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ABSTRACT

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE IN LOW-RISE MEDIUM-DENSITY HOUSING: A CASE STUDY OF CASTLE SQUARE

Mary Margaret Murtagh

Submitted to the Department of Architecture on May 11, 1973 in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Architecture

Public open space in housing projects is too often treated as left-over area—a negative field on which positive building elements are placed in abstract configurations with scant regard for the character of the resultant open space. Open spaces of differing characters receive very different patterns of use, and the fact that their placement and design is determined by the placement and design of the other components on the site can be most probably set down to a lack of information about communal open space in its own right. It is the aim of this study first to uncover as much information as possible about how a particular set of open spaces are used; and to draw from an examination of this information conclusions about which qualities of open space are conducive to certain types of use.

This work represents a small beginning in what could be expanded to be a more widely useful body of data on how open spaces are used, and the conclusions presented, although necessarily limited by the small number of areas studied, are a step toward what could become a set of design specifications for different types of open space. With such a set of specifications it would be possible to design both housing and open space according to positive criteria, rather than designing one at the expense of the other, as is now so frequently the case.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Public open space in housing projects is too often treated as left-over area—a negative field on which positive building elements are placed in abstract configurations or repetitive patterns with scant regard for the character of the resultant open space. Open spaces are "negative" in so far as they are defined by what is around them (type and size of building, type and number of entryways, circulation patterns, etc.) and it is as fatuous to consider each open space as an independent entity which can be designed apart from its surroundings and simply placed wherever it fits on the site as it is wasteful to consider open space as merely space necessary to afford light and air to the surrounding structures: places without buildings.

Open spaces of differing characters receive very different patterns of use, and the fact that their placement and design is determined by the placement and design of other components on the site can be most probably set down to a lack of information about communal open space in its own right. As William Whyte comments in Cluster Development, there is a lot of dogma available about how people use open spaces, but remarkably little attention is paid to how people actually do use them. It is the aim of this study first to uncover as much information as possible about how

---

a particular set of open spaces are used; and to draw from an examination of this information conclusions about which qualities of open space are conducive to certain types of use. This work represents a small beginning in what could be expanded to be a more widely useful body of data on how open spaces are used, and the conclusions presented, although necessarily limited by the small number of areas studied, are a step toward what could become a set of design specifications for different types of open space. With such a set of specifications it would be possible to design both housing and open space according to positive criteria, rather than designing one at the expense of the other, as is now so often the case.

SCOPE

From the outset my investigations were limited to low-rise medium-density housing, because this type of housing presents problems of collectively used open space which single family housing ordinarily does not, while avoiding the concentration of entryways (and consequent separation of the unit from the outdoor space) which occurs of necessity in high-rise construction. After visiting ten or eleven such projects in the Boston area, some of them several times, it appeared that the most fruitful course of action would be to pick one site and study it intensively rather than to dissipate my efforts over several sites and end up with what might be an inadequate study due to insufficient
time and problems with the comparability of demographic data. Castle Square presented a variety of outdoor spaces, a density of 40 dwelling units to the acre, the building type in which I was most interested (stacked duplex units, four stories high), units which had private outdoor space as well as units which did not, and furthermore an urban location close to the commercial center of Boston. In the course of the study I visited the site over thirty times, at all hours of the day and occasionally at night, and made documented observations of the activity there on eight occasions, noting age, sex, race and activity of user for each area; as well as making numerous notes during my "casual" observation periods. I also interviewed in depth several residents and consulted people who had made previous studies of the project. Toward the end of my observations I began to make friends with several of the younger, very friendly kids who live at Castle Square and spent several very cheerful hours watching drawings accumulate all over my notes and asking futile questions about where their older brothers and sisters went and what games they liked best, etc.

Most of the observations and commentary are about the activities of the young residents of Castle Square, who make the most intensive use of the outdoor areas of the site. Teenagers over sixteen and adults were much less in evidence in the public outdoor spaces throughout my observations and I assume this is generally the case. Presented
in the appendices are the exact data from the documentation I made as well as copies of the forms I used to document during the eight periods; also numerous other notes from general observations, relevant findings from interviews, a comprehensive list of every type of activity I ever saw occurring on the site, development history and demographic data available. Maps, photos and drawings are presented where it seemed appropriate in the text, and a detailed drawing of each space discussed is provided in the appendix if not in the text.

It seems appropriate to present first off a summary of my conclusions and a brief discussion of the list of factors I considered important in my examination of the various outdoor spaces of Castle Square. This will afford the reader the perspective of knowing which factors emerged as most influential in the way spaces are used at Castle Square before reading the in-depth analysis of the way the site is used, and organized.
II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Examining the range of public outdoor spaces at Castle Square, it is evident that no single factor can be isolated in any case which explains why certain spaces are used more than others. In each instance a combination of conditions operates and the importance of individual conditions can only be weighed by comparison with a space which has an almost identical set of conditions and only one or two differences. There are no two spaces at Castle Square which differ from one another in only one respect--but there are several instances where spaces differ in few enough respects to make a valid comparison possible.

There is also the type of use to consider: obviously kids can only play street hockey on a paved surface--what remains to be determined is why they will use some paved surfaces in preference to others. By examining those factors which are obviously necessary for certain types of use it is possible to zero in on other conditions which improve the likelihood that a certain space will be used for specific games, or used by a certain age group, or if it will be used at all given the popularity of some games over others.

It must be said at the outset that there are no vast expanses of unused space at Castle Square--there are several spaces which are intensively used, and some which are used for activities for which they were not "designed"; some which are used purely for the "designed" use and some small
pockets of space which are used only during the most intensive hours of activity on the site; and a few which I have never seen in use at all, but which bear signs that they serve a purpose, if only for a limited number of people and not for any group activities. There are only two types of space on the site which I consider to be underused—which is to say that they don't seem to be serving as wide a range of purposes as they could. In an area where there are as many children as there are in Castle Square, to find an outdoor space which is virtually ignored (in good weather, on a weekend) is a strong indication of bad design. Children are resourceful, and if they find a "good place" for a game they will improvise the equipment they need to play it there. Likewise they will ignore equipment if a certain location does not appeal to them—although it seems safe to say that they will most often ignore equipment because it is inadequately designed or because it is just boring to them. Use is the criterion of success—and to leave spaces unusable or only narrowly useful is wasteful when one has 5.7 acres of on-site open space (10.5 if one includes parking space) available for well over a thousand children.

The term use must be qualified in several ways: according to the times a space is used—for instance, even when no other space on site is in use, or used only when the site is overflowing with children; according to the intensity of use—if it is used by one large group of people at any
one time, or can serve several medium groups of people simultaneously, several small groups or only a few people at a time; and also according to the varieties of use which occur in the space, either simultaneously or at different times when different people are using it, if there is any variety of use at all. I am less concerned with labeling spaces "successful" or "unsuccessful" than I am with arriving at hypotheses about what factors allow people to use which spaces in which ways.

Following is a list of physical conditions which occur in varying combinations in Castle Square, and which seem relevant to the variation in the use which occurs there:

1. Space bordered by front entrances
2. Space bordered by back entrances
3. Space bordered by fenced back yards
4. Ground surface: grass or wood chip
5. Ground surface: cement or asphalt
6. Presence of play equipment for young children, type of play equipment
7. Definition of game area: bounded by low or high blank walls, or unbounded
8. Presence of parked cars
9. Amount of traffic entering and leaving the parking lot and speeds at which the cars travel
10. Space traversed by pedestrian paths (commonly used)
11. Space bordered by pedestrian paths/routes
12. Possibility of seating: benches provided or walls of convenient height
13. Proximity of space to units: front or back doors opening immediately onto it

14. Dimension of space

15. Physical divisions within the space; dimensions of individual areas

16. Position of area with regard to public street:
   a. bordered by public street
   b. visible from public street
   c. not visible at all from public street

17. Other open spaces immediately adjacent (not separated by buildings)

18. Micro-climate (wind, sun; especially important during extremes of weather)

It must be stressed again that it is only in combination that these factors work to allow different intensities and varieties of use in one space as opposed to another.

The four major conclusions which can be drawn from this study are as follows:

1. The front stairwell/entry condition serving the double duplexes at Castle Square serves as a play space for small children which functions as such independently of other factors: it is used consistently by children aged six and under wherever it is found on the site, when the spaces adjacent to it vary from an enclosed parking lot for over 70 cars, to an entry court for 28 units (where there are no automobiles whatsoever), to a public sidewalk bordering a public street at the edge of the project. The proximity of these entryways to the unit, the visibility from the kitchen window,
the position as a shared entryway belonging to four units and the structure of the fences and stairwells affording a shielded space (where kids can hide from strangers if they wish) amount to making this a place where small children will play regardless of the nature of the space in which it is found.

2. Children between the ages of 9 and 15 will most usually play in the spaces which are best suited to their favorite games, and factors such as the presence or absence of automobile traffic, "action", pedestrian traffic, visibility from the street, orientation of the surrounding units and microclimate are secondary in importance to the design of the game area.

For instance, a hard-surfaced area with boundary walls on at least two sides, preferably measuring at least 40' by 50', is the minimum necessary condition for a fast game of street hockey with eight or more players. In vicinities such as Castle Square where street hockey is very popular, the presence of such an area is enough to ensure heavy use by children wherever it exists on the site. This is not true of areas which are paved but lack boundary walls.

3. The intensity of use that any one large area receives can be optimized by dividing the space into two or more defined game areas, by designing game areas that can be used in a variety of ways, and by providing
nearby an ample amount of low walls or anything else which can be used for casually seating varied numbers of people who might want to watch the games. An area which has multiple game areas and which can support a variety of games and a lot of observers has the potential to become a real gathering place because of the number and variety of people it will attract.

4. The paved front entry courts which serve two buildings (as seen in the center of Paul Place and in the Berkeley Street Section of the site) which provide entry to approximately thirty units and are lined on both sides with front stairwells and wooden fences, provide a play space which will be used consistently by children aged 7 - 14 who live in the adjacent buildings, regardless of where such an entry court may exist on the site.

There are a number of factors listed but not specifically mentioned in the conclusions which I took into account in looking at the public open spaces at Castle Square, but there is not enough information about them
available to conclude if or in what ways they influence the use of the outdoor spaces. I will discuss these at greater length in the following section and will briefly summarize all the factors here:

1. Front entrances
2. Back entrances

As described in the first conclusion, the front entrances are used by small children without regard for the location of the entrance on the site. Aside from this the presence of these entrances appears to relate to the way the adjoining spaces are used only in that they have a larger volume of traffic than do the back entrances. The problem of how spaces are used which are accessible by back entrances rather than by front entrances will be discussed at length in Section V.
3. Fenced back yards as a bordering condition

This condition occurs in two of the major public spaces at Castle Square, but as there are no places of comparable dimension or other description where it does not occur, it was not possible to draw any conclusions about effect the presence of the fenced areas has on neighboring use. There are many interesting things to note about these back yard spaces as they exist at Castle Square, but I will withhold the discussion until later in the paper.

4. Type of ground surface: grass or wood chip

Soft ground surfaces serve different and less popular purposes than do hard surfaces, if one can judge by the choice of children between the ages of 9 and 15. Most of the grass areas at Castle Square are in the back yards along Paul Place or in the private fenced areas. It is not possible to determine if the limited use they receive is due to their position at the backside of the units or because grass is not suitable for popular games like street hockey and roller skating. These grass areas do get used occasionally for baseball and many residents have small gardens and shrubs planted there.

5. Type of ground surface: asphalt or cement

This is discussed in the second conclusion above.
6. Play equipment

Play equipment is problematical. There certainly isn't enough of it at Castle Square, but some of that which is there is hardly used, while other equipment is always used. The kinds which are most popular (swings and slides) are enough of an attraction to draw children of ages younger than nine constantly.

7. Definition of game areas: unbounded or bounded by low or high walls

This is discussed in the second conclusion.

8. Presence of parked cars
9. Amount of traffic entering and leaving the parking lot

Kids don't seem to be disturbed by cars coming in and out of the parking lots at Castle Square--they go ahead and play various ball games in the lots anyway, and go so far as to set up goals when playing street hockey. There is one parking lot (Village Court) which is never used for games of any kind, and this lot usually has more cars parked in it than the ones which the kids play in. But there are other reasons which might deter them from using this space, and so I cannot conclusively state that densely parked cars keep kids from playing ball games. Parked cars are not ideal for ball games because it is easy for the ball to roll under them, but despite this inconvenience the games go on in Castle and Emerald Court parking areas--albeit much less frequently than in the areas where there is no automobile traffic at all.
10. Space traversed by pedestrian paths
11. Space bordered by pedestrian paths

There are spaces which are heavily used and others which are only occasionally used which have well-travelled pedestrian routes passing around or through them. The marginally used back yards of Paul Place have no significant amount of pedestrian traffic—but it would be difficult to prove the opposite case: that pedestrian traffic acts as a generator of or is a condition of activity, especially in the light of the fact that kids use the parking garage as much or more than they use the Paul Place back yards, and there is no regular pedestrian route through the garage.

There is a map of pedestrian routes on page 29.

12. Seating

Seating seems by itself insufficient to draw people to it, but in combination with good play facilities, for instance, or in a courtyard near a front door, it will be frequently used and will enhance the uses around it. In the "wrong" place it will be largely ignored.

This is discussed in the third conclusion.

13. Proximity of the public outdoor space to units

Proximity of public outdoor space to the unit is very important in the case of the smallest children (as mentioned in the first conclusion) but it is not by itself enough to make a place acceptable for kids of this age. The public back yards of the units of Paul Place are equally close to
home and do not function in at all the same way as the entryways.

14. Dimension of space

After all the other factors are taken into consideration, it is the dimension of the space which governs how many people can use it at any one time.

15. Physical divisions within the space (division into game areas)

See second conclusion.

16. Position of the area with regard to public street:
   a. bordered by public street
   b. visible from public street
   c. not visible at all from public street

There are seating areas in the Castle Square site which are more public than they are part of the Castle Square "turf", and which are accordingly used by the public and not by the residents of Castle Square. There are also two areas which clearly belong to the project but which are bordered by a public street: these are used by the children who live in Castle Square the same way as areas which are not open to the street, although one of them reputedly also attracts drunkards. The most used area of the two (Church Lot) is bordered by a less heavily traveled street (Shawmut Ave.) than that which borders the area frequented by drunks (Berkeley St.); but the heavy use it receives from the kids can more plausibly be explained by its design than by the level of traffic on the adjoining street.
17. Connecting open spaces

_Kids_ frequently move in and out of different areas while playing and there is one section of Castle Square which is particularly well suited to this, which I will describe in the last section. Connected areas such as this lend themselves well to floating games and bike-riding circuits.

18. Micro-climate

_Clim ate_ does not vary enough from one space to another in Castle Square to have any significant effect on the way the outdoor environment is inhabited, except during extremes of temperature. There are some places which afford shade on very hot days, but no places that afford good protection from the wind on very cold days.
III. SITE ORGANIZATION

Castle Square is planned in such a way that although access to the interior spaces is not physically obstructed and anyone can enter the project, it is clear that having done so, one is no longer on public ground. The project is for the most part turned in on itself--fenced back yards line most of the Shawmut Ave. and Berkeley Street edges, and Tremont St. is walled off from the low-rise section of the project by an 8-story high-rise building, with major openings at ground level in only three places in 800 feet of length. The corner of Herald St. and Tremont St. is occupied by a supermarket, and the rest of the Herald St. edge is the side of a two story parking garage. Paul Place road winds in between this and the supermarket and along the backside of the parking garage to Shawmut Ave., and at both ends is the dimension of a small access road, leading to and from a truck dock for the A & P. Because of its size and the 90° turn in it, it does not offer much of a shortcut to anyone wishing to circumvent the traffic light at the corner of Herald and Shawmut Ave., and is used by outsiders from the area at all only as a place to park. As the project is located only a short walk from the downtown area of Boston there is a great deal of pressure in the area for parking space, and commuters take advantage of the fact that the parking courts and the road along Paul Place are city owned and maintained streets to avoid the
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price of the parking garage, despite the fact that these areas are clearly project "territory."

There is one section on Shawmut Avenue where the front entrances of a building face the public street, but this is the only section where this occurs. Otherwise all the entrances to the buildings face onto interior courts, many of which are not accessible by car and which are thus even less public in character than the parking courts. This site arrangement is briefly discussed in a report on security in multi-family housing prepared by the Lower Roxbury Community Corporation\(^2\), where it is criticized as inconsistent from the point of view of security. The site plan suffers from the long exposed back yards which have fences which are inadequate to stop intruders from entering (the fences lack gates unless the residents have taken it upon themselves to provide them) but which serve to shield them from public view. The site plan breaks the traditional row house entrance pattern by providing off-street interior courts for entry, but still a large number of units are aligned with major public streets: with the difference that now the more vulnerable back side of the building is open to it. The implication is that it would have been better to organize the site so that as few buildings as

---

possible were oriented toward public streets, but oriented instead to project streets, back to back with fenced off communal back yard areas—thus being protected on both sides. Part of the Castle Square site is organized around pedestrian ways in this fashion—but suffice it to say that although the site plan may not be an ideal organization for security purposes, almost all the interior open spaces have the quality of being semi-private project territory, which is clearly under the surveillance of the residents. This is true to a greater degree as one penetrates the areas of the project which are not accessible by car. The most private areas (excluding private open space) are the communal back yards which can be seen along Paul Place. Although these are still physically accessible to anyone, the presence of a partial fence makes it obvious that they are intended for residents only.

There are public pedestrian ways running through every part of Castle Square (with the exception of the above mentioned back yards) which is an aspect of the site plan which seems to be at odds with the protected nature of the interior spaces. The project is open to pedestrians at many points on all sides and consequently the pedestrian flow is not directed along any major routes. An example of what would seem to be needless duplication of entry points is the juxtaposition of the automobile entrance on Shawmut Ave. with the pedestrian entrance/underpass only 40' away. The entrances, especially from Tremont St. are so designed
as to diffuse the pedestrian traffic. There are several ways to enter the Village Court parking lot from Tremont St. under the high rise and from the open end of Village Court on Berkeley St., but once having entered the court there are no clear paths across it which do not involve picking one's way amongst cars or walking in the driving lanes. Walking along a major pedestrian route from Shawmut Avenue to Tremont Street one passes underneath buildings at the places where the path enters and leaves the low-rise housing section--only to be emptied into the Village Court parking lot before reaching Tremont St. The ambivalent nature of spaces which look enclosed but which are accessible from all sides, and of paths which appear to be major pedestrian routes but which falter (or are duplicated by adjacent paths) is also present in the relationship of the high-rise units to Village Court. The wall of high rise units is interposed between the court and Tremont St., and provides a strong visual barrier between the two areas. This would make Village Court as "protected" an area as the other two courts, were it not for the fact that the court is completely open at the Berkeley St. end, and that anyone can pass through the base of the high-rise at at least two additional points beside the major pedestrian underpass. The set of front entrances of the one low-rise building that opens onto this space seems particularly inconsistent, as there are no other front entrances opening onto this space whatsoever.
Another strange quirk in the pedestrian network is the sheltered walk which goes from the entrance of the A & P on Tremont St. (a fairly well used path) and which ends in the truck dock for the store, which everyone headed for the project must cross. It is not a large distance but it does seem awkward that pedestrian routes should conflict with parking areas and vehicular access in so many cases. All in all the site plan does not seem to reflect a very rigorous attitude towards unit orientation or pedestrian circulation.

The site organization does provide a real variety in size and type of play space available, however, and very little space there is unused. This may be as much a result of the large numbers of children who live at Castle Square as of the quality of the outdoor spaces--but the wide range of size and type in the outdoor spaces at Castle Square is a highly commendable aspect of the site organization. There are ten public areas on the site which can initially be classified according to those which are accessible by automobile and those which are not. In the latter category there are four further divisions: communal front entry areas, communal back yards, "designated" play areas and major walkways. The classification is as follows:

A. Areas accessible by automobile

1. Emerald Court
2. Castle Court
3. Village Court

4. Parking Garage

B. Areas not accessible by automobile

1. Communal front entry areas
   a. Paul Place front entries
   b. Front entry area of Berkeley St. units

2. Communal back yard areas
   a. Paul Place back yard area
   b. Berkeley St. units
   c. Area behind units between Castle and Emerald Courts

3. "Designated" play areas
   a. Tot Lot
   b. Berkeley St. Play Area
   c. Church Lot
   d. Central Play area

4. Major walkways: Millicent Way
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IV. SUBSTANTIATION OF CONCLUSIONS

FIRST CONCLUSION

The front stairwell/entry condition serving the double duplexes at Castle Square serves as a play space for small children which functions as such independently of other factors: it is used consistently by children aged six and under wherever it is found on the site, when the spaces adjacent to it vary from an enclosed parking lot for over seventy cars, to an entry court for 28 units, to a public sidewalk bordering a public street at the edge of the project. The proximity of these entryways to the unit, the visibility from the kitchen window, the position as a shared entryway belonging to four units and the structure of the fences and stairwells affording a shielded space amount to making this a place where small children will play regardless of the nature of the space in which it is found.

Front entries at Castle Square consist of concrete and glass stairwells which are semi-detached from the building which houses the duplex units: they stand out in front of the units and to get into the first floor units or to climb the stairs to the upstairs duplex, one steps into a sheltered but unenclosed area which lies between the stairwell and the building. To either side of the stairwell stand wooden fences which form partially enclosed yards in front of each unit and which also serve as a screen to keep the garbage cans out of sight from the sidewalk side. These front yard areas are paved with cement and are from one to three steps lower than the floor of the sheltered entryway.

The area which lies between the front doors of the two downstairs units and the bottom of the stairwell as well as the pavement immediately surrounding the stairwell (the area behind the fences and the part of the sidewalk
10. Typical stairwell structure

11. Small child in front entry area
immediately in front of the stairwell) are areas which are frequently used by children between the ages of 3 and 7 as a play space. One can see toys spread out in the sheltered area and see little children using these areas at almost every building in Castle Square.

One reason the entryway space is used in this way is undoubtedly its proximity to the unit: but there is space outside the back doors of the ground floor units which is equally close to home and which is rarely used by children in this way, so proximity cannot be considered the sole determinant. The use the front entryways receive is partially due to the more public nature of the stairwell, which is shared by the occupants of four units. The area thus can serve as a play space for children from the upstairs units as well as the downstairs units, whereas the back yards are directly accessible only to those people in the downstairs units.

Another feature of the semi-detached stairwell structure is that in combination with the front fences, it affords a visually semi-private area where children who are shy can hide if they want while still remaining in the center of things. Although these areas are less far removed from the public sidewalk than the traditional rowhouse stoop, they afford a visual privacy which the stoop does not. Children are as often as not found playing just under the front of this stairwell, next to the public sidewalk. But unless they are seven years old or older they rarely leave the
immediate vicinity of the entryway. This use holds constant despite the variety of spaces which these entryways open onto--ranging from the most public to the least public areas of the site. That this is true indicates that this stairwell/entry condition through this combination of factors amounts to being a self-sufficient unit, which small children will use in this way regardless of its position on a site.

SECOND CONCLUSION

Children between the ages of 9 and 15 will most usually play in the spaces which are best suited to their favorite games, and factors such as the presence or absence of automobile traffic, "action," pedestrian traffic, visibility from the street, orientation of the surrounding units and microclimate are secondary in importance to the design of the game area.

For instance, a hard-surfaced area with boundary walls on at least two sides, preferably measuring at least 40' by 50', is the minimum necessary condition for a fast game of street hockey with eight or more players. In vicinities such as Castle Square where street hockey is very popular, the presence of such an area is enough to ensure heavy use by children wherever it exists on the site. This is not true of areas which are paved but which lack boundary walls.

One of the things I found the most enjoyable to look for in the course of my observations at Castle Square was how the different groups of children make use of the available spaces, and the adaptations they made for their different games. They play as much in the parts of the site where one might least expect them as they do in those areas specifically planned for their activities, and leave some
of the "planned" areas empty in preference for sidewalks and parking lots.

William Whyte in Cluster Development observes:

...in the majority of the developments we studied, the designated play areas were under-used, and even the free-form play sculpture that so intrigues the adult eye didn't seem to have much drawing power for children...

Children go where the action is, and the action most usually is on the streets and alleys and parking lots. Here's where the delivery men deliver their goods, where fathers wash their cars on week-ends, and where children have the most room for wheeling around on their own vehicles.³

There may certainly be some positive drawing power for children in being "where the action is," but it seems to be more the case at Castle Square that children play where the space is best suited to their favorite games, regardless of whether there is action there or not.

One of the most popular games at Castle Square is street hockey, and because of the frequency with which it is played at Castle Square, it makes a good test case for the above hypothesis. For a group of 8 or more kids to get a fast game going, a paved area at least 40' by 50' is required. In every case at Castle Square in which one finds a hard-surfaced area which is bounded on at least two sides by walls high enough to stop a ball it is used for street hockey. Ideally the space should be bounded on all four sides by walls high enough to stop a rolling ball, but low

³Whyte, op. cit., pp. 86-87.
enough for newcomers and onlookers to sit upon. Two spaces which suit these requirements well are the Parking Garage and the Central Play Area. The Church Lot play area is suitable also, although it has walls only at both ends and along part of one side, and where it is possible to lose the ball out into the street. Kids also play hockey in Castle and Emerald Court parking areas, but much less often than in the three places first mentioned. To adequately understand why this is so, one has to consider all the potentially relevant factors in each space. Without such consideration, it is impossible to assess the impact of such things as "action" or pedestrian traffic. The following are summaries of the relevant characteristics of each space and the activities which occur in them which were examined in the formulation of the second conclusion:

PARKING GARAGE

See photograph on following page.

The commercial parking garage was not designed to have anything to do with the pedestrian network or the designated play areas of the site. It is open to Herald Street, separated from it by only a 2' concrete wall, and is considered by the residents to be a dangerous place after dark (see interview notes in the appendix). It is off any beaten pedestrian path and the upper levels of it are not visible to passersby at street level, although they can be seen from the upper floors of the Paul Place buildings. For this
12. A hockey game in the parking structure

13. A baseball game in Castle Court
reason it took me quite a while to discover that the upper levels of the garage were used as a play area, as unless one goes up to the nearby sidewalk and listens carefully, it is impossible to tell that kids are playing there. After I began to make a point of checking the garage on each of my site visits, I realized that the uppermost levels of the garage get used quite frequently for street hockey, by a group of kids who set up their own goals and play there on roller skates. This area is also used by younger children (9 and 10 years old) for chasing and hiding games. The garage is not used for hockey as frequently as the Church Lot or the Central Play Area, both of which are at ground level and connected with well used pedestrian paths.

CHURCH LOT

See illustration on following page.

The Church Lot is a piece of ground abutted on three sides by the high end walls of units, and on the fourth side by Shawmut Avenue. Millicent Way, a well-used pedestrian path, runs from the side of this area along Paul Place to the Tot Lot and the elderly high-rise building, and is used frequently by people coming onto the site from Shawmut Avenue. There is also a way to go into Emerald Court at the corner of this play space which is frequently used by the children who play in the area, and less frequently by the other residents. The area is public in character, as it is not directly overlooked by the back or
CHURCH LOT looking east
front windows of any units, and is not separated from the
public sidewalk by an level change, change of material, or
physical barrier. Church Lot offers nothing in the way of
interest other than three polished granite benches, and
basketball standards. It is one of the two most used
hockey areas on the site, and in the course of my observa-
tions was almost always occupied by ten or twelve boys
playing a fast game.

CENTRAL PLAY AREA

See photograph on page 59.

The other principal street hockey area is part of the
depressed asphalt section of the Central Play Area, which is
about 2' below grade, paved with asphalt and surrounded by
low retaining walls. The Central Play Area is completely
surrounded by housing units, and is not visible from any
public street. It is bordered by fenced back yards on the
two longest sides, most of which fences are closed off with
gates which the residents have provided themselves. At the
two short ends of the area there are front entrances to
housing units. The sunken asphalt area surrounded by
pedestrian paths occupies more than half the courtyard, and
is divided into two areas by a "play wall," which is a large
rectangular cement block about 10' long and 3' wide by 6'
high, with some holes in the center. This "play wall"
serves to separate the basketball area at the far end from
the hockey court, and games frequently go on simultaneously without any interference.

CASTLE AND EMERALD COURTS

See illustration on pages 49 and 50.

These courts hold respectively 56 and 80 cars, and are both bordered on all four sides by the front entryways of the surrounding buildings. Seventy-four units are entered from Castle Court and 72 from Emerald Court. Castle Court can be entered by car via the drive opening onto Berkeley Street or from the Shawmut Avenue entrance which serves both courts. There are pedestrian ways into Castle Court next to the automobile entrances, at the corner of Berkeley and Shawmut, and from the sidewalk which connects the two courts at the western side. Leading out of Emerald Court there is a pedestrian underpass to Shawmut Avenue, which marks the end of a long and heavily used pedestrian way beginning at Tremont Street and passing through Village Court, under a building into the Central Play Area, and between two buildings into Emerald Court at the western edge. In addition to this major path, the sidewalk connecting the courts and the driveway which serves both courts, there are two other pedestrian entrances into Emerald Court: one leading to the Church Lot and the other to Millicent Way.

These parking courts are used frequently for washing and repairing cars, and frequently by children playing catch and baseball. Several residents make a habit of pulling
EMERALD COURT looking east
17. A baseball game in Emerald Court

18. Kids watching the same baseball game
chairs out next to the front stairwells on sunny days to watch the goings-on; others lean up against the fences and parked cars to socialize on weekends. Although people who do not live in Castle Square use these courts to park in on weekdays, the areas definitely have the feeling of being project territory, under direct resident surveillance. These courts are only infrequently used for hockey games, and when they are used for this the kids who play there set up portable goals. I have never seen a large group (say more than 5) playing hockey in either parking court.

The three areas which are most used by groups of boys for street hockey all have paved surfaces, a minimum dimension of 40' by 50', and boundaries on at least two sides which can stop the ball from rolling away. Spaces which suit the conditions of boundary walls and paving but not of size—for instance, the front entry courts along Paul Place—are used by smaller groups quite frequently for hockey but cannot accommodate very big games. It is clear from comparing the way Castle and Emerald Courts are used to the use seen in the Central Play Area and Church Lots that one of the necessary conditions for street hockey is a clear expanse of paving with boundary walls. There is plenty of pavement in Castle and Emerald Courts but no one plays hockey there with any regularity, although some of the kids do own portable goals which they can set up where they like. If the fact that automobiles are present in Emerald and Castle Courts
can be considered a deterrent, it is most likely that the parked cars rather than those which are moving through constitute the greatest problem for the hockey players. Castle and Emerald Courts both get used for games of catch and baseball often (games in which the ball is only occasionally rolling on the ground) and the players are not bothered by interruptions from automobiles entering and leaving.

The fact that the parking garage is used at all as a hockey area would seem to be adequate demonstration that pedestrian activity in an area is not a necessary minimum condition for a space to be used; but it should be noted that the most used hockey areas are in more accessible spaces and do have a fair amount of regular pedestrian traffic. As far as the problem of the degree of openness to the public street goes, the upper levels of the parking garage are out of sight from street level and the Central Play Area is surrounded by dwelling units on all sides and accessible only by foot. These areas, especially the latter, are regularly used for the game—so the amount of activity found at the Church Lot cannot be ascribed to its "public" character.

Nor does the orientation of the surrounding units appear to make any difference. Church Lot is faced on three sides by largely blank end walls, but the Central Play Area has front entrances on two ends and fenced back yards with balconies above on the two long sides: clearly easily surveillable by almost all the surrounding units. The only
Conditions which consistently occur in the most popular hockey areas are the paved surface and the presence of boundary walls; and with those areas popular for large games, the minimum area dimension of 40' by 50'.

THIRD CONCLUSION

The intensity of use that any one large area receives can be optimized by dividing the space into two or more defined game areas, by designing game areas that can be used in a variety of ways, and by providing nearby an ample amount of low walls or anything else which can be used for casually seating varied numbers of people who might want to watch the games. An area which has multiple game areas and which can support a variety of games and a lot of observers has the potential to become a real gathering place because of the number and variety of people it will attract.

A single space can accommodate a narrow or wide range of ball games, depending on how it is designed. If it is approximately 40' by 50' and provides low surrounding walls and a paved surface, it is good for street hockey; if it has paving, low side walls and high walls at either end it can be used for street hockey, wall ball and tennis backboard practice; if it provides basketball hoops set out from the high walls it will serve for all the above games and basketball as well.

Baseball requires no bounding walls but needs a space of greater dimension than is necessary for either hockey or basketball. Hockey and basketball can be played by as few as three or four people, and very little space is required
for this scale of game. Baseball would seem to require a
space long enough to hit a long drive regardless of the
number of people playing it, but games, although somewhat
cramped, are played in Emerald Court frequently on weekends.
Stickball seems to demand a long, narrow area with high
side walls—which is to say I have only seen it played on
the site in the front entry courts of Paul Place, and
occasionally in the communal back yards there. Volleyball
can be played anywhere there are two upright posts of any
description close enough to each other to allow a net to be
slung between them. Wallball requires of course a wall,
next to a section of paving. The paved areas at Castle
Square are suitable for most of the popular games, but the
grass areas are used for other purposes.

With every sizeable game area there are always people
who are looking on: admiring girlfriends, others
who are preparing to join, people just watching, eating
lunch or whatever. If there are no walls or benches to sit
on, people will sit on cars; if there is nothing to sit on,
ye will lean up against whatever is available to watch.
The most active spaces at Castle Square provide some physical
definition capable of supporting a few loiterers, and the
one area which provides the most opportunities for seating
turns into a real socializing spot on the weekends. If the
seating takes the form of low boundary walls it will be less
"stiff" than specially placed benches, and will allow groups
of varying size to congregate easily. Seating which is not
adjacent to a particular game area may go completely unused, but those which are in combination with game areas at Castle Square are frequently occupied, and serve to enhance the activities in those places.

The best example of this is the Central Play Area, which has the sunken asphalt area occupying one half of the space. The retaining walls around this asphalt play space are constantly used by onlookers whenever a game is going on, and people also sit on the play wall and even on the electrical meter housing (highly uncomfortable) to watch and talk to each other. This area works particularly well not only because it provides such convenient and flexible seating, but because it provides it adjacent to but not in the way of the pedestrian routes which pass through the area. Pedestrians can continue on their way without interrupting the play or passing between the onlookers and the game area.

The more formal seating areas which are provided in the Tot Lot and near the Berkeley Street playlot are not adjacent to any defined game areas and are virtually unused compared to the seating in the Central Play Area. The one bench which is not directly in the line of fire in the Church Lot is also regularly used by onlookers or waiting players, but as it is in the form of discreet benches it is less useful than the wall space in the Central Play area.

One of the most successful aspects of the Central Play Area and one of the characteristics which distinguishes it from the other play spaces at Castle Square, is the way it
is divided into discrete game areas. The sunken asphalt area is divided into two play areas--one for basketball, one for street hockey--by the "play wall" described earlier. There is also an area for small children separated from the game areas by the main pedestrian walk which crosses the space at a higher level than that of the play areas which lie on either side. This area, equipped with swings and slides, can be used by small children and anyone who is looking after them without interference with the "big kids" using the sunken asphalt area.

On a crowded day the Central Play Area is filled with little kids playing on the swings and slide at one end, basketball players at the other end, the everpresent hockey game in the centermost area, and people watching over the smallest children or the games sitting or standing around talking. The area seems to work as a gathering place, even for teens, at such times. Even at odd hours parts of it are always in use, but at peak times the space takes on a socializing character which sets it apart from any of the other play areas at Castle Square.
CENTRAL PLAY AREA looking east
20. Children using the play equipment in the Central Play Area

21. Basketball game in the Central Play Area
V. DISCUSSION OF THE PAUL PLACE, MILLICENT WAY AND TOT LOT AREAS: AND THE FOURTH CONCLUSION

The Paul Place front entry courts and communal back yards, Millicent Way and the Tot Lot will be discussed together in this section because as very closely interrelated spaces it is difficult to separate the discussion of one area from that of the others. They are all parts of a "play circuit," and although this is also true of other areas of the site, what is salient here is that the Tot Lot and Millicent Way are used as play spaces primarily as extensions of the activity in the Paul Place areas. Because of this organization of the discussion an issue will be included which in fact concerns only the Paul Place back and front entry areas and the other three areas similar to these which exist elsewhere on the site. This is the discussion of what differences in the ways these areas are used occur as a function of their being bordered by back entries instead of front, and vice versa. As is the case with every other area on the site, it seems to be a combination of factors which operate to produce the disparity in use. The fourth conclusion is covered in this section but is only one of a number of matters of interest.

FOURTH CONCLUSION

The paved front entry courts which serve two buildings (as seen in the center of Paul Place and in the Berkeley Street section of the site), which provide entry to approximately thirty units and are lined on both sides with the
front stairwells and wooden fences, provide a play space which will be used consistently by children aged 7 - 14 who live in the adjacent buildings, regardless of where such an entry court may exist on the site.

FRONT ENTRY COURTS AND COMMUNAL BACK YARD AREAS: Particularly Those Exemplified by Paul Place

The units which comprise Paul Place are in six buildings set parallel to each other in a row, bordered on one side by Millicent Way and on the other side by the Paul Place access road. The buildings are arranged face to face so that every intervening space is a communal back yard. At the end closest to Tremont Street the front entries of the first building face a blank wall which is the side of the management office and day care center; and the front entries of the last building in the row before one reaches Shawmut Avenue face onto this public street. Elsewhere in this row, however, the front entries of each building face the front entries of another similar building across a paved space approximately 50' wide. The buildings and entry conditions are the same as elsewhere in the low-rise part of the site: stacked duplexes four stories high (with an occasional two story section) and a semi-detached stairwell serving each four units with wooden fences to either side of it. These paved entry courts serve a total of 28 units apiece. There is one other entry court like this on the site which is not at Paul Place but perpendicular to Village Court, near Berkeley Street (hereafter referred to as the Berkeley Street Section).
There are three communal back yard areas in the Paul Place section, with 16 back doors opening directly onto a grassy area about 30' across. Either end of each grassy area is partially enclosed by brick walls approximately seven feet high which have 4' wide openings in the center. The upstairs units which do not have direct access to the grassy area have balconies which overlook the space. There are two back yard areas like those of Paul Place elsewhere in the project—one between the units which separate Emerald and Castle Courts, and the other behind those units which comprise the Berkeley Street Section. All of these back yard areas are distinguished from back yards of the downstairs units elsewhere in the project by the absence of fences demarcating private open space. Interestingly, in many cases the residents have taken it upon themselves to build their own fences from the wall of the building out to the sidewalk which runs through the area. There are several such fences in varying degrees of completion in every communal back yard area with the exception of the area which lies between Castle and Emerald Courts. One can frequently see residents gardening in these areas, and one person in the Berkeley Street Section has built a large play house there where his children sit out when the weather is nice.

TOT LOT AND MILICENT WAY

The Tot Lot is an open space about 130' long and 90' wide, which lies at the junction of several other areas in
22. Front entry court in Paul Place

23. Children playing in front entry court in Berkeley Street Section
24. Communal back yard area in Paul Place

25. Play house in communal back yard in the Berkeley Street Section
TOT LOT looking east
the site plan: the high-rise building for the elderly, the private back yards of a building which fronts on Emerald Court, the private back yards of a building which fronts on the Central Play Area, and part of Paul Place. It is likewise at the intersection of three major pedestrian ways: the route from the A & P past Paul Place leading to Village Court; the route coming from Berkeley Street past the Central Play Area; and Millicent Way, which leads from the Church Lot on Shawmut Avenue through the Tot Lot and passes underneath the elderly high-rise on its way to Tremont Street.

The Tot Lot contains a defunct wading pool, now enclosed by weed which gets used for climbing; a sand pit, and a large number of polished granite benches which are set against low concrete walls. The pool area is surrounded by seating and is separated from the sand pit area by a raised grass island which almost encircles the sand area. The rest of the space is taken up by paving where the pedestrian paths enter and become wider as they pass through the area.

As one follows Millicent Way out of the Tot Lot area and towards Shawmut Avenue, one passes along the alternating front and back areas of the Paul Place buildings on the left, and a line of fenced back yards on the right. The pedestrian way varies from 30' to 40' in width along its length, of which about 15' is paved.

The communal back yard areas described above receive a different amount and type of use than do the front entry courts, although the areas are almost identical in size.
The front entry areas are frequently--almost constantly--in use by kids riding bikes, roller skating, playing basketball and street hockey, leaning up against the fences and talking, or standing clustered around the entryways. The most intensively used entry courts are those which serve two facing buildings, although the front area of the one building which faces Shawmut Avenue is used a great deal for socializing purposes, if not much for games. The front stairwell areas in each of these entry courts is used by very small children as is described in the first conclusion.

The back yard areas by contrast are used much less for games, although they serve well those residents who have arranged private garden plots for themselves. Smaller children (ca. age 8) sometimes play games in and out of the back yard nearest the Tot Lot, and the centermost back yard area is occasionally--during peak hours of outdoor use on weekends--the location of a baseball game. According to one resident interviewed, these communal back yards were formerly a regular meeting place for the fathers who came home from work and went out back to have a beer with the neighbors and sit around watching while the youngsters played baseball. This resident noted that this was no longer the case, and attributed this to the fact that Paul Place is now largely populated by Chinese families, whereas formerly the majority had been Puerto Rican. The centermost back yard of Paul Place is still used in this fashion but apparently not as intensively as used to be the case.
The difference in use of the front and back areas described above cannot be set down simply to the fact that one type of space is bordered by front entrances and the other by back entrances, although this certainly has something to do with it. A major factor is that the front entry court is directly accessible to all 28 families in the two facing buildings, whereas the back yards have the doors of roughly one-half as many units opening onto them. This means not only that one-half of the families who overlook the space have only circuitous access to it, but also that the number of people who regularly pass through the front entry area is double that number of people who even have direct access to the back yard area—without taking into account the fact that the back doors are used less frequently than the front doors for regular access.

The type of surface is also a major factor: since the front entry courts are paved and the back yard areas offer only a very limited amount of paving, the front areas are better suited for roller skating, bike riding, hockey and basketball, and sustain a lot of traffic with groups of kids coming and going on their bikes and skates. As paved surfaces connecting Paul Place sidewalk to Millicent Way and the Tot Lot, they serve as optional routes in the play circuits used by the kids who live there. The Paul Place entry courts function as play spaces by themselves and as part of play circuits—especially of the bike riders—so frequently one will see them used simultaneously for
stationary games and for activities which "float" from one space into another. The front entry court in the Berkeley Street Section does not have this type of connection with a well-used play circuit, and is used primarily for stationary games such as frisbee, hockey and stickball.

Children move in and out of the back yard areas of Paul Place in the same sort of "floating" games--chasing each other in and out, hiding behind the end walls, etc.--but not with the frequency that one sees this occurring with the front entry courts. The back yard areas of Paul Place are used more frequently, however, than the back yard in the Berkeley Street Section or that which lies between Castle and Emerald Courts--in fact I have never seen this last area in use by anyone of any age. It is devoid of home-constructed fences and the abundant grass growing there testifies to the lack of traffic through it. This is perhaps due to its unique location between two parking courts with pedestrian paths on all sides. This is the only completely unused space at Castle Square. The back yard area in the Berkeley Street Section contains several resident-supplied fences although not much other evidence of gardening activity. In contrast to these two areas the back yards sections of Paul Place are quite heavily used--for baseball games and for small children playing; for gardening and occasionally for adult residents sitting outside. But apparently the condition of two buildings back to back with a communal grass area in between,
overlooked by all the units and accessible to half of them, is not sufficient to guarantee use.

During peak hours of outdoor use—say on a warm Saturday afternoon—one can find kids flowing in and out of both the back and front areas of Paul Place, and it is at times like this that the Tot Lot and Millicent Way become play areas in and of themselves, rather than just links between one play area and another. Children congregate on the pedestrian way and set up games of hopscotch and volleyball right in the line of traffic, while knots of cyclists stop to mill around before dispersing on another tour of the project. Millicent Way is used in this way where it is part of the Tot Lot as well as where it is not, and most of the activity which occurs in the Tot Lot happens as an extension of the activity on this broader section of Millicent Way.

The Tot Lot itself has nothing much to draw people to it. There is a great deal of pedestrian traffic and occasionally a few adults sitting there—but most of the action is from kids riding their bikes through, playing in the adjacent front and back yard areas or meeting kids from Emerald Court at the intersection of the paths. No one ever seems to settle down to any game in the Tot Lot proper, with the one exception of the sandbox area, which is used quite a lot by children under seven. The lack of interest of the older kids is most probably due to the fact that the arrangements there don't lend themselves to any particular games. There is a lot of seating provided, level changes and grass islands,
sandbox and the defunct wading pool (now covered with a wood
deck). Only rarely does one see people sitting and talking
there, as compared to the seating in the Central Play Area.
The Tot Lot does not afford any space suitable for ball
games, or very much play equipment for the little kids (and
it might have been an excellent place for some). It is too
broken up to be used for any games, yet the lack of such
activity means that the seating really doesn't get used. It
is interesting that although this area has a high volume of
through pedestrian traffic and many kids hanging out nearby
and congregating on Millicent Way, very little of the facili-
ties it provides are used. Even people waiting for laundry
at the nearby laundramat sit on the steps underneath the
high-rise building for the elderly residents, but not here.

The moral of the story would appear to be that seating
and one sand area are insufficient to attract very much use.
The front entry courts of Paul Place and the Berkeley Street
Section, on the other hand, provide a defined game space of
sufficient dimension for stickball and small groups of
basketball players (who tie milk crates onto the wooden
fences for makeshift baskets), and hockey players too--while
having the added advantage that older children playing here
can keep an eye on their younger brothers and sisters while
staying quite close to home. The back yard areas are also
useful although for a more limited set of games. The success
of Paul Place arrangement and by extension, that of Millicent
Way, would seem to lie in the fact that there are a number of
DISCLAIMER
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game areas available there, each big enough to handle at least one game with five or six kids, and each area has a certain personal character: the same groups of children can be seen playing there day after day. This is true also for the front entry court of the Berkeley Street Section—but what is unique about the Paul Place arrangement is that there is a series of these spaces, some more used than others, which all have direct access to wide common paved walk. The number of these areas and the overlapping of the play circuits which go in and out of them combine to make Millicent Way used as a play area during peak hours of use on the site. Other pedestrian walks in the project are used by the kids for biking and roller skating but none are used for games and congregations in the same fashion as the kids use Millicent Way.
29. The Tot Lot

30. Gardeners in a communal back yard area
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The following is taken directly from a paper on the development of Castle Square and the roles of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the architect and the developer in that process; written by Ray Warburton and Peter Kemble of the Harvard Graduate School of Design in 1965. The paper is entitled: "A Report on the firm of Samuel Glaser and Associates, and the development of the Castle Square urban renewal project." All the credit for the research is due to the authors and this summary of the development history is included purely for the convenience of the reader.

In 1963 the land on which Castle Square was to be developed was taken by the Boston Redevelopment Authority by eminent domain. The BRA promised the development of the area to the City Redevelopment Commission, a development corporation headed by Drucker, now called Castle Square Associates. The project was first negotiated as an industrial extension of the New York Streets Area, with early acquisition and little controls promised. Sam Glaser was asked to make studies and when the land was finally acquired in the summer of 1963 he was selected as the architect. Don Stull of his office was in charge of design throughout the project. The developer, the BRA and the architect got together to establish a program based on the architect's ideas for combining industrial and residential land usage. The program included the number of housing units, permissible commercial footage, rent structure, definition of housing types and acreage permitted for industrial. In response to the wishes of the residents of the area the program was
altered: the residents said they would support the taking of the Castle Square area only if it were made into a residential rather than industrial area. The BRA subsequently withdrew permission for industrial development, and decided to isolate the industry to the New York Streets area and to use the Castle Square area for combined commercial/dwelling construction. Density at this point became a function of design and costs. An increase in commercial footage was permitted beyond the 10% ration in an attempt to generate income and thereby subsidize the housing.

Initially the architects had planned commercial with about 300 dwelling units on the site, but they decided to raise this number to its present level of 500 dwelling units. The changes from industrial/residential to commercial/residential and raising the number of dwelling units were the most important changes to the program and these occurred even before Glaser had a contract with the CRC.

Initial costs were determined by footage and compared with and adjusted to unit costs market figures--assumptions were made based on knowledge of general subsurface conditions in the area. These costs in turn determined rent structures necessary to support construction, maintenance and project management. These rents were initially submitted to and rejected by the BRA.

In planning Castle Square, the architects and the BRA worked very closely--in fact they essentially collaborated on the design. The architect was working with the BRA and
for the CRC, but since the BRA chose the developer and had design review rights they were ultimately the client Glaser had to please. "The CRC did not really care what was built as long as it was cheap and they got their guaranteed 5%." "The BRA's program was exceeded only because of the 'particular interest and dedication for housing' and a 'great deal of tact and presentation ability of Mr. Stull'." The architect and the BRA presented a united front to the CRC, with the determination of Mr. Stull purportedly behind the caliber of the work.

Changes were generated by the Building Department, the BRA, the FHA and by cost difficulties as determined by the contractor and by subsurface difficulties. This project was the first 221(d)(3) work ever done by either the CRC or by Glaser's office--as well as being the most inexpensive housing that Sam Glaser had ever attempted, the rent levels established by the BRA being lower than those recommended for (D3) housing.

The major design objectives as set forth by the BRA were as follows:

1. Approximately 500 units of 221(d)(3) housing of which no more than 300 would be in high-rise

2. Approximately 100 units for the elderly in high-rise units to be built on site by the Boston Housing Authority

3. "All signs must be suitably integrated with the architectural design of the structure which they identify."

4. "A minimum of 1 car for every 2 units is to be parked on the ground (provided by the BRA); the remaining 50%
to be in a garage (provided by the developer). An additional 3 square feet of parking for every square foot of commercial, either in the ground or on the ground is to be provided by the developer.

5. The BRA has the power to review and veto design. Limitations on the design were:

a. Low rent levels demanded by the BRA

b. A requirement that every building over 7 stories have two elevators; (the cost of the additional elevator would put the project beyond D3 cost and also into new code limitations)

c. Extensive foundations necessary: the area of Boston on which the project is built is resting on 15' of fill and 2' 8" wide caissons 15' o.c. had to be sunk 25' deep to support the structural columns in all the buildings. These costs in fact persuaded the BRA later to raise the rent levels; spread footings accounted for one quarter of construction costs.

The architect chose to use the British Omnia building system, consisting of concrete pre-cast joists with block infill combined with poured in place major structural members, and constructed according to a 2' 2" design module.

Green areas on the site were given to the city to benefit both the city and the developer, as within cost constraints the developer could only afford to blacktop the areas. Stull through political maneuvering managed to get some of the 1% construction costs normally allocated for works of art re-allocated so that larger trees could be planted. Another coup on Stull's part was persuading the city to install the services to lower the cost to the developer; and the parking lots were proclaimed to be city
streets: they were given names and the clearance increased to accommodate city plows.

There were considerable headaches for the architect in trying to arrive at a site plan which had public housing integrated into private development for the first time in Boston—which proved to be an especially troublesome process because of the lengthy negotiations required and the stipulations attached to public housing.

The project as constructed contains:

89 low rise buildings which contain:

390 two, three and four bedroom duplex apartments of which the lower floors contain kitchen, living and dining rooms; and bedrooms and baths are on the upper floors

4 high rise elevator buildings containing:

192 one and two bedroom units, with the first floor of the seven story building devoted to commercial enterprises

2 high rise buildings containing:

96 apartments for the elderly; constructed by the Boston Housing Authority

The rental schedule as of 1965 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elevator Apts.</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>$/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one bedroom</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>88-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two bedroom</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98-108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Garden Apts.

| two bedroom    | 117          | 97      |
(Rental schedule continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garden Apts.</th>
<th>No. of units</th>
<th>$/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>three bedroom</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four bedroom</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>117-132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX B

#### TABLE 1

TOTALS FOR RECREATIONAL UCE; WITH BREAKDOWNS BY AGE AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Male</th>
<th>Number Female</th>
<th>Sex not noted</th>
<th>0 - 5</th>
<th>6 - 11</th>
<th>12 - 17</th>
<th>18+</th>
<th>Age not noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Observed Altogether = 721</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Percentage</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2

% OF TOTAL USE BY SPACE AND BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Av. No. Per Observation Period</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Total %</th>
<th>Total Counted</th>
<th>% of Total on Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Paul Place front yards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Paul Place back yards</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tot Lot</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Church Lot</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Central Play Area</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emerald Court</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Castle Court</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Berkeley Play Area</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>18+</td>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>Total # of Users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Place Front Yards</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Place Back Yards</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot Lot</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lot</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Play Area</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Court</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Court</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley St. Play Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
TOTALS FOR PEDESTRIAN USE: WITH BREAKDOWN BY SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex Not Noted</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Observed = 401</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
TOTALS FOR PEDESTRIAN USE BY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th># Observed</th>
<th>% of Total For Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tot Lot</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Play Area</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Court</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Court</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Lot</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT LOT</td>
<td>SANDBOX</td>
<td>GRASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A: Pedestrians
- B: Miscellaneous
- M: Maintenance
- W: Weather
- F: Facilities
- Y: Yearly
- O: Overall
LIST OF ACTIVITIES

The following is a list of every activity I have seen on the Castle Square site in the course of my observations. Following the mention of the activity is a number which refers to the number of times I saw any number of people engaging in this activity--it is not the total number of people I ever saw doing any one thing, but merely a rough index of the relative popularity of the various activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike riding</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing catch</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street hockey</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing on play blocks (Berkeley St. Area)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing chase in and out of back yards (communal)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing near front stoops</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swings and slides</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting and talking</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing other games or activities</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car washing</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall ball</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with pet dogs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing and talking</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking pot</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with sticks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing with wheeled toys (including shopping carts)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeping front stoop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting in communal back yard</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random play</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumprope &amp; other rope and string games</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing on balconies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting on or near front stoops, (with or without a lawn chair)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopscotch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing on balconies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandbox</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisbee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blowing bubbles 1
Riding motorbike 1
Playing house 1
Tennis practice on wall 1
Playing on cars 1
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The racial breakdown of the Castle Square project is as follows (figures courtesy of HUD):

500 units:  
147 white  
50 black  
50 Spanish-American  
153 Oriental  

Elderly units:  
10 white  
8 black  
1 Spanish-American  
1 Oriental

The U.S. Census for 1970 on tract 704 which includes only Castle Square, lists the following figures which would appear to be inaccurate. The number of children (612) they list is significantly lower than any estimate I received from either residents or management (these estimates ranged from between 1000 and 1500 children in the project, and several of them were obtained from people who worked at one of the various day care centers at the project). On the following pages are reproductions of relevant pages from the census itself.

All persons: 1842

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 29%
Children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Number of Persons Under 18 Years of Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All families</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband/wife families</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with other male head</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with female head</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of persons under 18 years of age: 641
### Table P.2: Social Characteristics of the Population: 1970—Continued

#### C-SQ

#### Census Tracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, A COUNTRY OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized parent or native parent</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized parent or native parent</td>
<td>2.064</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized parent or native parent</td>
<td>3.064</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized parent or native parent</td>
<td>4.064</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized parent or native parent</td>
<td>5.064</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1573</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>2133</td>
<td>2233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, A COUNTRY OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never enrolled</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never enrolled</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never enrolled</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, A COUNTRY OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CHILDREN EVER BORN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, A COUNTRY OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never born</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never born</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never born</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RESIDENCE IN 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, A COUNTRY OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never born</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never born</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never born</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION AND PLACE OF WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, A COUNTRY OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CENSUS TRACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIVITY, PARENTAGE, A COUNTRY OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
<th>Tract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private car or van</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*See text for definition. Includes 'Moved' 1965 residence not reported.
### Census Tracts

#### Table P-4. Income Characteristics of the Population: 1970—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Tracts</th>
<th>C.S.Q.</th>
<th>Boston—Con.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Income in 1969 of Families and Unrelated Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 and over</td>
<td>$20,000 - $24,999</td>
<td>$15,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>$10,000 - $14,999</td>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>$0 - $4,999</td>
<td>$22,999 and over</td>
<td>$17,999 - $22,999</td>
<td>$12,999 - $17,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Median Income

- **Mean income:** $25,000
- **Median income:** $10,000
- **Percent below poverty level:** 10%
- **Percent above poverty level:** 90%

#### Type of Family in 1969 of Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Percent 65 years and over</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent related</td>
<td>Percent other</td>
<td>Percent children under 18 years</td>
<td>Percent related children under 18 years</td>
<td>Percent related children under 18 years</td>
<td>Percent related children under 18 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ratio of Family Income to Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
<td>Percent of families with incomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Income Below Poverty Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
<td>Percent of families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unrelated Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
<td>Percent of unrelated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Values are based on survey data. For minimum base for derived figures, see notes.
### Table P.3: Labor Force Characteristics of the Population: 1970—Continued

#### EMPLOYMENT STATUS

- **Total, 16 years old and over**
- **Not in labor force**
  - Home workers
  - Unemployed
  - In labor force
  - Employed
  - Unemployed
  - In labor force
  - Retired
  - In labor force
  - Not in labor force

#### OCCUPATION

- **Total employed, 16 years old and over**
- **Professional, technical, and kindred workers**
- **Clerical workers**
- **Sales workers**
- **Service workers**
- **Farm workers**
- **Retail trade**
- **Transportation and public utilities**
- **Accommodation and food services**
- **Construction, except heavy and civil engineering**
- **Manufacturing**
- **Mining**
- **Finance, insurance, and real estate**
- **Transportation and public utilities**
- **Public administration**
- **Education**
- **Other services**
- **Private household workers**

#### INDUSTRY

- **Total employed, 16 years old and over**

#### CLASS OF WORKER

- **Total employed, 16 years old and over**

---

**Census Tracts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Data based on sample. See text for more detailed figures and explanations of symbols.
INTERVIEW NOTES

ALMA MCKINNON - TENANT

The Berkeley Street lot is used a lot by kids but she herself wouldn't like to send children there because of the broken glass.

The area near Shawmut Avenue (Church Lot) would be much more useful but it is graced so that there is an enormous puddle which hinders use a lot of the time.

Paul Place--and between houses, especially the paved area between front stoops--the small children play games there a lot.

The Village Court parking lot isn't used--she doesn't know why--maybe because the traffic goes through faster--but she attributes the use of the Emerald and Castle Court lots to the need of large numbers of children. Is always a ball game going on there.

The Central Play Area is used noontimes by the students from the Franklin Institute (I myself saw this only once). This area could have been used for flooding for ice hockey in the winter but its difficult to keep blacktop frozen (as opposed to cement?) and kids break up the ice before it can set. About two-thirds of the area is used for street hockey and works O.K.--is in use most of the time--and the kids themselves pick up the broken glass and try to keep it clean.

The problem with the Central Play Area is that the play wall and the fountain are placed so that their use conflicts directly with the basketball court.

Also are an inadequate number of swings--at beginning had only three swings, for 1500 children. (Now have six.)

The Tot Lot: is a problem both with management and design. Have to design the sandbox so that cats and dogs can't get into it; also people break glass into it and it's hard to clean.

The wading pool in the Tot Lot is stagnant because the drain was incorrectly designed and/or it was never properly drained. Hence useless.

There are three day care centers--one at Castle Square, or nearby, and the kids play in the Tot Lot and in the Central Play Area. Is not enough play equipment for them here. She herself is associated with the infant center but doesn't
like kids from there to play in the Tot Lot because of the broken glass.

The parking garage upper levels are used by kids as a play area; probably because there is an inadequate amount of play space elsewhere on the site.

The private back yards are used intensively, although only a small number of people have them. Shared back yards don't work so well and are usually ill-maintained—are fenced in so that you can't see into them. The grass isn't mowed. Problems with grass which management won't mow; tenants don't own their own mowers.

The management is unresponsive ("With the rents you're paying you don't deserve..."). They went into the project to make money and refuse to lift a finger to clean it.

GLORIA ANDERSON - TENANT
Phone conversation

She has no young children herself. Says none of the play areas at Castle Square are used—and that kids will play in the street no matter what you provide for them.

Says there is no good place for the littlest children to play—should have a lot with supervision—she wouldn't send her children out to an unsupervised tot lot.

She and her husband enjoy gardening and sit outdoors in their open space and fix it up—but other people don't take care of their places because "they expect other people to do everything for them."

As for grates on windows, some people put them up because they're afraid of being robbed but she doesn't see that it would help much if someone is really determined to break in—most often people get ripped off because they leave their windows open.

The private balconies seem to get used—not a question of visual privacy.

The private back yards: whether or not to put up a gate is up to individual choice, some people will take the trouble and some won't ever bother.
DICK KELLEY - ASSISTANT MANAGER
Off-record interview

As far as crime goes overall this is the safest project around—he ascribes this to the fact that the project is racially balanced and if someone gets hurt they can depend on retaliation from members of their own group. Initially there was lot of fighting back and forth but everyone soon realized that there was no way to take over so they quit. The Chinese leave everyone else alone—but stand up for themselves when they have to.

"Biggest problem is overcrowding..." Mr. Kelley referred several times to the fact that frequently more than one family will share an apartment. Many Chinese people are here illegally from Canada and the reason they never trouble the management is because they don't want to be found out.

Gates on the private outdoor spaces are purely up to the choice of the resident and are not supplied by the management.

VICKI WILLIAMS - TENANT

Has a private back yard, shared with a neighbor. This is a satisfactory arrangement. She enjoys the privacy and prefers this arrangement to the unfenced communal back yards of Paul Place.

The Central Play Area Equipment: need a smaller slide for the little kids—the large slide is too near the concrete wall and one child at least has fallen off and hurt himself.

Inadequate number of swings.

There is a large hole in the Basketball Court in Central Play Area—they can never get it fixed, and when it is fixed it comes back. The management maintains the project inadequately although that part is supposed to be maintained by the City Parks Department.

The concrete wall contains a sprinkler—for climbing on—it doesn't get turned on too often.

The sidewalks don't get plowed because nobody can decide whose responsibility it is to do it, and the management is not legally responsible for cleaning them.

The plumbing in the units is inadequate: in a family development there is no reason to prohibit washing machines.
When people install them the pipes are inadequate and sewage backs up.

The parking lots are owned by the city which doesn't ticket illegally parked cars although they are technically reserved for the residents--executives from the downtown area park there.

The parking courts stay dirty all the time—the management doesn't clean them and neither does the city because they are always full of cars.

Kids race motorbikes up and down Millicent Way—and it is dangerous for old people and little kids.

The Tot Lot should have at least one fenced in area so that a mother could go into the laundramat and not have to take the kids with her.

There is a fair amount of space in the project where the kids can go without being right out in the street. As soon as the kids get really active they refuse to stay in the yard at home.

The parking garage is dangerous—people have been murdered there. It is a bad public use to put near housing—used to be very dark; now has better lighting.

Usually strangers don't walk through the project very much.

The tops of the stairwells are dangerous—people can hide there and wait to rob you—it is an easy place from which to break into the apartment. Entrance to it should be locked.

There is no basement or crawl space under the buildings and consequently the downstairs floor is cold and damp all winter long.

GAIL SHARFMAN - TENANT

The basketball equipment wasn't originally even there. Kids play a lot of street hockey—

On Paul Place, the kids are mostly Chinese, and they play street hockey nearby. They need a hard surface, and their parents can watch them.

It would be nice to have some railroad tie structures like they have up at Washington Park: they might appear to be dangerous but the young kids do handle themselves very well.
There is an inadequate amount of play space at Castle Square. Also the management has a very elitist attitude.

Teenagers congregate in the garage, winos sleep there at night. A few people have been murdered there.

The management advertised the project as having attractive playgrounds and parking space available in the garage for monthly fees—which it isn't. There are now more cars than there used to be, with teenagers getting them. The parking garage is now lit up at night but could be fenced off and closed at night.

There are 500 units in the project with some rent supplements spread out through the project. Distribution approximately 30% white, 30% black, 30% Puerto Rican and 10% Chinese, originally—but now the Chinese immigration is changing and the percentage of Chinese people in the project may be as high as 40%.

The back yards of Paul Place used to be used for baseball games for the Spanish families—they put out chairs to watch—the fathers would sit out with a can of beer and so on...But the Chinese residents don't do this, and Paul Place is now mostly Chinese families.

There is no good place to keep bicycles. They get stolen altogether or in pieces if you keep them outside.

Need more outdoor space. That which exists is not well designed as it is. The basketball court gets a lot of use.

The Berkeley Street Play area gets used by winos—and the concrete play blocks are hard and listing.

Are at least three kids per family, so that means about 1500 in the project.

The fenced back yards are definitely more used—they have better privacy.

She has lived here five years—since her kids were in the third grade.
FRONT ENTRY COURT