Doctor's offices may be fit into renovated ground floor apartments. Although such a change in use might eliminate a few low income housing units, these units can be replaced elsewhere and the net addition to the livability of the project would be worth the change. Professional offices may serve an inspirational, exemplary role as well as giving the neighborhood better services and creating more jobs. The importance of job creation even if the number of jobs is very small from new stores and businesses is very important for impoverished Lower Roxbury.

9. Certain community facilities are similar to shops in respect to stimulating activity in their vicinity and being open in the evening as well as the daytime and becoming social nodes. The Roxbury Neighborhood House will be forced to relocate their main headquarters on Albany Street when the inner belt is constructed. Some of these facilities should be relocated so that they help dispel the monotony of the project.

35 Elizabeth Wood, op. cit., p. 29
10. Unforeseen uses - stores can be rented and private entrepreneurs may be able to conceive of enterprises which a market study may not be able to foresee.

It should be noted that the existence of stores does not guarantee vitality. Dudley Station, Washington Street and Dudley Street form a shopping complex that borders the project on the north and west yet adds little to the vitality of the project. This is because these shopping areas are separated from the project by thin strips of other land uses. A single large supermarket (Kennedy's - formerly Stop & Shop) is located on Dearborn Street in the center of the knot of the bow tie shaped project. Yet this store also adds little visual and psychological vitality to the project. The design of the store is such that it has few and small windows and looks somewhat like a red brick factory.

It is evident that the design and the type of stores as well as the manner in which they are clustered will determine their success as focal centers of activity.
XV -- The Improvement of the Outside Neighborhood

It would be unwise to attempt to improve the project without simultaneously improving the larger neighborhood. This surrounding neighborhood was described in Chapter V-1. Assuming that the inner belt will be constructed, most of the industrial areas will be separated from the project by this highway. Then the neighborhood we are most concerned with is the remaining residential areas around the project. The socio-economic level of these areas is surprisingly close to that of the tenants of the project. However, two significant differences are the higher median income and the existence of home ownership in the outside neighborhood. The conditions of the buildings are poor and much of the housing, especially to the north, is unattractive.

Our proposal does not call for immediate clearance. The principle we will start with is that these people's houses are their homes and that they have a particular life style. We must first respect their values, their way of life, and their culture. We must find out how they feel about their homes and way of life. The type of evaluation that is needed has been partially outlined by Herb Gans in his article concerning the human implications of current redevelopment. He states:

Such procedures should determine...whether the existing social system satisfies more positive than negative functions for the residents. If this is the case, planners must decide whether destruction of this social system is justified by the benefits to be derived from clearance.36

Assuming the population of the private housing surrounding the project is of a low socio-economic status, it follows that many of the families are on relief and that delinquency levels and social disorganization (this area is also in racial transition) is prevalent. If we were simply to clear the area and build shiny new housing (if it were feasible) the site occupants, many of whom are problem families, would be forced to relocate elsewhere (probably middle and upper Roxbury). This displacement would repeat the pattern of the Washington Park Urban Renewal relocation. The movement of lower income families from lower to upper Roxbury, as noted previously, has caused conflicts between lower and middle class Negroes. The most serious consequence of this pattern is that low income but especially the low class problem families actually accelerate the decline of what were formerly good neighborhoods. Bob Coard has aptly called these destructive and irresponsible families "blight carriers". This is not to say that all of the residents of the Orchard Park area are "blight carriers" but the small proportion of this population who exhibit destructive behavior are enough to cause a great deal of damage to the buildings and the neighborhood into which they move. Elizabeth Wood has noted the folly of relocating such families from slums to better neighborhoods. As she put it, "A city cannot afford to scatter dragons' teeth by relocation or conservation that shuts its eyes to the impact of such families."

Thus it may be unadvisable to attempt to replace the old housing of this area with new housing. Even if demolition were selective the problem of replacement is still a major obstacle. Middle income housing in the area will not be marketable and although it may be feasible to build additional public housing units in this neighborhood, is it desirable? This actually raises a major policy issue. The question arises as to whether the EHA or even the BRA can create a new environment in a run-down, poverty stricken slum section of Boston or should the Authority (EHA) restrict the placement of new public housing to existing neighborhoods which are already in good shape. This dilemma is most vivid in the context of the racial integration issue. Many Negro communities have resisted local public housing projects since these would automatically become segregated. New public housing in the Orchard Park area would likewise become all Negro. But if new construction is limited to the established, successful neighborhood (if this is possible) what should happen to the run-down areas of the city such as Lower Roxbury (Orchard Park).

We propose to let the area run down (in the sense of becoming abandoned) if it appears inevitable. On the other hand those that choose to stay should receive assistance in maintaining the area and improving their own welfare. At its best, our program could act as a holding maneuver (stabilizing the existing population) and improving the welfare of the residents to such a point that the community begins to grow on its own.

In some respects this program contradicts what was proposed for the project itself. It may turn out that letting the neighborhood thin out even more than it has in the past will only leave a residue of hard-
core poverty problem inhabitants. Such a population would conflict with the balancing attempts within the project. The only way to resolve this conflict (if it would occur) is to have a program which would be successful enough to create a balanced population within the entire area. The home-owners of the neighborhood can act as a core to offset the hard-core group. Furthermore, special educational and social programs must be instituted for the rehabilitation of the problem families. The ultimate goal of the proposals is to create a viable community, the process of reaching this end may necessarily involve certain imbalances and an enormous amount of investment in human development and sufficient time.

The types of improvements that can be made under this program would be to turn vacant lots and abandoned housing in functionally useful areas. Their function in residential areas would be for recreational and other public uses (schools and community facilities). The space needs of the project children could be partly satisfied by the development of such uses. The construction and planning of at least some of these facilities should be done by the residents themselves.

Another aspect of the planning for this area would be to rid it of nuisance land uses. Additionally, those land uses which may not be nuisances but are nevertheless visually unattractive (such as parking lots) should be hidden from view by fencing, planting and other means.

A program of replacement housing should be developed (land is plentiful) but such a scheme would be most effective if it were linked to experimental and educational techniques of moving families from old to new housing and imbuing them with a sense of pride in their housing and a sense of responsibility. Exactly how to formulate such a plan is beyond the scope of this paper.
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