



31.0.23
2020

FEDERAL
CITY
PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

URBAN HOUSING

2020
7



CARL MACKLEY HOUSES—Philadelphia's Limited-Dividend Project

SEE PAGE 20

URBAN HOUSING



THE STORY OF
THE P·W·A HOUSING DIVISION

1933-1936

BULLETIN No. 2



WASHINGTON·D·C·AUGUST 1936

**FEDERAL EMERGENCY
ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC WORKS**
HAROLD L. ICKES, Administrator

HOUSING DIVISION
H. A. Gray, Director

Forsale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C.
Price 20 Cents

THE LIBRARY
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 15, 1936.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Administrator, Federal Emergency
Administration of Public Works,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Transmitted herewith is the manuscript prepared as Housing Bulletin No. 2, "Urban Housing", prepared by members of the Housing Division Staff. This bulletin fulfills the need for a brief handbook on the Housing Division and its relation to the urban housing movement.

The present manuscript is a logical sequel to "Slums and Blighted Areas in the United States", Dr. Edith Elmer Wood's able exposition of the housing problem, which was published as Housing Bulletin No. 1. "Urban Housing" makes no pretense to be a complete or technical study, but is intended to fix the position of the Housing Division in housing progress.

It has been written in the Editorial Section of the Branch of Research and Information, headed by Mr. Charles E. Pynchon. Winston Elting was chiefly responsible for the bulletin and was aided by Talbot Wegg and other members of the Editorial Section.

I consider this manuscript important not only as a record of the Housing Division's accomplishments, but as a vital chapter in the definitive history of American housing and it is therefore recommended for publication by the Public Works Administration.

Very respectfully,

H. A. GRAY,
Director of Housing.

416725

FOREWORD

AMERICA stands today on the threshold of a vast national housing movement. Three years of intense activity have brought this country to a position where the urban low-cost housing problem is no longer a purely academic subject, but has rather taken its place among the foremost issues of the day. It cannot be put aside. These 3 past years of Government activity in housing matters have climaxed 20 years of study and research by the few far-sighted individuals who have long seen the vital need for a housing program. By surveys, figures, and statistics of all kinds they have clearly shown the existence and extent of this great need.

It has been the job of the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration to demonstrate, in 3 crowded years, how this need can be met by definite action. The undertaking of a Federal program, while not caused by the depression, was brought to a head by the emergency situation that existed in 1933. Men had to be put to work; the devastated building industries had to be stimulated; private capital for the time being had shown itself incapable of accomplishing either aim. Accordingly the Federal Government undertook to show, by means of demonstration projects throughout the country, how this great need for urban low-rent housing could be attacked. In 125 cities throughout the United States and its insular possessions surveys were made, data was accumulated, and conditions studied by representatives of the Division. This in itself has been a herculean task. It formed the foundation for subsequent recommendation of the 50 projects in 35 cities now in the process of construction. These projects are not intended to solve the low-rent housing problem. Rather they consist in a practical demonstration to serve as a yardstick of experience in the activity that lies ahead. They offer to municipalities all over the country a measure of solvability. Their true value is as components to a future

program. Finally these projects have translated a proved need into what is fast becoming a popular demand.

The accompanying bulletin concerns itself briefly with the history of urban low-cost housing abroad and in this country. Particular emphasis is placed on the past 3 years and the work of the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration during that time. Attributes to the need for action are also reviewed. The steps forming a development of consciousness of the problem prior to 1933 are taken up with specific examples of projects constructed during those years.

The history of the Housing Division as discussed, is one of difficulties overcome, of disappointments, of accomplishments and always of great activity.

At the moment of writing, legislative measures are before Congress which contain definite provisions for a comprehensive long-term policy for the housing of people of low income. These measures are herein reviewed. The emphasis contained in this legislation is on increased local responsibility for the initiation and execution of the program. The Federal Government, during years of stress, has introduced a housing policy which is essential to any civilized State. States and municipalities must now assume their share of the burden in carrying this program forward.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SINCE this bulletin is intended to serve only as a popular reference book, no attempt has been made to document its source material. In many cases, acknowledgment has been made in the text itself.

For historical background the authors are indebted to Dr. Edith Elmer Wood and Miss Catherine Bauer whose books, "Recent Trends in American Housing" and "Modern Housing" are recognized as standard works.

For figures on the social and economic costs of bad housing the authors wish to thank the following persons and agencies who have submitted surveys to the Housing Division: Mr. William J. Collins, Chairman of the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority; Miss Elisabeth M. Herlihy, Secretary of the Boston City Planning Board; Mr. J. C. DeHoll, Chairman of the Housing Authority of the Birmingham District; Mr. Joe R. Beckett, Chairman of the Indianapolis Community Plan Committee; Mr. Fred B. Bradshaw, Chairman of the Jacksonville Municipal Housing Board; Major M. J. Mackler, Chairman of the Tampa Municipal Housing Board; the Iowa State Planning Board; Mr. Milton Lowenthal, of the Housing Study Guild of New York; and Mr. Howard Whipple Green.

CONTENTS

	Page
PART I. BACKGROUND.....	3
Introduction.....	3
Need for Housing Activity.....	3
Present Living Conditions.....	6
Incomes and Rents.....	6
Demand for Additional Low-Rental Dwellings.....	7
Cost of Slum Maintenance.....	8
PART II. HOUSING DIVISION, P. W. A.....	14
Purpose.....	14
Policy.....	15
Function.....	15
Structure.....	16
PART III. HISTORY OF THE HOUSING DIVISION.....	24
Introduction.....	24
War Housing.....	24
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	26
Federal Housing Administration.....	26
Limited-Dividend Legislation.....	27
Typical State Boards of Housing.....	27
Housing Division.....	27
Limited-Dividend Program.....	28
Financial Policy.....	28
Applications.....	29
Federal Program.....	29
Abandonment of Limited-Dividend Program.....	30
Local Initiative.....	30
Land Acquisition.....	30
Expansion.....	32
The Housing Division's First Project.....	33
Activity.....	33
Local Sponsorship.....	34

Housing Division—Continued.	
Federal Program—Continued.	
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act	35
Change of Administration	36
Curtailment	37
Final Program	37
PART IV. PRESENT PROGRAM	38
Deadline	38
Procedure	38
Contracts	40
Architects	41
Construction	41
Administrative Change	42
Relocation	43
Completion	44
Management	44
Employment	45
CONCLUSION	47
APPENDIX A. Development of the Housing Move- ment	51
Personalities	51
Europe	52
England, Germany, Austria, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Scandinavia.	
United States of America	55
Early Limited-Dividend Projects	55
1. Philanthropic	56
Octavia Hill Association	56
Phipps Houses, Inc.	56
J. D. Rockefeller, Jr.	57
Bayonne, Thomas Garden Apartments, and Paul Lawrence Dunbar Apartments.	
Mariemont	57
Lavanburg Homes	57
Chicago	57
Marshall Field Garden Apartments	58
Michigan Boulevard Garden Apartments	58
Chatham Village	58

United States of America—Continued.	
Early Limited-Dividend Projects—Continued.	Page
2. Investment	58
Boston Cooperative Building Company	58
City and Suburban Homes Company	58
Cincinnati Model Homes, Inc.	59
City Housing Corporation of New York	59
Sunnyside Gardens and Radburn.	
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company	60
New York State Housing Law of 1926	60
Ordinance of 1927	60
Other New York Limited-Dividend Projects	61
Prudential Life Insurance Company	61
3. Cooperative Societies	61
Wisconsin	61
New York	62
APPENDIX B. HOUSING LEGISLATION	63
Municipal Ordinances	63
State Limited-Dividend Housing Legislation	63
National Limited-Dividend Legislation	64
State Housing Authority Legislation	64
National Public Housing Legislation	65
List of Official Housing Agencies	76
APPENDIX C. PROJECTS OF HOUSING DIVISION	79
Limited-Dividend Projects	79
Federal Projects	82

URBAN HOUSING

PARTS I-IV

Part I

BACKGROUND

Introduction.

BEFORE 1933 the word "housing" meant little to the people of the United States. The term "housing" in its accepted connotation contains the qualification of "low-cost" housing. A few sincere philanthropists, builders, social workers, and technicians had worked for years to improve housing conditions in the country, but outside of a few urban centers their work was either unknown or dismissed as visionary and socialistic. They can point to regulatory ordinances and to a handful of pioneering housing projects as evidence of hard-won accomplishment in the face of public apathy or opposition.

Today their achievements are being recognized in Nation-wide recognition of the need for better housing for the lower income groups. Much has been done in the past 3 years to devise solutions for this problem. Yet before the people of this country are adequately housed, there is a tremendous job ahead. The magnitude of that job is indicated by the conditions now existing in our cities.

Need for Housing Activity.

Appreciation of the need for housing of the low-income groups developed simultaneously with the Industrial Revolution. During the period between 1860-80 the sudden expansion of urban population brought about the crowding together of peoples of low income into hastily built, inadequate dwellings for which rents were charged in proportion

only to the pressure of demand and the quick profits that were anticipated. Shoddily built, insufficiently maintained, they became in a few years the foundation for inadequate returns, as well as cankerous sores on the mental, moral, and physical life of their respective communities. This condition existed not only in America but in Europe and the British Isles as well. Costs for the maintenance of these areas in public moneys have become excessive. The income has become negligible. Police and fire protection, health and sanitary services have cost municipalities sums out of all proportion to the income from, and the percentage of, the population of these areas. The income due from such districts has been reduced by tax delinquencies and has included in returns a goodly amount of crime, delinquency, and human disintegration thrown in as rather doubtful assets.

The condition of these slum areas has been purely a result of neglect, a hands-off policy provoked primarily by a fear of financial loss and unaided even by a zealotry, sound in itself, on the part of those who until recently have stressed only social conditions, children, the home, and morale to the exclusion of a dollar and cents consideration. The staggering evidence of the social ills and evils directly bound up in the slum question bears universal weight only in its translation to the actual costs of such social evils to the community, and finally to the preferability of replacing such evils with a substitute.

We know what the substitute is and we are beginning to find out how we can place it.

The need for low-rent housing has been made apparent not only by a growing realization of the physical, moral, and economic worthlessness of the dwellings and conditions that it supplants, but by a necessity of providing for a class of people for which provision has never been adequately made whether in or outside of blighted areas. It became apparent at the turn of the century and has become since then increasingly more so, that our economic system has been hard put to provide, through private unaided initiative, decent minimum standard dwellings for what has now become over one-third of our total families. This problem can be considered for the

moment independently of the question of slum elimination, there being no particular relationship between the two except where special conditions demand.

It is generally agreed that, to maintain a reasonable budget, no family should pay more than 20 to 25 percent of income for rent.

In 1934 it was estimated that 37 percent of all nonfarm families had incomes of \$800 or less; 20 percent of that sum, \$160, will pay for only the dregs of housing in metropolitan areas. Yet the remaining 80 percent is not sufficient to maintain a family on what figures, based on Department of Labor statistics, call a minimum subsistence standard. In other words, if even the meanest acceptable standard of living is to be observed such families can *afford* to pay nothing for their shelter. They do pay for it, of course. Almost invariably it is a worthless product, and payment is possible only at the expense of other necessities of life.

The condition of housing inhabited by such families indicates all too well our inability to provide them with decent homes on a profitable basis. Until 3 years ago the country was prone to deplore these conditions and in the same breath to accept them as unalterable.

Now cognizance has been forced upon the country at large and a policy of dealing with the situation is being evolved. In further study of urban housing conditions we realize, that while they have been aggravated, they have in no way been caused by the depression. The need for housing activity is deep rooted in our economic and social life. It concerns fundamentally the betterment of living conditions for the majority, and in its accomplishment provides a stimulus to business and industry. Housing is not an emergency measure in itself; it is the answer to a long term problem brought to a head by an emergency situation. It involves an increase in values by bettering conditions and stimulating morale. It is more than a definite complement to what we call the "American standard of living"; it is the creation of that standard in the sense in which it should be taken, i. e., a standard of decency in living conditions made available to the majority as a commodity not as a luxury. This standard has not yet been attained.

Present Living Conditions.

A better knowledge of the need for housing can be gained by study of facts and figures concerning the present status of incomes and rents, the condition of present dwellings, the demand for additional dwellings, and finally the character of blighted areas with special reference to their costs of maintenance and productivity of crime and disease.

Incomes and Rents.

Capacity to pay is the fundamental factor in development of any housing program. According to figures issued by the Brookings Institution, 21 percent of all families in 1929 had incomes of less than \$1,000; 21 percent had incomes between \$1,000 and \$1,500; and 17 percent received between \$1,500 and \$2,000. If, as the Housing Study Guild of New York maintains, \$1,700 may be regarded as a "minimum decency" income and \$1,100 as a "minimum subsistence" income, it would seem to follow that roughly 50 percent of all families were living below the so-called American standard and 40 percent were below even bare subsistence. The farm population, of course, has less need for cash in hand than the urban. Yet with all possible deductions, the percentage of families living in deplorable conditions must be staggering. Experts will differ substantially on estimates, yet there is no need to quibble over exactitude when even the most conservative are above 30 percent.

The real property inventories of 1934, made under the direction of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in 64 typical cities, give the first comprehensive data on the condition of the Nation's housing. From them we glean tabulated facts to confirm our visual impressions of slums and blighted areas. In 64 cities, 2.3 percent of total dwellings are unfit to live in, 15.6 percent are in need of major structural repairs; 44.4 percent are in need of minor repairs, and 37.7 percent are in good condition. These figures refer only to relative condition and take no account of the quality of plan or equipment, the relation of individual dwellings to the neighborhood, nor the number of persons in each home.

The inventories also chart the obsolescence of the Nation's urban housing; 34 percent of dwellings in 64 cities have both

Razing the Slums



SEE PAGE 44

TEN EYCK HOUSES

Architects: **ROBERT EYCK**, **WALTER GARDNER**, **WILLIAM LEHMAN**, **JOHN W. DOUGLE, JR.**, **MORLEY LEECH, WALKER**, **WALTER TRUMAN**, **SPENCER CLAYTON** (Manager)
Contractors: **WALTER A. GIBBERTY**, **EDWARD J. CLARK**, **WALTER A. GIBBERTY**, **EDWARD J. CLARK**, **WALTER A. GIBBERTY**, **EDWARD J. CLARK**, **WALTER A. GIBBERTY**, **EDWARD J. CLARK**



The Country's Largest
Slum Clearance Project



Courtyard View

TEN EYCK HOUSES, NEW YORK, N. Y.

hot and cold running water, but 8 percent have no interior water supply at all; 17.1 percent have no private indoor water closet and 1 in 4 has no bathing facilities. Approximately one-third provide only coal or wood stoves for cooking.

From these figures one can form a mental picture of the average urban dwelling. Better than 50 percent of the rental units in 1934 rented for less than \$20 per month. More than one-third brought \$15 or less and 15 percent were priced below \$10. Generally speaking, one can say that the dwellings which may be rated as substandard—those without running water, private indoor toilet, bathing facilities, etc., are those which rent for less than \$20. Stated conversely those who have adequate housing pay in excess of \$20 per month rent. If this is the average for the 64 cities studied, conditions in the larger cities are even more aggravated. For instance, 41 percent of families in Cincinnati paying \$28 a month have no conveniences other than a cold-water sink.

What must we pay for decent housing under our present economic conditions? It depends, of course, on standards of adequacy. Carl Mackley Houses, a recently completed private project in Philadelphia financed by the Public Works Administration, rents for \$9.50 per room per month. In this figure is included heat, light, cooking, and refrigerating power. In other words there are no extras; at the same time there is only a nominal profit to the sponsors. Mr. Langdon W. Post, chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, has stated that "no builder can build under the building code or law a decent building in New York City which can rent for less than \$10, \$11, or \$12 per room." Figures in smaller cities may be less, yet the principle remains valid—adequate housing today is not within reach of the lower income groups.

Demand for Additional Low-Rental Dwellings.

Aside from any questions of suitability, the National Housing Association has stated that "during 1932 and 1933 there weren't enough single homes built to replace those burned down in those 2 years." In 1934 the total housing construction in 257 cities amounted to 22,603 dwelling units as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Estimates of a yearly dwelling unit requirement vary from 400,000 to 1,000,000

new homes for the next 10 years. These are requirements for new dwellings. On the other hand, Government estimates show that two-thirds of the industrial workers in the United States are poorly housed and that exclusive of the farm population, this shortage of decent dwellings affects approximately 50,000,000 individuals, more than one-third of our population. Dr. Edith Elmer Wood, the well-known authority on housing, believes that from 9 to 10 million families are living in homes so deteriorated as to endanger their health, safety, or morals—in some cases, all three. There are thus two interrelated problems involved: catching up with a definite housing shortage on the one hand, and eliminating unfit housing on the other.

Since the greatest need for additional dwellings is to house low-income groups, any comprehensive program should be based on rental scales which would make such accommodations available to those income groups. If in urban communities private capital cannot produce rentals of less than \$9 or \$10 a room a month, some form of subsidy is required.

To supply decent housing conditions to the 17 percent of our total families whose incomes are less than \$800 per year and who cannot, under a balanced budget, afford rentals of over approximately \$1.50 per room, a complete reorganization is necessary. Housing for this class must be on a permanent relief basis. If they are to be housed the present conception of a financial policy must be reversed. A 100 percent subsidy must be hypothesized at the outset and rents collected where possible.

Cost of Slum Maintenance.

Aside from any question of need for additional accommodations and their provision for the needy, is the problem of the slum with its cost in dollars and cents, and in human life and misery. The eradication of the evils adherent to blighted areas is a prime factor in any general housing program.

The staggering cost to the public for the maintenance of slum areas has only recently been learned.

During 1932, in a certain slum area in Cleveland, where 2.47 percent of the population of the city dwelt on 0.73

percent of the land area, the tax income was \$225,035, whereas the total cost of maintaining the section was \$1,972,437, or a net loss of \$1,747,402. Likewise in Indianapolis, in those areas of greatest economic drain, it has been found that taxpayers are spending each year for the maintenance of each person \$27.29, as against \$4 per person in other areas; 26 percent of the taxes spent for police, fire, health, and sanitary services are maintaining only 10 percent of the city's population. Thirty percent of the city hospital service in 1932 went into this area of 10 percent of the population. More than 33 percent of the public relief and 36 percent of the city expenditure for arrests, trials, and imprisonments were likewise absorbed by these 11 census tracts. Again during 1933, a study of a sub-standard area in South Boston of 769 families indicates an income of \$27,093.23 and expenses of \$275,113.74 or an excess of expenses over income of \$248,020.51. These figures, astounding as they may be, are typical in a general way of every city in America where there are slums and this means practically every one.

In Cleveland this yearly loss represents a sum of money which at the end of 20 years could produce approximately 7,300 new 4-room dwelling units. In other words, it represents a burden on every taxpayer in the city which, if put into clearance and housing channels, would provide 7,300 new family units within 20 years, as well as eradicating at the same time an extremely evil social and economic condition.

In Minneapolis the average cost to the city for a fire run is \$800. At this rate the cost of fire protection for an area considered for a housing project totaled \$70,000 in 1932, for runs alone. Compared to this, the total taxes assessed against all properties in the neighborhood amounted to \$30,835.

In the city of Birmingham there are 22 distinct blighted areas covering 817 city blocks and approximately 200 additional blocks in scattered areas. Twelve of these total areas, covering 541 blocks, are occupied by colored families. On the basis of 1,000 comparable blocks, the city would spend about \$2,500,000 annually or nearly one-half of its budget to operate about 20 percent of its area.

The Illinois Housing Commission made a survey in 1933 of a square mile in a partially blighted residential area in Chicago. It was found that the city paid \$3,200,000 toward fire and police protection, schools, street maintenance, garbage removal, and the like in this area. On the other hand the taxes levied could have equaled only \$1,191,352, but 3 years after the due date had been collected only to the extent of \$586,061.

Similarly all over the country people are paying to preserve that of which they most want to rid themselves. In truth municipalities can't afford to keep their slums. Better can they afford in dollars and cents alone to eliminate them and build new dwellings. The expenditure of seven times the normal for the maintenance of each and every person in a slum area is too heavy a price to pay.

Aside from the dollars and cents aspect we cannot overlook the social evils that blighted areas produce. There have been many studies made relating to the degrees of delinquency, crime, immorality, safety, and general welfare in slum districts. In many cities geographic surveys of the distribution of social evils have clearly indicated the demoralizing effects of poor living conditions. Affected from an early age by uncontrolled and unsanitary conditions where an overcrowded dwelling forces him to play in streets, filthy alleys, and backyards, a child has every chance in the world of becoming a truant. The truant will probably become a delinquent; the delinquent, a criminal. With a state of bad inheritance established by such conditions, and with an unquestionably evil environment, the chances for decent productive living are small enough. Occasionally a superior family breaks away and moves on, but in most cases discouragement, bad habits, and bitterness have taken their toll.

Dr. Clifford R. Shaw, in his consideration of Chicago's delinquency areas, shows by spot maps that, in one of the districts of bad housing conditions, 26.6 percent of the boys between 10 and 17 years of age had passed through the juvenile police probation office in 1926. This is generally true in other areas. The highest rates of male juvenile

T&U

delinquency, 29.3 and 29.1 percent, were in slum districts immediately west and south of the Loop. Areas of high concentration inevitably have produced higher rates of delinquency. These areas are slum areas. Fifty percent of the 5,000 truants studied in Chicago lived in 9.8 percent of the total city area which contained 20.4 percent of the total 10-16-year-old male population. This shows a concentration of people on land more than twice the average for the city and the concentration of truancy, 2½ times the city average. One-fourth of all the juvenile delinquents came from 10.9 percent of the juvenile population crowded into 6 percent of the city area.

The Wickersham report of 1931 shows similar conditions in other cities. In Philadelphia 46 percent of the juvenile delinquents came from 25.1 percent of the population in 9.4 percent of the city area. In Cleveland 47.4 percent of the juvenile delinquents came from 26.3 percent of the population, in 17.3 percent of the city area. Parallel conditions have been found to prevail in Birmingham, Richmond, Denver, and Seattle. In all these cities, the high delinquency areas are areas of bad housing.

Crime likewise is definitely associated with slums. The successful criminal will, of course, move on to better quarters in other parts of town which makes his definite relationship with slums purely a matter of upbringing. The homicide rate and the prevalence of houses of prostitution, dives, and places of low amusement, are however, clearly indicative. In Chicago the maximum rates of major crimes committed by youths of 17-21 years of age average approximately 26 percent in each of the three principal slum areas to the north, south, and west of the Loop. In Baltimore as a whole the average crime rate was 8.7 per thousand. In the slum areas of that city the average rate ranged from 24.9 to 43.6 per thousand. Similar conditions are found in other cities.

Conditions of overcrowding, common toilets, dark hallways and corridors, and general lack of privacy are unquestionably productive of immorality. The proximity of questionable neighbors and of sexual matters is thrust on children at an early age.

Definite hazards to safety are found in faulty construction and in fire. A disintegration within the building itself, rather than a complete collapse causes many minor and major accidents, especially to children. Tenement and slum fires occur with great regularity and frequently with loss of life. In the 1 year previous to April 1935, 81 lives were lost in tenement fires in New York City.

Further than this, the health conditions provoked by insanitary, crowded, ill-ventilated, dark living quarters are abominable and perhaps more than anything show the menace of slum life. In every city in the country the rate of tuberculosis, of contagious diseases, of rickets, of hookworm, anemia, etc., is in direct proportion to bad housing. Nor is this difficult to understand. The relation between housing and health is affected by overcrowding, by lack of fresh air and sunlight, by unclean running water or contaminated surface wells, by dampness, and by lack of privies. Against lowered resistance and extreme susceptibility, illness spreads quickly through crowded quarters. Mental and nerve ailments, though difficult to compute, are likewise common.

Spot maps prepared throughout the country show in every case a concentration of disease, infant mortality, and death in blighted areas.

Figures from eight cities, published in 1925, have shown that in families averaging less than one person per room, the infant mortality rate was 52 per 1,000 live births, but where the room density was between one and two the rate was 94.9 and for two persons and over it was 135.7 per 1,000. Even after the effects of income and race are eliminated the rate of infant mortality in congested areas is about twice that of areas with decent housing conditions.

During the years 1930-33 the rate of infant mortality in a blighted district of Buffalo was 100 per 1,000 as against 20 per 1,000 in other areas. Tuberculosis cases in a similar area were at a rate of 57 per 1,000 in 1933 as against less than 3 in a decent housing district. There were 22 deaths from tuberculosis in one slum census tract as against none in nine other census tracts.

In Dubuque, Iowa, there were 24 deaths in 10 years from scarlet fever, diphtheria, malaria, and typhoid fever, and every one of these was in blighted areas.

In Tampa the records of a bad slum area show 17.2 deaths per 1,000 as against 4.5 deaths per 1,000 in the rest of the city. Likewise the disease rate was 23.8 in the same district as against 4.8 for the remainder of the city.

The area of greatest economic drain in Indianapolis, a bad slum area, showed 30 percent of the city hospital cost, 24 percent of the venereal disease cost, and 19.1 percent of the cost of keeping the insane caused by 10 percent of the population.

Of the 18 wards in Jacksonville, 1 slum ward accounted for over 16 percent of all diseases in the year 1933.

These cases are picked at random. There are many parallel situations in other cities. Some are worse and others better. The fact remains that the cost of slums in human life and human misery is a considerable cost to pay and one for which there is no return.

These figures of economic and social loss indicate the need for housing in America. A realization of the need will create a demand. In other countries at other times and under different circumstances similar conditions have been revealed. The result has been a demand for housing that no government has been able to overlook.

Part II

THE HOUSING DIVISION, P.W.A.

IN THE United States a growing cognizance of housing need, coupled with the distressing conditions caused by the depression, brought about the creation of the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration. Although the depression undoubtedly made activity in public housing a more immediate problem, the conditions that necessitated such a movement had long been extant. These have been reviewed above.

Purpose.

The purpose of the Public Works Administration was to reduce unemployment and to restore purchasing power through the construction of useful public works. The purpose of the Housing Division was further than that "to promote the program of low-cost housing and slum-clearance projects and to provide low rentals". Of the \$3,300,000,000 allotted to the Public Works Administration under the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, \$125,000,000 was earmarked for slum clearance and low-cost housing. Allotments were not made until specific projects had been approved. The total funds finally allotted to the Housing Division under the National Industrial Recovery Act were \$31,558,500. Upon such a basis the four principal objectives and policies of the Housing Division took form. The first of these was to deal with the unemployment situation by giving employment to workers, especially those of the building and heavy industry trades. The second aim was to furnish decent sanitary dwellings to those whose incomes are

so low that private capital is unable to help them. Third was the eradication and rehabilitation of slum areas in order to check the exodus to the outer limits of cities with consequent costly utility extensions and the leaving of centrally located areas unable to pay their way. The last aim was to demonstrate to private builders, planners, and the public at large, the practicability of large-scale community planning.

Policy.

The original policy of the Housing Division was twofold. First there was a continuance of the limited-dividend program inaugurated under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and secondly there was to be a Federal program similar in effect to the program of public works regarding sewers, roads, schools, etc. Under this latter policy a 30-percent grant to legally constituted local authorities was to be supplemented by a 70 percent loan. This program was postponed due to the then total absence of properly qualified local bodies. Although the history of the Housing Division will be taken up in later pages something of its structure and functions is important to an understanding of its activities.

Function.

Set up as it was to initiate, plan, supervise, and manage projects, the Division called to Washington a large corps of experts including realtors, architects, engineers, and lawyers. Besides Executive and Administrative, there were seven branches set up to handle this vast building program. They were: Initiation and Recommendation, Plans and Specifications, Land Acquisition, Construction, Legal, Management, and Research and Information. Starting with a comparatively small personnel made up primarily of initiation, land acquisition, and legal experts, the growth of the Division followed closely the expansion of its program. The task of all members of the Division during the early stages of its existence was twofold. In the first place "Housing" to the American public was almost a totally unfamiliar subject. Representatives of the Division were faced with the immediate problem of educating people in housing problems and

relating them to individual communities. This in itself was a herculean task. Secondly, a program of projects throughout the country had to be initiated; land acquired, architects selected, plans drawn, and construction started. Each project had its own solution; in each city pertinent data and information had to be collected; local sponsorship organized; public sentiment sounded; definite cooperation listed, and activity commenced. These were the problems.

Now after 3 years of comprehensive activity it is well to consider the accomplishments. They can be briefly stated.

Seven limited-dividend projects have been completed and are occupied.

Fifty Federal projects in 35 cities of this country are in varying stages of construction.

Public housing has reached a stage where it is one of the most important national problems of the day. A need has been translated into a demand.

Legislation, both local and national, has been enacted, or is now under consideration, which recognizes the necessity for a long-term housing program.

A feeling of local responsibility in housing has been awakened.

Structure.

1. Branch I—Initiation

The Initiation Branch deals directly with the local persons or bodies interested in sponsoring a housing project for their community. It receives all requests for projects and when necessary selects the Advisory Committee, whose personnel is carefully chosen from those qualified by experience, eliminating any who might benefit financially from the development of the project.

The sponsor fosters local interest in housing, gathers and submits to this branch of the Housing Division required data and information.

Through all the early stages of a housing project, the Initiation Branch cooperates with the sponsor in determining a project site for that community. The site must be chosen with due regard to probable growth of the city, existing

school and community facilities such as transportation, access to employment of future tenants, etc.

Upon the selection of a site, the type of dwelling most suitable for the prospective tenants and most appropriate for the location must be determined. Preliminary estimates of initial and annual expenses are made at this time in order to estimate rental charges. The rates must compare favorably with present rents and incomes in the area in order to justify the project. If the project at this stage is recommended by the Initiation Branch and approved, it is ready to be carried forward into the next stages of development. Throughout such development Branch I keeps itself informed on the progress of each project and handles the general correspondence concerning it.

2. Branch II—Plans and Specifications

The Plans and Specifications Branch of the Housing Division provides a complete consultant service functioning in cooperation with local architects selected by the Division. For each project a site plan is prepared, and basic specifications are supplied to the local architects.

Tests are made by the engineers of this branch to determine soil bearing capacity and special characteristics of the site selected.

Conference must be held by our engineers with local utility corporations in connection with the analysis of project loads for heating, cooking, lighting, and refrigeration energies, and with local governmental authorities on matters relating to necessary changes in existing streets, water, gas, telephone, or sewer service. An infinite variety of equipment is involved in these surveys and much time and labor is consumed by those in the field who interview the necessary authorities.

Washington staff men assist the local architects in their own offices in the preparation of preliminary drawings, sketches, and plans; and later, conferences in Washington and at the architects' offices develop the plans and specifications up to the point of their final acceptance. At these consultations questions regarding structural development,

such as the most suitable and inexpensive type of construction, and other engineering problems are discussed and decided.

Final plans and specifications are checked, approved, blue-printed, and mimeographed in the Washington offices of the Housing Division. Following approval, a second estimate is made of the cost of the project. This requires a thorough tabulation of current data on labor rates and cost of materials in the various cities where projects are located, as well as a compilation of data on quantities of materials to be used, together with their probable sources and distribution.

The Plans and Specifications Branch maintains a file room where may be found complete plans, specifications, and data on all active projects together with catalogs and samples of building materials and equipment.

Models of typical residential units and of complete projects are made for the purpose of architectural and landscape study, and topographical models to scale are prepared for each site.

3. Branch III--Land Acquisition

Steps involved in the acquisition of land include obtaining options, appraisals, title examination, and title clearance. The Land Acquisition and Legal Branches cooperate in these problems.

All appraisals for the Housing Division are made by local men who are carefully selected with reference to character, ability, and experience after a thorough investigation to determine their qualifications has been made by Branch III.

Appraisers are usually engaged under contract, two men being assigned to a project. Compensation is on a per-parcel basis in slum areas, the rate being subject to negotiation in each case. When the site selected is on vacant land, or when ownership is in only one or two persons, a flat rate for the whole property is usually agreed upon. However, this also is subject to negotiation.

Appraisers are instructed to place valuations upon property which will be fair to the owners and to the Government. These values are then spot-checked by Housing Division field men of the Land Acquisition Branch and if satisfactory,



UNIVERSITY TERRACE, COLUMBIA, S. C.

SEE PAGE 81



LAUDERDALE COURTS, MEMPHIS, TENN.

SEE PAGE 81

the negotiators are given prices based upon the appraisals as a foundation on which to negotiate options with the property owners.

An appraisal certificate giving the essential information required by the Division is made for each parcel appraised. After options are obtained, checked, and approved by the Land Acquisition Branch, they are turned over to the Legal Branch for final closing and taking of title for the United States.

4. Legal Branch

The Legal Branch closes options transmitted to them by the Land Acquisition Branch and takes title to the sites for the United States; prepares and executes all contracts; edits all specifications; cooperates with municipalities in the preparation of ordinances for the closing of streets and alleys and other local responsibilities, and handles general legal routine in cooperation with the other branches.

Titles are usually examined by title companies selected by the Department of Justice and certificates of title are transmitted to the Attorney General's office for examination prior to securing his opinion of title. Lack of satisfactory title companies in some states or prevalence of a condition in which issuance of certificates of title by a title company would violate a prohibition against the practice of law, necessitates a somewhat different procedure. Where the parcels concerned are few in number it is possible to use the local district attorney's office. Otherwise private attorneys, secured under contract by the Housing Division with the approval of the Department of Justice, are engaged.

Actual closing of title is performed by representatives of the Legal Branch of the Housing Division operating out of Washington. In view of an inability to pay over money until title is vested in the United States, it is necessary to contact the various lien holders and mortgagees, secure releases and discharges of their mortgagees, and record titles in the name of the United States prior to payment. Immediately upon recordation, however, payment is made by the disbursing officer of the United States.

Architects', demolition, foundation, general, landscape, and other contracts are prepared and executed by the Legal Division.

Specifications prepared by Branch II, Plans and Specifications, are examined and edited by the Legal Branch.

The legal representative in the field cooperates with the local architects who have tentatively been selected in the drawing up of architects' partnership agreements and power of attorney; with the municipal governments in the preparation of what agreements and ordinances may be necessary, and with the Land Acquisition representative in a preliminary survey of option and title status.

5. Branch IV—Construction

The Construction Branch of the Division has charge of bids and contracts, supervises demolition, and controls construction in accordance with the plans and specifications until the project is completed and ready for occupancy. It is the contact between the Housing Division and the contractor.

This branch maintains a section which is a central control point for the consideration of all questions relating to insurance, wage rates, interpretations of labor provisions and change orders. One of the most important functions of this branch is the maintenance of a constant check between project managers, architects, and contractors to the end that no commitments or erroneous instructions are issued or statements made upon which the contractor might have claims for unauthorized extras, extensions of time, or relief from any of his contractual obligations.

The construction work engaged in by this branch is so involved that it has been divided into seven sections, each planned to handle an average of seven projects.

6. Branch V—Management

Actual operation of a completed project is supervised by the Management Branch of the Housing Division which takes charge of the removal of tenants from areas to be evacuated and assists in relocating them.

It has developed standards covering all phases of the operation of each Housing Division project. To assist in this purpose, it has conducted a course for the training of management personnel.

District managers of the Housing Division are responsible for management affairs in the field and to these are assigned assistants from the Management Branch as occasion demands.

When Federal projects are placed in operation, decentralized field supervision over their operation is to be established.

Some of the most notable accomplishments of the Management Branch to date are the removal and relocation through F. E. R. A., P. W. A., and other local workers, of 8,900 families from 27 slum areas to be reconstructed with low-rent housing projects.

Much study has been devoted to possibilities and limitations of various methods of management, and two were approved by the Administrator, namely: lease to local housing authority or similar public body, and direct operation by the Federal Government. The lease and direct operation forms have been authorized by the Administrator and approved by the Comptroller General.

The Management Branch supervises the management and operation of seven limited-dividend projects. The first of these was opened for occupancy on September 15, 1934. Four are 100 percent occupied, two are 90 percent occupied, and the remaining project, which has been opened less than 2 months, is rapidly completing its rentals. A total of 2,659 families are living in these properties.

Training persons for housing managers and assistant managers began under arrangements completed with the National Association of Housing Officials. A school in Washington admitted candidates bearing special qualifications and trained them in the essentials of successful housing management, at the same time acquainting the students with the management standards and procedures of the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration.

7. Branch VI—Research and Information

As a complement to these functioning branches, the Research and Information Branch maintains two research

and three information sections. One of the former sections deals with technical research or habitations and the other with social and economic research, or occupants. The technical group prepares material for the use of the branches by assembling, evaluating, and disseminating data to lower costs, lengthen the life, and increase the efficiency of low-rent housing structures. Their studies cover structural and mechanical engineering, architecture, and city planning.

The Social-Economic group makes surveys, gathers census data, and interprets reports on housing, delinquency, foreign and domestic legislation, rental, income, and other personal problems arising from slum conditions and affecting persons included in the low-income groups.

These two research groups contact all branches of the Division. Their work is aided by the library of the Division, wherein are to be found modern housing legislation of the United States by States and cities, and that of foreign countries, as well as periodicals, reports, and published works on modern housing, its conduct, problems, and management.

Information is made up of three sections, Editorial, Conference, and Demonstration. The Editorial Section prepares articles and speeches relating to the work of the Housing Division; releases news items; assembles and considers published articles concerning housing; is responsible for answering inquiries concerning policy and coordinates the Division with outside activities. The Conference Section arranges meetings, conferences, dedications, openings, etc. The Demonstration Section arranges exhibits and prepares dioramas, models, photographs, and other informative material pertinent to the program of the Housing Division.

8. Field Offices

Field offices have been set up in the 35 cities in which projects are being constructed by the Housing Division. This does not include an office in San Juan, P. R., from which the three projects in the Virgin Islands and the San Juan project are administered.

In the larger cities or in some cities which have more than one project, such as Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Louisville, Memphis, Nashville, and New York, the personnel includes a District Manager and a Project Manager with assistant for each project in that city. In other cases the District Manager with an assistant performs the functions of a Project Manager in addition to his own duties. In some cities, where there is more than one project, the District Manager may be Project Manager for one of those projects.

A District Manager is the direct representative of the Director of Housing and as such performs duties locally similar to those performed by the Director nationally. He is directly responsible for the development of the project or projects in his particular territory. He supervises the Project Manager, and assumes the duties of the Director with regard to local relationship to the press, the Advisory Committee, the city government, etc.

The Project Manager is responsible to the District Manager for the project assigned to him. He follows its development in all phases, and answers questions and interprets matters concerning it.

Part III

HISTORY OF HOUSING DIVISION

Introduction.

The part played by the Government in urban low-cost housing has been twofold in character. The early developments of private low-cost housing in America, which are briefly taken up in the Appendix, were primarily of a limited-dividend type. They can roughly be divided into three categories: philanthropic, investment, and cooperative. In all cases profits were limited, even though projects were undertaken by private initiative on a self-liquidating basis. This type of project was continued under a new phase of government patronage with the establishment of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932. The execution of this program was subsequently transferred to the Public Works Administration in 1933. At present the limited-dividend type of housing is sponsored under a slightly different system by the Federal Housing Administration.

Direct responsibility by the government for housing had its beginning during the World War. The declaration of war in 1917 created a situation calling for direct Government participation.

War Housing.

War housing constituted the first efforts of the Government in the field of low-cost housing. The emergency situation created by the entrance of the United States into the World War made apparent the necessity for immediate

construction of suitable accommodations to house not only our armed forces but also the vast army of war workers who were concentrated in certain definite areas.

In this new departure our efforts would have been of the pure barrack variety had it not been for the quality and type of developments built by the British, designs and plans of which were brought back to this country by Frederick L. Ackerman in 1917. The Council of National Defense appointed a committee in 1917 to deal with the housing problem caused by mobilization of fighting forces and industrial war workers. During 1917 and up to July 1918, \$175,000,000 was allotted for this purpose and the United States Housing Corporation was created under the Department of Labor to proceed with this work in conjunction with the previously formed Shipping Board Committee, the Division of Transportation and Housing. The former built and administered directly, the latter lent money to realty companies incorporated by ship-building companies, with loans secured by blanket mortgages covering land (provided by the ship building companies) and improvements. The Housing Corporation carried out some 44 projects in 28 localities, the Shipping Board 35 projects in 24 localities. The latter developments included 8,949 houses, 1,119 apartments, 19 dormitories and 8 hotels, with total accommodations for 27,732 men. These projects were similar to the familiar plans for corporation housing. The Housing Corporation's activities on the other hand were of greater scope and permanence; were owned, built, and managed by the Government. In all, the Corporation's construction provided 6,148 family units, 452 of which were transferred to other Government departments after the war and the remainder sold to individuals.

Besides serving a wartime need, these two housing bodies, by means of good technical assistance and sufficient funds, produced better standards of design and subdivision than had before been evidenced; raised the standard of living among war workers, and showed that the Government could intelligently attack the problem without endangering the Constitution or in any way undermining our concepts of democracy.

1918-1919
1918-1919
after WWI

Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In 1932 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up with power to issue building loans for limited-dividend projects subject to State or municipal housing board approval. This step was considered possible, due to the creation of the New York State Housing Board, and the further anticipation that sufficient local organization in other parts of the country would correspondingly be forthcoming. This move constituted the first entrance into the housing field by the Government since war days, albeit under a different type of program. No loans were granted until 1933 when the Fred F. French Corporation of New York, obtained a loan for housing construction on a slum block of the lower East Side. The result was Knickerbocker Village under the New York State Housing Board.

Federal Housing Administration.

The passage of the National Housing Act in 1934, created the Federal Housing Administration. In addition to the Modernization Credit Plan under Title I of the Act a mutual mortgage insurance policy, known as the "single mortgage system", was introduced under Title II. Under this latter policy the insurance of mortgage loans on large scale housing projects was included with the more prevalent type of home mortgage loan.

The housing program called for projects privately conceived, privately financed, and privately constructed. A project on submittal to the Federal Housing Administration is qualified as to soundness and if approved an operating company is authorized to negotiate a mortgage up to 80 percent of the total cost. The mortgage is insured by the Federal Housing Administration which collects an insurance premium and maintains supervisory control. Projects constructed under this system approximate in type and rentals those that were privately constructed under the limited-dividend policy of the Public Works Administration as well as other earlier limited-dividend projects purely local in character. They are designed to house those who can afford adequate accommodations constructed without subsidy and

should not be confused with the public housing projects of the Public Works Administration.

In June 1936, two projects were in the process of construction (Meadeville, Pa., and Wilmington, Del.), and one, "Colonial Village", at Clarendon, Va., was completed. Several other projects have been approved for construction.

This Government interest in housing matters evidenced by the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 brought about subsequent housing laws in other States.

Limited-Dividend Legislation.

Following that of New York State, legislation providing for limited-dividend housing corporations with the power of eminent domain had been enacted in Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Kansas, New Jersey, Ohio, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas prior to the transfer of the limited-dividend program from Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Public Works Administration in June of 1933. Illinois and Massachusetts followed in July with enabling legislation and soon thereafter, Virginia.

Typical State Boards of Housing.

The earliest of these above laws relative to housing was enacted in Ohio on October 3, 1932. This act created a State Board of Housing consisting of the Director of Public Welfare, Director of Public Works, Director of Commerce, and four members appointed by the Governor with power to study housing conditions and regulate housing corporations whose dividends are limited to 6 percent.

Another typical form of housing legislation is the Illinois law of July 12, 1933. This act created a State Housing Board appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate, with power to study housing conditions and regulate housing corporations whose dividends are limited to 6½ percent. Other acts are roughly similar to these.

History of the Housing Division.

On June 16, 1933, the National Industrial Recovery Act, passed by the Seventy-third Congress, was signed by

the President, creating the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works. Under Title II of this Act, provision was made for "construction, reconstruction, alteration, or repair under public regulation or control of low-cost housing and slum-clearance projects." The Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, was subsequently appointed Administrator of Public Works.

A primary purpose in the creation of the Public Works Administration was to afford employment in the building trades. Residential construction was particularly hard hit by the depression. The Bureau of Labor Statistics states that, in 257 cities where homes were built for 244,394 families in 1929, only 25,879 were built in 1933. This decrease, which can be regarded as typical for the whole country, amounted to 89.5 percent. As a part of the "priming" process, therefore, a Housing Division was a natural adjunct to the Public Works Administration.

Limited-Dividend Program.

The small staff of experts who were charged with launching the housing program had two distinct objectives. The first was to afford employment as quickly as possible. The obvious way to reach this goal was to loan money to private agencies. The second was to demonstrate the possibilities of slum clearance and low-rent housing. To achieve this end, regulation and control were essential since knowledge of the problems involved and technique of solution were not general in character but involved expert opinion. To have loaned money indiscriminately would undoubtedly have put men to work, but the products of their work in most cases would not have been a valid solution of the problem.

Financial Policy. The Division determined to establish a clear cut financial policy, to sketch the general standards required for planning, and then to make interpretation as liberal as possible. Successful applicants were to receive a loan of 85 percent of the estimated cost of a project. They were to provide 15 percent in true equity. The loans bore 4 percent interest and were to be amortized in 30 years. The Government's interest was a first mortgage

that preceded all interest, both on equity and stock of the applicant.

Applications. With the announcement of this policy applications began to flood the Housing Division office. The small staff worked until past midnight 7 days a week for months. By the end of 1933 a total of well over 500 applications had been received. They fell naturally into a number of categories. The first and most numerous contained those in which the applicant had—perhaps in good faith—attempted to create an equity out of whole cloth. Architects' and contractors' fees, for instance, which would not be earned until the project was built were to take the place of tangible equity. It is true that few persons in 1933 had liquid assets and those who had were wary of putting them in any building enterprise however conservative. Yet it seems reasonable that the Division should have required such an evidence of good faith—and continuing interest. This type of application was immediately ruled out.

A second category of application was that which, along with housing, called for hotels, stores, theaters, or any one of a number of other unrelated enterprises. Most of these were fundamental misconceptions of the program and, even with the elimination of the nonconforming uses, could not qualify. Among other variations of this type were a tourist camp, a twelve-story hotel in the desert of Arizona, and a summer colony subdivision.

A third type—and one which usually seemed plausible at first sight—was that calculated to unload frozen assets on the Government. When the depression came, a great number of optimistic speculators found themselves holding real estate on which they could not only realize no profit, but which were definite liabilities. They saw a way out through offering their holdings as equity for a loan, usually at fictitious prices. Such proposals never withstood analysis.

Federal Program.

Examination of the 500 applications disclosed a distressingly small number which could meet the liberal standards

of the Division. The fact that only seven finally qualified for loans indicated that the country was not yet housing conscious. It indicated further that if housing were to be an effective part of the recovery program it must be handled, for some time at least, directly by the Housing Division.

Abandonment of Limited-Dividend Program. In February 1934 the Division announced the suspension of the limited-dividend loan policy and concentrated on the initiation, financing, and construction of projects under its own responsibility. Applications had come from a number of cities such as Atlanta, Indianapolis, Cleveland, and Montgomery which could easily be converted from the limited-dividend to the Federal type. Their only weakness had been a lack of equity. If the Division was to take over these projects completely this weakness disappeared. Such projects formed a nucleus, but they were far too few to round out completely the new program.

Local Initiative. It was obvious that the Division would have to go into the field and to create projects. Such a procedure presented many difficulties, and a complete new technique was necessary to solve them. Immediately recognized was the danger of foisting upon a community projects which were not wanted or were accepted passively without any sense of obligation. The cities had to want housing and had to stand behind the projects which the Division was prepared to give them.

In March 1934 the Director of Housing, Mr. Robert D. Kohn, made an extensive tour of the country to assess the cities' desire for housing. He found that it far exceeded the most optimistic hopes for a supply.

Land Acquisition. During this time the Division took its first steps in the difficult work of land acquisition. The assembling of many small parcels of land remains after 3 years the most unpredictable element of urban housing. The Housing Division's technique, as described in part II, was developed in the purchase of sites for the Techwood Homes and University projects in Atlanta. In these two



RIVERSIDE HEIGHTS, MONTGOMERY, ALA.

PAGE 1

WM. B. PATERSON COURTS, MONTGOMERY, ALA.



undertakings the Division recognized the absolute necessity of the right of eminent domain for the successful development of slum clearance projects. This right was specifically accorded to the Public Works Administration in the National Industrial Recovery Act. The Housing Division invoked it not so much to force sale by recalcitrant owners or to beat down asking prices as to expedite the clearance of title. It is almost universally true that the greatest percentage of defective property titles exists in the slum areas of a city. To acquire such areas with clear title would often take a year or more if the customary procedure were followed. The technique developed by the Public Works Administration consisted in securing options from the apparent owners by friendly agreement and then placing a blanket condemnation on the whole area. The consequence was that title was transferred to the Government and the long drawn out details of title clearance could be worked out subsequently. By operating in this manner the Housing Division could be assured of its slum clearance program and could proceed expeditiously. For more than a year it went ahead effectively. Two sites in Atlanta, one each in Cleveland, Indianapolis, and Montgomery were completely acquired and purchase of 22 others was well under way.

When the accepted procedure was attempted in Louisville, however, a property owner protested on the grounds that it was unconstitutional. On January 4, 1935, a judge of the Federal district court ruled that the Housing Division could not condemn property for housing. In the judge's opinion, housing did not constitute a "public use." The decision was appealed to the circuit court. On July 15, 1935, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati upheld the previous decision by a two to one majority. The appeal was carried on to the Supreme Court but was withdrawn when it became apparent that pending legislation would obviate the need of the power of eminent domain by the Federal Government.

The effect of the Louisville decision and the subsequent confirmation was to make extremely difficult the achievement of slum clearance. The Housing Division was forced

to abandon this phase of its program except in cases where slum sites were held in few and willing ownerships. Slum clearance had been the more dramatic and popular practice. Yet the Division's duty was to provide housing. If it could not be done in connection with slum clearance it must be built on vacant land. The ultimate program contained 50 projects of which—despite great obstacles—27 were built on slum sites.

If the acquisition of land presented the major difficulties encountered, it was not the only serious problem. The number, location, size, and type of projects to be built called for the greatest ingenuity on the part of the Division.

There was no precedent for such planning in the country. The Division sought out men with some experience in city planning and some knowledge of housing. Combining the two fields, they developed a technique of site selection and project design which is destined to have considerable influence on standard practice.

Expansion. By the spring of 1934 it was evident that if the Division were to handle effectively the program as outlined, considerable expansion and reorganization would be necessary. The work to date had been confined largely to examination of applications and to a study of procedure for the development of the Federal type of project. Now that the course was charted and policies outlined, the Division should take the form of a huge production office. Col. Horatio B. Hackett, of Chicago, had a notable record of achievement in large-scale construction. With Mr. A. R. Clas as assistant, he was appointed Director of Housing on June 15, 1934, and proceeded to expand the Division from its staff of approximately 40 persons to the hundreds necessary to handle the volume of work.

Consultants were called upon to develop plans of group houses, flats, and apartments. These men produced hundreds of variations of the small dwelling unit to take care of every conceivable local precedent. Representatives were sent into the field to select sites for projects. Others investigated the merits of architects, engineers, realtors in scores of likely cities, for Colonel Hackett had insisted on the participation of local men in the program.

The Housing Division's First Project. The seven limited-dividend projects, all under construction, were pushed and in September 1934 the Division announced the completion of its first project, Alta Vista in Virginia. It is interesting to note the modest beginning. The Alta Vista project consists of 50 small houses in a small mill town. From the day of their opening they have been in constant demand. When a vacancy occurred in the spring of 1936, the management had 49 requests for it on the first day. In sharp contrast to this modest project is Hillside Homes, a limited-dividend project in the upper Bronx with 1,416 apartments, 4,948 rooms, or the Ten Eyck Federal project now under construction in New York containing approximately 5,658 rooms.

Activity. In November of 1934 investigations were being made in over 70 cities by members of the Branches of Initiation and Land Acquisition who reported on conditions and possibilities, tentatively selected sites, interviewed architects, consulted with local sponsoring groups and municipal bodies in answer to applications which had already been submitted to the Division.

During this period of activity emphasis was placed on a consideration of slum sites. In most cities, local sponsoring, municipal, planning, and other groups, had made tentative surveys of possible sites. These were reviewed by representatives, their possible ease of acquisition studied, their relation to a planned city growth, to more immediate physical elements such as schools, employment, transportation, parks, etc., carefully considered. The Branch of Initiation representative working from the physical aspect of sites, i. e., their general character and relation to existing conditions, cooperated with the land acquisition man who studied the problem from the aspect of acquirability. In this way the field of possibilities was narrowed down and a definite preference in some cases self-imposed. The accumulation of options on property under multi-ownership and the clearing of titles proved to be a slow and painstaking performance. However, by the end of December 1934 out of a total of 27 approved projects, 5 sites had been entirely

acquired and land acquisition was in varying stages of progress on the remainder.

Local Sponsorship. The Housing Division required representative and enthusiastic sponsorship in each city where a project was under consideration. Unless such sponsorship was apparent, the Division did not feel justified in pushing its activities there. In most of the larger cities complete surveys and local recommendations had been prepared and proved of immeasurable assistance in the rapid initiation of a project. Sentiment did not originate in Washington. It was generated in progressive cities like New York, Atlanta, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Indianapolis, and Chicago (to name only a few), whose studies antedated the Housing Division itself. Subsequently many cities, profiting from the pioneer work of those mentioned above, developed excellent material.

Sometimes such sponsorship originated in the city government; sometimes in official housing committees, in chambers of commerce, or groups of civic-minded citizens acting under the advice and cooperation of architects, city planners, and other professional men. Representatives from the Housing Division contacted the sponsoring groups upon arrival in cities and worked with them during the early stages of the initiation and recommendation of projects.

Except where a lack of funds or of information on the purposes and aims of the Division precluded active local support, a mass of pertinent material was made available in the form of surveys and other related data. In most cases interest in housing made an explanation of purpose and policy sufficient to produce thorough cooperation. A certain amount of education in housing matters on the part of representatives of the Division was of course necessary.

The financial condition of some municipalities precluded their allotting funds for certain purely technical purposes. Where surveys were to be made, maps prepared, and a great deal of pertinent material assimilated, city finances were often unable to bear the burden of the additional expense.

In such cases local bodies, such as city planning commissions, chambers of commerce, school boards, and other committees were often helpful in cooperating toward this end. Often other Government agencies, such as the Civil Works Administration and Federal Emergency Relief Administration, were helpful in preparing real property inventories and in gathering together other related data. In general, the lack of funds to be used for such purposes tended to delay the development of projects in their early stages. In the interest of expediting their initiation, a good deal of the preliminary work had in some cases to be done by Housing Division representatives. As time went on and a more thorough understanding of the problems involved was reached locally this material became increasingly more available.

By the end of March 1935 projects totalling \$31,558,500 were being rapidly pushed ahead. Further applications had been studied from other cities on additional projects totalling some \$110,000,000. These latter had reached a stage of development where they could be carried through with the minimum of delay on further allocation of funds.

Emergency Relief Appropriation Act. It was obvious during the winter of 1934-35 that a new relief bill would be passed by Congress. Although conditions throughout the country were improved, direct Federal aid to the unemployed was still considered of prime importance. The size of appropriation necessary, the manner in which it should be dispensed, and the form of organization which could handle the job efficiently and expeditiously, were problems which taxed the utmost ingenuity of the Administration and which called for thorough investigations.

During the course of study for this work relief bill, the Housing Division officials and other experts in housing administration were constantly called upon to estimate the potentialities of public housing programs. The reports submitted, aside from any definite action produced, served to crystallize the Division's thoughts of what public housing could and should accomplish. Much of what has followed in the way of programs and legislation can be directly

traced to the reports made for the preparation of this bill. The Emergency Relief Appropriation Act was signed by the President after spirited debate in Congress on April 6, 1935. It called for an appropriation of \$4,880,000,000 of which \$450,000,000 was to be allotted for "housing", although the specific housing agencies were not mentioned.

Change of Administration. Colonel Hackett was appointed Assistant Administrator of Public Works Administration on May 13 and Mr. A. R. Clas, former Assistant Director of Housing, was appointed Director in his place.

Three days later the Administrator presented to the Advisory Committee on Allotments, which in turn recommended to the President, a program consisting of 79 projects aggregating a total expenditure of \$249,860,000. This program was informally approved by the President by the end of May with the request that applications for each project be submitted separately for approval as funds were needed. This procedure was followed in the intensive work which was to follow.

On July 9 the Division was officially notified that the first allotment of funds from the Emergency Relief Appropriation account was approved and made available. This action enabled the Division to proceed with the acquisition of sites and to contract for services.

Projects for which preliminary work in the field had already been completed were pushed forward rapidly. Options were accepted and architects set to work on the plans. Representatives from the Initiation and Land Acquisition Branches were sent to other cities from which applications for projects had been received. An intensive period of study and accumulation of data followed. Projects in many cities throughout the country were initiated, recommended, and given preliminary approval. Personnel of the Division in Washington worked overtime for weeks digesting, correlating, and developing the information and material brought in from various cities.

Curtailment. By September 15, 1935, preliminary plans had been consummated for a list of 95 projects totaling \$264,720,000 and applications had been filed with the National Emergency Council. As a result of the Cincinnati decision, however, not all of these projects were, by reason of land acquisition problems, in a position to be completed with minimum delay. The President accordingly ordered the program confined to those projects which could be put into construction expeditiously.

Final Program. A final program of 50 projects, totaling approximately \$130,000,000, was subsequently approved.

Part IV

PRESENT PROGRAM

Deadline.

THE PRESIDENT, by a letter released on August 26, 1935, set September 12, 1935, as the date on which all applications for projects should be submitted to the National Emergency Council. October 22 was set as the date when the Housing Division should be prepared to take bids on the construction of all projects or to proceed with construction of projects on a force account basis. On December 15, 1935, contracts on every project were to be awarded and signed.

With these definite schedules set, the Housing Division proceeded at high speed to fulfill its requirements.

Procedure.

A true comprehension of the task faced by the Housing Division in the planning and execution of its vast program involves an understanding of the steps that must be taken and the average time that each requires. Even assuming that the development of a project meets with no extraordinary delays, approximately 21 months are normally required as a minimum for the initiation of a project; the acquisition of the site, the preparation of drawings, the letting of contracts and subsequent construction. This period of time can be broken down as follows: 3 months for initiation and approval of a project; 4 months for the optioning, clearing of title, and purchase of a site (which runs concurrently with the designing of the project and the preparation of drawings); 2 months for the advertising of

bids, acceptance and letting of contracts, and 12 months for construction.

This is an optimistic estimate and does not take into account various difficulties that may be encountered. The most upsetting obstacles are produced by land acquisition. Delays or hold ups in this work wreck not only the land schedule but also that of the architects.

In the initiation of a project the steps involved, as stated in part II, include the preparation locally of adequate surveys and other related data, the organization of sponsorship, the approval of an allocation, the selection of a site, selection of architects, preparation of a working program (which involves the physical type of project to be constructed, number of rooms, type of equipment, other facilities, etc.) and the approval of the project as proposed by the Administrator of Public Works.

Acquisition of sites has proved to be the most complicated and perhaps the most interesting phase of the development. Where a site has been held under one ownership the optioning, clearing of title by the Legal Division, and purchase has been accomplished with no delay. The majority of sites, however, were under several ownerships. A myriad of details were encountered in the clearing of titles, closing of streets, rezoning, relocation of utilities, etc. While steps in land acquisition are taken up in part II, it is interesting to note the type of difficulties that were sometimes encountered in the purchase of some \$19,000,000 worth of real estate.

One property was found to be owned by a "lodge" of some 200 members. This association had not been incorporated and no one thus had authority to deed the property. To find and secure the signature of these 200 persons, needless to say, was difficult.

Heirs of deceased owners were often many in number and scattered all over the country, many of them with children for whom guardians had to be appointed by the courts to protect their interests. The failure of persons to record their papers in connection with former transfer was another source of tribulation. Divorces made further complications. Holders of title sometimes had to be traced through many States.

Since most negotiations with property owners were beyond the control of the Housing Division it was extremely difficult to expedite land acquisition. Owners had to "think it over", or frequently were obliged to confer with a "cousin who lived in Seattle." Much of the property was held by estates and could be transferred only by court order. Hearings had to be conducted according to court calendars and were often subjected to exasperating delays. Some conception of the magnitude of the program is contained in the number of individual transactions necessary—3,943; the amount of land purchased, 48,008,927 square feet; and the number of owners, mortgage holders, etc., with whom the Division had to deal—upwards of 11,000.

While the acquisition of the site was in progress the architects were at work on the site and unit plans. These were checked and approved in Washington and were followed by working and shop drawings.

Upon completion and approval of drawings and purchase of site, bids were called for, estimates were prepared by local contractors, submitted to Washington, approved, and contracts let. A minimum of 2 months was required for this work. Construction then began.

Contracts.

The period of great activity which followed, saw general, foundation, demolition, and architectural contracts being let on all projects. On three sites demolition was undertaken by the Works Progress Administration and on one site, in Lexington, it was done by the grantor. Three projects in the Virgin Islands were developed on a force account basis and one project in San Juan, Puerto Rico, was designed by Housing Division representatives in the field.

At the date of the dead line, December 15, 1935, all projects had been qualified by demolition, foundation, or general construction contracts awarded or by work actually proceeding on the site. By May 1st, 23 demolition, 28 foundation, and 13 general or superstructure contracts had been let, or bids had been accepted. The majority of the demolition contracts had been completed.

Architects.

At the peak of activity some 2,200 architects, engineers, draftsmen, and landscape architects in 35 cities were employed in the preparation of drawings. It had become apparent at the time of early submissions that a general unfamiliarity with housing technique was common with the majority of architects throughout the country. Nor was this difficult to comprehend in the light of the paucity of experience in construction of planned low-rent housing. During the early days of the Division, consultants had been called to Washington to prepare a general basis for architectural treatment and approach. After a thorough study a unit plan book had been prepared which laid down certain minimum standards of planning and arrangement, room sizes, window openings, etc. This book was used by architects as a guide in the designing of projects although a latitude of interpretation and improvement was encouraged. In no cases were these plans forced on an architect against his better judgment. They were purely educatory and offered to obviate impossible or widely divergent conceptions of plan and treatment.

Despite this material it was considered advisable, in order to insure a minimum of delay and a soundness of design, to conduct a short period of training in housing for all architects under employment in the execution of the program. Accordingly in the summer of 1935, the chief architects on all approved projects came to Washington and were put through an intensive course on housing problems. The result of this period of training was apparent in the character of drawings subsequently submitted. In all cases fine cooperation between the architects and the purposes and aims of the Housing Division has been apparent.

Construction.

Fifty projects in 35 cities of the United States and its insular possessions are now (July 1936) in construction. Several of them are nearing completion. Techwood Homes in Atlanta has been completed and opened to tenants.

The University project in Atlanta and Wm. B. Paterson Courts in Montgomery will be finished in a very few months. General construction on three projects in Cleveland, one in Indianapolis, and a second project in Montgomery, Ala., is rapidly nearing completion. By December 15, 1935, general construction had been commenced in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, followed later in the month by Atlantic City, N. J., and in January of 1936 by Miami, Fla., and Milwaukee, Wis. With foundations completed, work on superstructure had commenced in May on San Juan, P. R. By the middle of June foundations on the Jane Addams project in Chicago, and on projects in Dallas, Tex.; Jacksonville, Fla.; Louisville, Ky. (College Court); Stamford, Conn.; and Washington, D. C.; were completed. On projects in Boston, Mass.; Louisville, Ky. (LaSalle Place); Buffalo, N. Y., Camden, N. J.; Charleston, S. C.; Chicago, Ill. (Julia C. Lathrop Homes and Trumbull Park Homes); Columbia, S. C.; Lexington, Ky.; Nashville, Tenn. (Cheatham Place); New York City (Ten Eyck Houses and Harlem River Houses); Philadelphia, Pa.; Schenectady, N. Y.; and Wayne, Pa.; the construction of foundations was well under way.

On other sites in Birmingham, Ala.; Cambridge, Mass.; Chicago, Ill. (Jane Addams Addition); Cincinnati, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; (Brewster and Parkside); Enid, Okla.; Evansville, Ind.; Memphis, Tenn. (Dixie Homes and Lauderdale Courts); Minneapolis, Minn.; Nashville, Tenn. (Andrew Jackson Courts); Omaha, Nebr., and Toledo, Ohio, demolition was completed or under way.

Administrative Change.

By July of 1936 the construction program was entirely under way. The work of initiation, planning, and development begun by Colonel Hackett and ably administered by Mr. Clas was complete. To carry on the building activities of the Division, Mr. Howard A. Gray was appointed Director of Housing on July 23. Mr. Gray, for 2 years Director of the Inspection Division, had intimate knowledge of construction in general and of the field work on housing projects. Mr. Clas succeeded to the position of Assistant Administrator in charge of investigations.

Relocation.

A great problem in the process of demolition and development of built-up sites has been the relocation of tenants who were displaced. The total number of families to be removed from their homes was 8,947. The total number of persons involved approached 30,000. It was as if you were to pick up bodily the whole population of Baton Rouge, Pensacola, or Bloomington and move it to a new city. Nor was this the whole problem. Accommodations had to be found which were not inferior to, and better if possible than, those from which they had been moved and yet of the same rental scale. Of the total number of families, only 245 are now remaining (June 1936) on the 36 built-up sites that have been acquired. In most cases this job has been handled by Housing Division representatives, sometimes with the assistance of W. P. A. workers, local relief agencies, or Housing Authorities. They have conducted occupancy and vacancy surveys and prepared lists of available accommodations.

In many cases a change in dwelling was made by tenant at his own initiative. Less fortunate families or those on relief were frequently moved to new quarters at the expense of local relief agencies, the city, or a housing authority. Jobs were frequently found with the Works Progress Administration or with other Federal or local agencies for many of those on relief. In some cases the relocation office made arrangements with landlords of desired accommodations for a period of free occupancy in return for work on necessary repairs. Where tenants were listed with Federal employment offices or other similar agencies with preference for jobs, such credit was often accepted by new landlords as well as by transfer people doing the moving. Many families listed as "requiring aid" were moved by friends and neighbors. In some instances families, previously reported as destitute, were able to make their own arrangements due to the fact that the head of the families had secured a W. P. A. or other job. Owners of property were paid a "fair and not a distressed" price and were in almost all cases glad to be relieved of houses, most of which were in a state of comparative dilapidation and to be able to

purchase other houses in better condition and in many instances in a superior location. As a whole, the accommodations to which these families have moved are in better condition and have more adequate facilities than the homes which they have left. Rents in general have been slightly higher. There are a great number of families who have moved into temporary quarters in the neighborhood of projects in anticipation of obtaining permanent homes in the projects. The fine work of relocation and the cooperation that the Housing Division has enjoyed locally has greatly expedited subsequent construction.

Completion.

It is anticipated that the general construction on all projects now under way will be substantially completed by 1937. The unusually severe winter of 1935-36 handicapped work, especially on excavation and foundations. Other unpredictable difficulties have been encountered. But in spite of this, construction is proceeding rapidly with University project in Atlanta, William B. Paterson Courts and Riverside Heights in Montgomery, Cedar-Central Apartments in Cleveland, and Lockefield Garden Apartments in Indianapolis scheduled for completion the end of this summer.

Management.

Coincident with the development of the housing program and its increasing importance as projects neared completion, was the question of management. Two plans of operation were possible: (1) lease to a legally constituted housing authority, and (2) direct operation by the Federal Government.

In defining management policies, the Division outlined its desire to relinquish responsibility and control to local housing authorities as soon as they were qualified to act. However, the comparative lack of such bodies and the inexperience of the majority existing necessitates in most cases direct operation by the Government for the time being. A policy for each project is being evolved as that particular project nears completion.

Whatever form the management policy ultimately takes, the importance of having personnel thoroughly trained in large scale management was always apparent. The responsibilities and duties of management were recognized to be many and varied.

Late in 1935 a management training school was started in Washington under the auspices of the National Association of Housing Officials to train men in the administration of Housing Division and Resettlement Administration projects. Applicants for this school were recommended by local advisory committees and sent to Washington for the intensive course. After a period of training they were sent into the field to visit and acquaint themselves with the operation and management of projects already existent, later returning to Washington to discuss their experiences and to formulate definite convictions on policy. It is anticipated that these men will be called on to administer projects upon completion in their particular localities.

Due to the success of this school a second course has been proposed. A similar training in project management was carried on at the University of Chicago in June 1936 by the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

Employment.

Figures on architectural employment show a total of 320 architects who have received compensation for services on all projects. Approximately 1,700 draftsmen have been employed, 45 landscape architects, and 145 engineers, or in all a total of some 2,200 persons engaged in the designing and execution of projects. It has been estimated that 50,000 carpenters, masons, bricklayers, plasterers, glass and iron workers, etc., will be employed and an additional 50,000 persons will be engaged in the fabrication and transportation of materials to be used on projects.



TECHWOOD HOMES, ATLANTA, GA.
Interior View Before and After

SEE PAGE 32



TECHWOOD HOMES, ATLANTA, GA.
Before and After Views

SEE PAGE 31



TECHWOOD HOMES,

ATLANTA, GEORGIA



Before Demolition

THE PAGE 31



Group Houses

CONCLUSION

THREE years of public housing in America have raised a number of questions and issues. A clear-cut opposition has been formed of which the spearhead is the realtor. He sees in this work an invasion of the field of private initiative and contends that Government housing projects subject him to unfair and ruinous competition. However sincere this opposition may be, it is based on prediction rather than accomplished fact. Every attempt is being made to restrict competition with private enterprise to that restricted field where operators exploit the misery of the underprivileged. Here the competition is deliberate and amply justified. If the experience of European countries in public housing can serve as a guide, these dire forebodings should be greatly discounted. Since the war England has built over 2,000,000 dwellings under a bilateral policy of public and private housing. Most authorities maintain that, far from ruining private enterprise, public housing has greatly stimulated the private real-estate boom. In any case it will be impossible to judge whatever deleterious effects American public housing might have until the projects have been in operation for a number of years.

On the other hand is a tremendous and diversified sentiment to place public housing on a permanent basis. That statement is now crystallized in the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill. This bill, although it failed of enactment in the Seventy-fourth Congress (largely because of insufficient time for deliberation in the House of Representatives) was passed by the Senate. It bore the support of more than 400 diversified organizations, from the American Federation of Labor to outstanding bankers, from religious groups to mayors, from manufacturers to social workers, from criminologists to the medical profession.

The bill (stated in full in appendix B) aims toward the perpetuation of public housing on a decentralized basis.

Many persons, in sympathy with the objectives of the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration, have criticized its methods as too highly centralized. The Division has recognized the eventual wisdom of decentralization at the same time as it insisted on control of the first demonstration program. Uniformity of standards and practice were necessary at the outset if the program were to have universal application. Now that these standards have been applied to Memphis as to Miami, to Boston as to Dallas, the Division can point to a unified technique for housing on which cities can practice whatever local variants may be found to be effective. The Housing Division believes that the time has come for decentralization of not only authority but responsibility. The cities have shown a desire for public housing so long as the Federal Government provided the financing.

The Wagner-Ellebogen bill provides for a continuation of Federal Government aid, but the burden of initiation, maintenance, and partial financing is planned to fall where it logically belongs—on the communities which stand to benefit.

Mr. Herbert W. Morrison, British housing expert and member of the London County Council, came to America in the spring of 1936 to study American housing. After reading the Wagner-Ellebogen bill he stated, "This bill is somewhat milder in form than the British Act of 1890." To those who are familiar with the extent of the housing problem in this country, and who honestly strive toward a comprehensive solution, this statement may sound a discouraging note.

Yet we must remember that in 1931, Government housing was only a dream of progressives. Today it is a fact and there is strong reason to believe that, in the near future, it will be recognized as a permanent necessity, above the contentiousness of partisan issues.

There is no more important problem in the country today than the housing of the lower income groups. When we are able to guarantee for every American family a home that measures up to the American "standard of living", we shall approach the state of a truly civilized nation.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSING MOVEMENT

Personalities.

The history of the development of housing, both in America and abroad, is linked up closely with the thought and efforts of personalities who long have realized the importance of this work in the development of a more civilized state. In England as early as 1850 Shaftesbury's Society for Improving the Condition of the Labouring Classes found strong support in Prince Albert and produced the Act of 1851. Lloyd George, Christopher Addison, Stanley Baldwin, and other political figures have carried on the housing idea backed by the untiring efforts of Sir Raymond Unwin, England's foremost authority for 50 years. In England and on the continent housing problems have been linked closely with government and in most cases have benefited by a program of definite governmental financial assistance. With such backing, local societies and more particularly architects such as Walter Gropius, Dr. Alexander Klein, Bruno Taut, Martin Wagner, and Ernst May in Germany, J. J. P. Oud in Holland, Eskil Sundahl in Sweden, and Baudoin, Lods, and Le Corbusier in France have carried on experimentation and development in the planning of low-cost housing projects.

In the United States a wide spread consciousness of the problem has only been developed in the past 3 or 4 years. With the cooperation of the Federal Government, of local interested bodies and individuals, of organized labor, and of local governments, the United States is fast approaching the stage when definite policies for the future can be considered through the knowledge of a definite demand from the country at large. To date development of the housing program has been backed by three groups: progressive economists, the socially minded, and technicians. The housing movement primarily has been undertaken by those who have been trying in one way or another to do something for the poor and unfortunate. That it has been conceived, borne, and nourished into adolescence under such conditions is proof enough of the unselfish devotion and whole-hearted persistence of its founders.

Europe.

In general the history of housing in Europe and Great Britain following the war is one of development of the labor class idea as against the established force of individualism in a property sense. Previous to 1900 the idea of socialism had gained a foothold in England and the continent, social reforms had been undertaken, and the housing problem itself had definitely been attacked.

The Continental Revolution and Communist Manifesto of 1848 and the cholera epidemic in England in 1850 brought into being the first Public Health Act, and in 1850 the first piece of definite housing legislation in the form of the Shaftesbury Act. Prince Albert sponsored model workers' houses in the Great Exhibition of 1851 and subsequently Napoleon III in France, and Prince Wilhelm in Germany promoted or supported housing activities. In 1853 the first housing society was established in France and the idea of housing had definitely taken root in England and on the continent.

Until the close of the World War the development was gradual. In England the change between 1850 and 1910 was from Tory philanthropic control to Labour Party control. Housing passed from the field of royal prerogative into the hands of labor and consumer organizations. Further than that a new race of architects and planners grew up, who as technicians began to see that the problem was one of human environment which should be tackled at the very source.

This general trend was apparent also on the continent. The industrial revolution and the growth of labor parties brought demands for housing which were a natural result of the general wave of social reform sweeping the old world. Philanthropists, social reformers, technicians, and progressive socialists combined their efforts and dramatized the need for housing to the point where it created a demand. For 50 years the progress was slow and deliberate.

1. England

The recent history of housing in England has perhaps been the most complex and energetic. Following the Great War the situation of a shortage of 1,000,000 dwellings, and the need of 100,000 additional dwellings a year brought about the Act of 1919. The most important innovation introduced into the program by this act was a policy of subsidy which in great part has been responsible for the extreme activity in Great Britain in housing construction during the post-war years. By a series of further acts in 1923, 1924, 1925, 1930, 1932, 1933, and 1935, a definite program of slum clearance in addition to new housing has been undertaken. On the basis of an estimated need in 1919 for 2,400,000 new dwellings some 2,112,000 were built during the years 1919-1933. Of these 56 percent, or 1,180,000, have been put up through Government assistance to either public authorities, public-utility societies, or private individuals, and 44 percent, or 932,000, have been put up by private enterprise unassisted. This activity has been

increasing yearly. In 1934, 300,000 new homes were provided for and are now being completed at the rate of 1,000 per day.

Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin has stated that "The next 5 years will see the disappearance of the last of our slums, and we have already taken steps to make overcrowding illegal as soon as alternate accommodations have been provided."

The Act of 1935 is perhaps the most comprehensive piece of legislation on housing ever enacted anywhere. Aside from the amending of principles contained in various other previous acts, it makes further and better provision for the elimination of overcrowding, for the reconditioning of buildings, provision for a housing advisory committee, management commissions, and the consolidation of housing accounts.

The progressive trend of housing under the Ministry of Health has provided for a firm policy of condemnation without compensation for unfit dwellings, forced sale of uninhabitable property, and the establishment of rent levels in line with the incomes of that group which should be aided. The general tendency has been as much as possible to let private enterprise handle the problem as long as it is consistent with the principles set forth in each Housing Act.

2. Germany.

In Germany the housing program has developed in post-war years along much the same lines as those previous to 1914. Public interest in Germany has not been confined, as in most European countries before the war or in America to this day, to the question of slum elimination. There have never been as bad slums in Germany as in England or the United States. Housing was undertaken from the standpoint of planned economy, urban development, and social reform.

Dwellings in Germany were overcrowded and rents speculatively high. The progressives were not interested in partial philanthropic reforms but rather in the education of working classes to the point of realizing their power and interests, and demanding their just rights. As a result 1,400 housing societies were in evidence by 1914 which had built some 150,000 dwellings.

This program was continued after the war. During the years 1919-25, 700,000 dwellings were provided, and from 1925 to 1931 1,436,000 homes were built. Of these 10 percent were put up directly by public authorities, 34 percent by public utility building societies, and the remainder by private enterprise, some of which was government assisted. Cooperative societies have played a great part in this program.

By 1935 housing activity fell off and has now practically ceased. No money has been made available and urban housing has been superseded by a policy of government colonization of rural or semi-rural districts.

In summary, some 3,000,000 new dwellings have been provided since 1919, 80 percent of which were by direct public aid.

The history of housing elsewhere in Europe has been in most cases coupled with policies of public financial assistance.

3. Austria

Housing conditions in post-Empire Austria were abominable. Aside from a few show developments put up before the war and the creation of a Central Association for Housing Reform in 1907, nothing had been done. Federal assistance was granted in small measure in 1921, but it was not until 1929 that a definite policy produced other than negligible results. Principal activity was confined to Vienna, where, from 1924 to 1928, 33,000 dwellings were provided. Since the war 62,000 have been built, almost all directly by municipal aid.

The general form of development has been in great multi-family apartment buildings, socially self-contained. Within the last few years all such activity has been drastically curtailed.

4. Holland

In Holland State aid for housing came in the Act of 1901; 16,000 dwellings were provided in the years 1905-1914, 31,000 from 1915 to 1918, and 450,000 from 1919 to 1928. The public utility societies, local authorities, and private enterprise, all of which engaged in this construction, were assisted by the State.

5. Belgium

Belgium showed appreciation of the housing problem in the Act of 1889, which had some influence in subsequent Acts in France and Germany. By 1914, 60,000 new dwellings had been provided. The Act of 1919 prepared before the war provided for a National Housing Society, which up to the middle of 1933 constructed some 63,000 dwellings. A further number of 135,000 homes were provided by subsidies and loans during this period.

6. France

The trend of housing in France has been more specious in character with fewer tangible results. Napoleon III's efforts in the 1850's were rather ineffectual demonstrations. Haussmann's demolition and planning campaign was accompanied by very little replacement. In 1889 the first Housing conference was held in Paris and a society was set up under the leadership of Jules Siegfried known as the "Société Française des Habitations à bon Marché." The Act of 1894 was similar to previous Belgian legislation. The formation in 1912 of Public Housing Offices has been responsible for most of the housing undertaken in post-war days. Since the warsome 300,000 dwellings have been constructed, a good many of which are along the outer limits of Paris proper. Much theory and experimentation has been engaged in by architects, such as Le Corbusier, with very little tangible results in the form of slum demolition and low-rent housing.

7. Switzerland and Scandinavia

In Switzerland and the Scandinavian countries housing programs have been operating under government assistance for many years. From 1926 to 1930, 60,000 homes were provided in Switzerland; in Denmark from 1920 to 1929, 45,800; in Sweden from 1917 to 1929, 67,400; in Norway from 1914 to 1928, 14,900 dwellings, or new housing for about one person out of seven in the five largest towns of that country. In the city of Oslo from the establishment of a housing office in 1912 through 1931, 7,240 dwellings had been municipally erected and 6,300 further homes provided as cooperative or public utility houses. In this way some 54,000 people, or more than one-fifth of the city's population, have been provided for. Similarly, in Copenhagen every fifth person lives in a dwelling put up by either the town or by a public utility society, non-speculative in character. In Stockholm more than one-tenth of the population lives in cooperative developments.

Despite this prolonged activity in dealing with housing problems, Europe is far from reaching a satisfactory solution. Roughly, some 30,000,000 people have been decently housed, but there is another 100,000,000 who have not been. Slums still stand, some of them more crowded than before, and the necessity of constructing 10 to 15 million additional dwellings in the next 10 years is a minimum estimate if the program is to continue. In Germany and in Austria there have been serious setbacks. Soviet Russia on the other hand is swinging into a high-speed long-range program which is wholly public in character.

United States of America.

To many people the necessity for universal public housing is taken for granted. To them no industrial state, class-conscious or no, can lay the barest claims to intelligence or humaneness without earnestly tackling this problem.

Early Limited-Dividend Projects.

The development of planned low-rent housing in the United States to date has been confined to a few specialized interests. It can be loosely grouped into three major classifications: (1) philanthropic, (2) investment, and (3) cooperative.

Until recent years no concessions or inducements have been offered to those who attempted to provide decent housing for low-income workers. Their projects have necessarily been self-liquidating enterprises. Consequently the only manner in which rents could be reduced was by operating on a large scale with limited dividends.

As a general rule projects have provided for from 100 to several thousand families in order to obtain the economies of large-scale buying. Their earnings have been limited to 6 percent or less and they have housed the skilled worker and office clerk groups.

Philanthropy is perhaps an inaccurate term for the housing experiments of John D. Rockefeller and others who will be mentioned later. Theirs was a mixed purpose. They sought both a long-term conservative investment for their large incomes and a demonstration to determine the extent to which enlightened private enterprise could solve the low-rent housing problem. The same general motives actuated agencies such as the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. which make up the second group.

In many ways the cooperative movement, while it has not been nearly so extensive as in Europe, has provided the most interesting examples of housing in the country. Such projects were generated by prospective tenants themselves who sought to obtain lower rents by the same methods as the philanthropists and investing companies and by the additional means of eliminating the promoter's profit.

Planned housing previous to 1900 was usually carried on by building companies, some of them cooperative. They usually built detached houses piece-meal and effected their economics through a limited-profit policy. The earliest of such companies were the Boston Cooperative Building Co., launched modestly in 1871, and the City & Suburban Homes Co., of New York, whose program commenced in 1898. These developments will be taken up later with other "investment" projects.

1. Philanthropic

A great portion of housing activity prior to 1932 can, however, be properly termed "philanthropic" in that the principles underlying the initiation of such projects were primarily of such a nature. Frequently the operation and management of these developments were predicted on a firm business policy and resembled almost completely the second or "investment" type project. In most cases, however, the interest on the investment could be sacrificed if necessary without incurring losses to other than the original backer or the estate involved. Aside from a philanthropic character these projects were also intended as a long-term investment but as is essential in "investment" and "cooperative" developments, the continued payment of commercial interest rates was not considered as paramount to their success. Thus a double-barrelled philanthropic-business policy could be assured of success on one or the other or both counts.

The *Octavia Hill Association* under the guidance and patronage of Octavia Hill was founded some 50 years ago on a twofold plan, i. e., to manage its own buildings, and for a fee to act as agents for owners of low-rent dwellings. Its management policies have been just and humane, their fulfillment more on a "social worker" than a "landlord basis". In 1933 the association owned or managed 421 properties. In the past 3 years rents have been lowered and profits curtailed due to conditions of general depression.

Phipps Houses Inc. was founded by Henry Phipps in 1905 with a gift of \$1,000,000. Apartment houses were erected in 1905, 1906, and 1912.

the latter two for Negroes. Out of earnings from these more successful latter projects Phipps Garden Apartments, a fine development, was constructed on Long Island in 1932. The earnings from all these projects continue to be reinvested in a fund for new housing developments.

Following the New York State housing law of 1926 and the New York City ordinance of 1927 which will be considered later, *J. D. Rockefeller, Jr.* undertook several housing projects which, though philanthropic in background and initiative, have certain features in common with a development of the cooperative idea, tax exemption excluded. Mr. Rockefeller is one of the few wealthy men who have interested themselves in the subject of housing. Independently, without publicity, and earnestly he has been engaged in the construction of projects since 1924 when the *Bayonne, N. J.* project was launched. Andrew J. Thomas, as architect, produced four-story apartment buildings with a 36 percent coverage. This development was intended for low-income Standard Oil Company workers. It is inhabited by people of medium income employed in New York City.

There followed the Rockefeller Institute project for workers in the Institute, the *Thomas Garden Apartments*, designed for a group of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and finally the largest of the four—the *Paul Lawrence Dunbar Apartments* for Negro families in Harlem. The 511 greatly needed apartments in perhaps New York's most crowded and dilapidated district are set up with a plan for ultimate cooperative ownership. The project is well designed, and seems assured of considerable success. The rentals, though of course too high to meet the demands of the lower income group, are lower than most post-war housing projects. Although these projects were eligible for tax exemption, Mr. Rockefeller has refused to avail himself of this subsidy.

In 1923 after some 15 years of negotiation and discussion a housing project in *Mariemont, Ohio*, was announced. This civic venture, inspired by the English garden city, was carried out by Charles J. Livingston as advisor to the sponsor, Mrs. Mary M. Emery, and assisted by planner John Nolen. A nonprofit undertaking, it cannot be called anything but public spirited. Rentals are from \$35 to \$100 per month for row and individual houses. It is a suburban community, soundly planned and assured of success.

Javanburg Homes in New York, built by the Fred L. Javanburg Foundation, is the only product of a housing foundation in the United States. Constructed in 1927 in the heart of the Ghetto, its rentals are lower than the cooperative or limited-dividend projects in New York, its occupancy record entails no vacancy loss, and the gross return on capital cost is sufficient to economic stability.

In *Chicago* a report prepared in 1926 by Mary E. McDowell as Director of the city's Department of Public Welfare, publicized the

living conditions with which we are by now familiar. As a result of this report a group of prominent citizens requested and obtained from the mayor a city housing commission, which took preliminary steps for a program of large-scale limited-dividend housing projects.

From this movement two projects have been produced, both of which are philanthropic in character and neither of which can be said to cater to the needs of the truly low-income group; the *Marshall Field Garden Apartment Homes*, for whites, and the *Michigan Boulevard Garden Apartments* for Negroes.

The Marshall Field Garden Apartment Homes with no tax exemption, and with land and building costs at approximately \$1,900 a room, has been available only to people of middle incomes. Its situation in a neighborhood made up of lowest income families at first made vacancy a problem. But rents have been reduced and at present vacancies are few. Rent reductions have placed this project in the class of partial philanthropy.

The Michigan Boulevard Garden Apartments were undertaken by Julius Rosenwald and completed in 1929. Rents are moderate and cater to the higher income Negro family, Pullman porters, mail carriers, musicians, etc.

One of the most famous of limited-dividend projects is *Chatham Village* in Pittsburgh, made possible by the Buhl Foundation whose founder, Henry Buhl, Jr., left \$13,000,000 for its establishment on his death in 1927.

Situated on a hillside overlooking the Monongahela River and Pittsburgh's golden triangle in the distance, designed by Ingham and Boyd plus New York's Clarence Stein and Henry Wright, Chatham Village is a solidly built, completely equipped development of row-houses. These houses are on a rental basis at a level to meet the needs of Pittsburgh's middle-income group. There is no thought of charity in the operation of Chatham Village, its policy being the financially successful application of a long-term investment policy.

2. Investment

The second or "investment" type of limited-dividend project can be said to have had its beginning in the *Boston Cooperative Building Co.* which despite its name is in no way cooperative in its functions. It has constructed 249 family units, and, whatever its vacancy record, dividends have been paid yearly, although in the past 2 years the surplus has been drawn upon for this purpose.

The *City and Suburban Homes Co.*, of New York, provided impetus to the "investment" housing program in that city.

A competition held by City and Suburban Homes and won by a veteran housing architect, Ernest Flagg, spelled the finis for "dumbbell" tenement construction. A program of building was started in Brooklyn in 1898 and has continued unabated except for the period 1920-29

when construction costs were high. In 1930 a large development was launched. Wholesome homes have been provided at current rates for wage earners, and capital has found a safe and permanent investment—such is the corporation's policy.

In 1911 Jacob G. Schmidlapp founded *Cincinnati Model Homes, Inc.* Along with paying its 5 percent dividends yearly, it has provided decent homes for Negroes at low rentals.

Following the war further developments were occasioned by the investigation of a housing committee including Dr. Felix Adler and Clarence S. Stein, which was appointed in 1919 by Governor Smith of New York. Its studies showed an estimated housing shortage of 40,000 dwelling units by 1920. Further studies with parallel results were carried on by the Philadelphia Housing Association. During the war, rent restriction laws had been passed in Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Virginia, Nevada, and the District of Columbia. Municipal committees were created in many cities all over the country, some of which held authority under state law, some under municipal law. Most of these ceased operations after the war with the exception of the District of Columbia, New York State, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. An important development in 1920 was the adoption of a 10-year tax exemption policy in New York for corporate projects.

In 1924 the *City Housing Corporation of New York*, was formed by Mr. Alexander M. Bing and a small group of friends. Its dividends were limited to 6 percent and its first project was *Sunnyside Gardens* followed closely by *Radburn*. The former was undertaken as an experiment for a future garden city within New York City itself. The early building of one, two, and three family houses for sale was later supplemented by the construction of large rentable apartment groups, arranged about central gardens. The total population of Sunnyside is approximately 5,000, with a tendency toward the business and professional occupations of a middle-income group. Financing this project has been established on a joint business—philanthropic basis.

Early in 1928 work was started in *Radburn, N. J.*, by the City Housing Corporation of New York. A self-contained satellite community, it was undertaken as a civic demonstration. Its character is that of an English garden city development. Situated about 17 miles from New York City in Bergen County, the creation of a pleasant surrounding has been deftly brought about by its architect, Clarence S. Stein and its planner, Henry Wright. Associated with them have been Frederick L. Ackerman, Robert D. Kohn, Andrew J. Thomas, Thomas Adams, and England's Sir Raymond Unwin. The Radburn Association was formed as a nonprofit corporation under New Jersey law. It has enjoyed no tax exemption. As a consequence, its tenants have not fallen below the \$2,000 a year class. Its planning is on the super-block or residential-unit-based-on-elementary-school-population idea. It is a town for the motor age with a great many of its inhabitants working

in New York City. It is a decided tribute to the imagination, initiative, and perseverance of its father, organizer, and backer, Alexander M. Bing, the president of the City Housing Corporation.

Previous to the activities of the City Housing Corporation the *Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.*, had engaged in some successful housing work, with the assistance of Andrew J. Thomas, architect. Mr. Thomas had long advocated the economy and preferability of developing a whole block at a time, throwing all the open space together in the center of a block with low coverage and maximum rental space resulting. Further than this accomplishment Mr. Thomas set the style in respect to lay-out and floor plan for subsequent housing under Mr. Rockefeller, the State Board of Housing and Chicago garden apartment developments. The principal departures in the Metropolitan developments were tax exemption for a period of some years and a rent average limited by the enabling act to not more than \$9 per room per month. Between 1922 and 1924, 2,125 family apartments were provided under these conditions by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

Tax exemption had been, since 1920, New York's answer to the problem of subsidy and correspondingly of rent restriction. This exemption was to the amount of \$5,000 on a single family house, \$10,000 on a 2-family house, and \$1,000 per room with a maximum of \$5,000 per family unit on an apartment house. Tax exemption as applied with no requirements as to standard, rent levels, or selling price, became thus in general a subsidy to building industry rather than to health and welfare. A gradual soaring of rents followed until the *New York State Housing Law of 1926*, strongly backed by Governor Smith, was passed. This law constituted the first definite piece of local housing legislation in America and formed the basis for many subsequent State laws elsewhere. It created a State board of housing empowered among other things to grant tax exemption for 20 years on the value of the building to approved limited-dividend housing companies and permitting cities to exempt such companies from local taxes.

The city of New York passed an *Ordinance of 1927* granting 20 years' tax exemption on buildings constructed by limited-dividend companies approved by the State Housing Board. Thus the 1920, 10-year tax-exemption policy, while creating increased building activity did not produce decent quarters at reasonable rentals until 1926. In general, post-war housing in New York has been as heavily subsidized by the taxpayers as post-war housing in London or Liverpool, the difference being that the builder and not the consumer reaped the greatest benefit. In its best light, New York housing under the 1927 law has never come close to providing decent accommodations for the truly low-income group.



Air view

SLE PAGE 24

STANLEY S. HOLMES VILLAGE, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.

Construction Detail



In addition to the above-mentioned limited-dividend housing projects others were constructed under the New York State housing law by the *Brooklyn Garden Apartments, Inc.*, the *Academy Housing Corporation*, the *Stanton Homes Corporation*, the *Manhattan Housing Corporation*, and the *Stuyvesant Housing Corporation*. Average rentals per room per month were from \$10.74 to \$12.50 with a total of 889 units provided.

Of these projects the most interesting were the two developments undertaken by the Brooklyn Garden Apartments, Inc., at the initiative of Mr. Louis H. Pink, a Brooklyn member of the Housing Board. Subscribers included Gov. Smith and John D. Rockefeller, Jr. The first project completed in 1929 was in a shabby, but not slum district and was designed by Andrew J. Thomas. The second was a slum clearance project near the Navy Yard, the architect, Frank H. Quinby.

The success of the New York cooperative and noncooperative projects has been due to the fine management given to all. The thought of philanthropy has been subjected to the likelihood of a continued return on investment.

In New Jersey laws enacted in 1929 permitted the *Prudential Life Insurance Co.* to undertake slum clearance and rehousing in Newark, by allowing insurance companies to eradicate bad conditions and construct new dwellings with the approval of the governing body of the city. Public supervision of construction and of rentals, the latter regulated to a basis "within the means of wage earners of the lowest earning capacity", provides a relationship or partnership between public and private interests much the same as had been evidenced in London in 1850. Power of condemnation was provided but has not been exercised in the acquisition by Prudential of three sites. Two projects have been constructed, one for whites and one for Negroes.

3. Coöperative Societies

Coöperative societies, which on the continent and in Germany particularly have taken a great part in the housing program, were not prevalent in the United States before 1919 and only in more recent years have they produced any considerable results.

Organized coöperative housing societies by reason of financial favors offered to them by their local governments were established in New York as a result of the law of 1926 and to a lesser degree in Wisconsin due to the Wisconsin Act of 1919. By 1926 there were 26 small housing coöperative societies in Brooklyn alone. As a result a great number of coöperative buildings were built or bought during ensuing years by Scandinavian, Jewish, and Labor groups primarily. *Garden Homes* was built in Milwaukee, Wis., in 1921-23. The desire of some tenants to own one of the small detached homes in this development has led gradually to the end of the venture as a pure coöperative.

Further cooperative housing was undertaken in New York in years following 1926 by various societies such as the United Workers' Cooperative Association, a predominantly communist group, the Workers' Colony Corporation, the Yiddische Coöperative Heim Gesellschaft, the Jewish National Workers' Coöperative Homes Association and its later group, the Farband Coöperative Housing Corporation, and finally the *Amalgamated Housing Corporation*. Of these groups the Amalgamated Housing Corporation produced the best and most successful cooperative housing in America. The Farband group produced low rentals by means of high coverage.

Appendix B

HOUSING LEGISLATION

The number and type of housing laws now enacted indicate the growing recognition by both Federal and local governments that minimum standards of housing must be guaranteed if the public welfare is not to be jeopardized.

Municipal Ordinances.

Until 1926, when the New York State Housing Law was passed, most of such legislation was confined to restrictive municipal ordinances of three general types: (1) building codes, (2) zoning ordinances, (3) condemnation ordinances. Building codes established standards for new construction but they were not retroactive and the very conditions which caused the enactment of such ordinances escaped their regulative control. Zoning regulations, had they been realistic, would have had considerable beneficial effect, despite the fact that they too were not retroactive. But zoning has been subject to influence by individuals and organizations who sought to escape regulation which would benefit not only the community but, in the long run, their own interests. Consequently, a majority of ordinances has had no appreciable effect to improve housing conditions. Many cities have ordinances which call for condemnation and demolition of uninhabitable structures. Enforcement of such ordinances calls for courage on the part of municipal authorities and often entails prolonged litigation. Not infrequently condemnation is accomplished without necessary accompanying demolition. Very few cities have dared to pursue a vigorous policy of demolition.

State Limited-Dividend Housing Legislation.

In 1926 the New York State Legislature passed a law which created a State Housing Board. Corporations which agreed to build housing according to standards laid down by the Board, to limit rents and dividends, and to submit to regulation and control of the Board, were given partial tax exemption and could exercise the right of eminent domain. This inducement led to the construction of eleven large-

scale projects of great merit. It was the first legislation to have a truly constructive effect on the quality of urban housing. Previous laws had said, "You can't do this or that", but the New York law was designed to be not restrictive but positively encouraging. It was a model for subsequent legislation. Its worth was recognized in the National Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 which permitted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to housing corporations which could be subjected to similar regulation. The National Act induced 14 States to pass regulatory housing laws in 1932 and 1933. Most of these laws provide for (1) some form of tax exemption, or (2) the right of eminent domain. With the exception of New York, none gives both privileges.

National Limited-Dividend Legislation.

The provision in the Act of 1932, already referred to, caused the enactment of much legislation but it produced little housing. One project in New York was the sum total under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Housing Division of the Public Works Administration adopted the same general policy in 1933 and constructed seven projects. In an attempt to encourage the construction of truly low-rent housing it was found that this type of legislation had two major weaknesses. First, it did not offer a sufficiently attractive investment to private capital and consequently the response was unsatisfactory. Second, since it called for 100 percent self-liquidating projects, it could not reach the classes which cannot afford new housing under present methods of construction.

The only means of reaching such low-income groups was through publicly constructed, subsidized housing. The Housing Division recognized this principle in February 1934.

State Housing Authority Legislation.

As the Housing Division shifted its emphasis to a public-housing program, local communities realized the need to establish legally constituted housing authorities which might tie into the program, and eventually initiate their own projects. Ohio and New York passed laws providing for the establishment of municipal housing authorities with broad powers. These authorities had power to issue bonds, to buy and sell land, to contract for services, to construct and manage projects, to exercise the right of eminent domain and in New York to enjoy tax exemption.

The Housing Division was allotted roughly \$100,000,000 from the appropriation of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. In order that local communities could qualify upon a sound basis for projects from this fund, the Legal Division of the Public Works Administration sent out drafts of suggested housing authority bills to the Governors of the States. In varying form 19 States passed housing authority laws. The States qualified in 1936 to undertake

public housing are: Alabama, California (Los Angeles, only), Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, West Virginia, and Wisconsin. In addition are Hawaii and the District of Columbia.

With the exception of the New York City Housing Authority none have carried on construction apart from their association with the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration. In many States laws are on the books but authorities have not been established. In cases where authorities do exist they have neither funds nor personnel to undertake any extensive programs. Yet the machinery has been set up and action awaits only the development of sufficient public sentiment to demand it.

National Public Housing Legislation.

The two major acts which created and continued the Housing Division of the Public Works Administration were the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933 and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. Neither act defined administrative policy but both were so broad that the responsibility for establishing policy was considered an administrative function. In a number of important decisions the Comptroller General, who is the final authority, ruled that definition of policy must be established by Congress.

George-Healey Act

The George-Healey amendment to the National Industrial Recovery Act, passed in June 1936 established five major policies for the projects of the Housing Division. These were:

- (1) Civil and criminal jurisdiction over projects owned and operated by the Federal Government were ceded to the local governments.
- (2) A service charge—in lieu of taxes—was to be paid by the Federal to local governments. This charge did not equal ad valorem taxes, but was intended to represent the capacity of project tenants to pay taxes rather than the value of the properties.
- (3) Projects were to be operated from revenue derived rather than by Congressional appropriation.
- (4) The Administrator could fix the rate of interest on capital invested and could regard as much as 45 percent of the cost of a project as capital grant, the remaining 55 percent to be repaid in not more than 60 years.
- (5) Tenants of projects were to be selected from among families whose incomes did not exceed five times the rental of dwellings to be inhabited.

Wagner-Ellenbogen Bill

The sentiment for public housing had grown so strong by the end of 1934 that Senator Robert F. Wagner, in the spring of 1935, introduced in Congress a bill intended to perpetuate this work as a Government

function. Extensive hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Education, but the bill was not reported out of committee. In conference with labor leaders and housing experts, Senator Wagner revised the bill considerably. It was reintroduced in April 1936. Simultaneously Representative Henry Ellenbogen introduced the bill in the House.

At the Senate hearings a remarkably diversified sentiment in favor of the bill was expressed. It was reported favorably by the committee with some amendments and passed with additional amendments by the Senate on June 16, 1936, by a 42 to 24 vote. Adjournment of the Seventy-fourth Congress on June 20 prevented action by the House.

This, the first congressional act to recognize the permanent rather than emergency need for governmental aid in the housing of low-income workers, marks the high point in the American housing movement. The bill, as passed by the Senate, follows:

AN ACT To provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the development of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS AND POLICY

SECTION 1. There exist in urban and rural communities throughout the United States slums, blighted areas, or unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwellings, or a combination of these conditions, accompanied and aggravated by an acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial reach of families of low income.

These conditions are inimical to the general welfare of the Nation by (a) encouraging the spread of disease and lowering the level of health, morale, and vitality of large portions of the American people; (b) increasing the hazards of fires, accidents, and natural calamities; (c) subjecting the moral standards of the young to bad influences; (d) increasing the violation of the criminal laws of the United States and of the several States; (e) impairing industrial and agricultural productive efficiency; (f) lowering the standards of living of large portions of the American people; (g) necessitating a vast and extraordinary expenditure of public funds, Federal, State, and local, for crime prevention, punishment and correction, fire prevention, public-health service, and relief.

The failure to remedy the acute dwelling shortage has also produced stagnation of business activity in the construction, durable goods, and allied industries, thus impeding business activity throughout the Nation and resulting in widespread and prolonged unemployment with its injurious effects upon the general welfare of the Nation.

Private industry alone has been and now is unable to overcome the obstacles in the way of relieving the shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and the several States and their political subdivisions have been and now are unable adequately to aid in remedying this condition without financial assistance.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to promote the general welfare of the Nation by employing its funds and credit, as provided in this Act, to assist the several States and their political subdivisions to alleviate unemployment and to remedy the unsafe and

insanitary housing conditions and the acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income that are injurious to the health, safety, and morals of the citizens of the Nation.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act—

(1) The term "low-rent housing" means decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial reach of, and available solely for, families of low income, and developed and administered to promote serviceability, efficiency, and economy; and embraces all necessary or desirable appurtenances thereto, including administrative, educational, recreational, and other buildings and facilities.

(2) The term "families of low income" means families who lack sufficient income, without the benefit of financial assistance, to enable them to live in decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings and under other than overcrowded housing conditions: *Provided*, That no family shall be accepted as a tenant in any low-rent-housing project whose aggregate income exceeds five times the rental of the quarters to be furnished such family.

The term "rental" as used in this section includes the average cost (as determined by the Authority) of heat, light, water, and cooking, where such services are not supplied by the lessor and included in the rent.

(3) The term "slum" means any area where dwellings predominate which, by reason of dilapidation, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light, or sanitation facilities, or any combination of these factors, are detrimental to safety, health, or morals.

(4) The term "slum clearance" means the demolition and removal of buildings from any slum area, and may embrace the adaptation of such area to public purposes, including parks or other recreational or community facilities.

(5) The term "development" means all undertakings necessary for planning, financing, land acquisition, demolition, and construction and equipment activity to the point of completion. Construction activity in connection with a low-rent-housing project may be confined to the reconstruction, remodeling, or repair of existing buildings. The development of a low-rent-housing project may include slum clearance. The development of a slum-clearance project may be confined to demolition and removal.

(6) The term "administration" means all undertakings necessary for management, operation, and maintenance.

(7) The term "demonstration project" means any project owned or administered by the Authority, whether or not developed pursuant to section 10.

(8) The term "public housing agency" means any State, county, city, or other governmental entity or public body (excluding the Authority) which is authorized to engage in the development or administration of low-rent housing or slum clearance.

(9) The term "public housing society" means any association, cooperative, or corporate body organized solely to promote and administer low-rent housing, whose members are persons of low income in need of such housing, whose officers and directors are the freely chosen representatives of such members, which is operated, without possibility of direct or indirect financial profit, and which submits its records to the inspection of the Authority to the extent necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(10) The term "going Federal rate of interest" means, at any time, the rate of interest specified in the then most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a term of ten years or more.

(11) The term "State" includes the States of the Union and the districts, Territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States.

(12) The term "Authority" means the United States Housing Authority created by section 3 of this Act.

(13) The term "acquisition cost" means the acquisition cost to the Authority or to a public housing agency, as the case may be.

UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a body corporate of perpetual duration to be known as the United States Housing Authority, which shall be an agency and instrumentality of the United States.

(b) The management of the Authority shall be vested in a board of directors (hereinafter referred to as the "board") composed of three members, appointed by the President (not more than two of whom shall be of the same political party), by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and removable by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause. One of the three original members shall serve for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of three years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall annually designate one member to serve as executive and administrative officer of the board.

(c) A vacancy in the board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the board, and two members of the board shall at all times constitute a quorum.

SEC. 4. (a) Each member of the board shall receive a salary of \$10,000 a year, shall be eligible for reappointment, and shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment. No officer or employee of the Authority shall participate in any manner in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

(b) The Authority is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary for the proper performance of its duties under this Act; except that the Authority may, without regard to the civil-service laws, employ such attorneys and experts, and may contract for the personal services of such architects, engineers, appraisers, negotiators, and real-estate brokers, and employ such skilled and unskilled labor, as may be necessary for such purposes.

(c) The Authority may accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services (not excluding reasonable allowances for necessary traveling and other expenses), and with the consent of the agency concerned may utilize such officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal, State, or local governments as it finds helpful in the performance of its duties.

(d) The President may at any time in his discretion transfer to the Authority any bureau or division of any department or agency of the Federal Government that is engaged in low-rent housing or slum-clearance activities, including all its assets, equipment, records, and employees, and the Authority may continue such activities, and shall succeed to the powers of such bureau or division, subject to the provision of this Act. The President may likewise transfer to the Authority any housing or slum-clearance projects undertaken by any agency of the Federal Government, including all contracts and other

property held in connection with such projects, and any unexpended balance of funds allocated to such agency for such projects, and the Authority may continue such projects. In the event of any such transfer, the employees of the bureau or division so transferred shall thereupon be subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. No employee shall acquire by any such transfer a permanent or civil-service status, but within ninety days after such transfer the Authority may certify to the Civil Service Commission the names of such transferred employees as it desires to retain and as are required to be under the civil-service laws by the provisions of section 4 (b) of this Act. Upon such certification, said Commission shall provide for the inclusion of such employees within the Civil Service.

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the Authority shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may establish branch offices or agencies in any State, and it may meet and exercise any of its powers at any place within the United States. The Authority may, by one or more of its officers or employees or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, conduct hearings or negotiations at any place.

(b) The Authority may foreclose on any property, or commence any action, to protect or enforce any right conferred upon it by any law, contract, or other agreement. The Authority may bid for and purchase at any foreclosure by any party, or at any other sale, any low-rent-housing project which it previously owned or in connection with which it has made a loan or grant pursuant to section 9.

(c) The Authority may procure insurance against any loss in connection with its property and other assets (including mortgages), in such amounts, and from such insurers, as it deems desirable.

(d) The Authority shall sue and be sued in its own name, and all suits shall be brought in the Federal courts except where the Authority consents specifically to a different forum. Attorneys appointed by the Authority may, at the direction of the Authority, appear for and represent the Authority in any case in court.

(e) The Authority shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed.

(f) The Authority shall be granted the free use of the mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government.

(g) The Authority, including but not limited to its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, loans, income, assets, and property of any kind, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

SEC. 6. (a) The Authority may make such expenditures for the acquisition and maintenance of adequate administrative agencies, offices, vehicles, furnishings, equipment, supplies, and books, for attendance at meetings, and for such other facilities and services as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper administration of this Act. The Authority shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations and expenses shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, and the manner in which accounts shall be audited.

(b) The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall apply to all contracts of the Authority for services and to all of its purchases of supplies except when the aggregate amount involved is less than \$300.

(c) The use of funds made available for the purposes of this Act shall be subject to the provisions of section 2 of title 3 of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1934 (47 Stat. 1489), and to make such provisions effective every contract or agreement of any kind pursuant to this Act shall contain a provision identical to the one prescribed in section 3 of title 3 of such Act.

SEC. 7. (a) The Authority may engage in research, studies, surveys, and experimentation and may publish and disseminate information pertinent to the various aspects of housing.

(b) In January of each year the Authority shall make an annual report to Congress of its operations, including loans, grants, and contributions, made or contracted for, low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects undertaken, and the assets and liabilities of the Authority.

SEC. 8. The Authority may from time to time make, amend, and rescind such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL LOW-RENT-HOUSING AND SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS

SEC. 9. (a) The Authority may make grants and loans to any public housing agency to assist the development, acquisition, or administration of any low-rent-housing project by such agency.

(b) The value of the grant to a low-rent-housing project shall be that which is necessary, in the determination of the Authority, to assure the low-rent character of such project, but shall in no case exceed 45 per centum of its development or acquisition cost. Such grant may be paid, in whole or in part, in a lump sum. Any balance (of the total value of the grant) not so paid shall be paid in the form of fixed and uniform annual contributions, over a fixed period not exceeding sixty years, each such annual contribution to be payable out of any funds available to the Authority when such payment is due. Each such annual contribution shall be equal to the amount of the annual payment which such balance would yield over such fixed period of years in annuity computed at the going Federal rate of interest at the time such grant is made. The Authority shall embody the provisions for such annual contributions in a contract guaranteeing such fixed and uniform payments over such fixed period.

(c) No loans pursuant to this section shall be made or be outstanding for any low-rent-housing project in an amount greater than the development or acquisition cost of such project, less the total value (at the time when made) of such portion as has been paid of any grant pursuant to subsection (b) of this section. Any such loan shall bear interest at such rate, be secured in such manner, and be repaid within such period, not exceeding sixty years, as may be deemed advisable by the Authority.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 10. (a) The Authority may, subject to the approval of the President, develop and administer low-rent-housing and slum-clearance demonstration projects in order to demonstrate to localities the benefits to be derived therefrom. No such demonstration project shall be commenced in any locality without the consent of either the local governing body or the public housing agency covering the locality: *Provided*, That not more than one demonstration project shall be developed in any one city and such demonstration project shall not exceed in cost the sum of \$2,500,000.

(b) As soon as practicable the Authority shall sell its demonstration projects: *Provided*, That low-rent-housing projects shall be sold only to public housing agencies.

(c) Pending sale, the Authority may lease any low-rent-housing demonstration project in whole or in part to a public housing agency or a public housing society, or enter into contracts for the administration of any such project in whole or in part by any such society or agency: *Provided*, That a project shall be leased to or administered by a public housing society only with the consent of a public housing

agency in the locality if such an agency exists: *And provided further*, That the tenants of such project shall not be limited to the members of such society. The provisions of section 321 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (U. S. C., Supp. VIII, title 40, sec. 303 (b)), shall not apply to any such lease or contract.

(d) The Authority may dedicate land for parks, playgrounds, and other recreational facilities, for sewers, for the opening or widening of streets, for incidental improvements, or for any other public purpose, and may grant licenses and easements upon such terms as it deems reasonable.

(e) The Authority may sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, any real property (except low-rent-housing projects, the disposition of which is governed elsewhere in this Act) or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, the retention of which is not desirable in performing its functions under this Act, upon such terms as it may fix. To facilitate the sale of such securities or obligations any other securities or obligations retained by the Authority may be subordinated to those sold.

(f) In connection with the development or administration of any low-rent-housing or slum-clearance project pursuant to this section the Authority may acquire real or personal property or any interest therein by purchase, eminent domain, gift, devise, lease, or otherwise. In the acquisition of any land or site the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, shall not apply, but the Authority may avail itself of the services of the Attorney General acting in accord with his powers under such section to procure information relating to the state of title. The Attorney General shall, upon the application of the Authority, institute condemnation proceedings in its name. The practice and procedure governing such proceedings by the United States, shall be followed, and the Authority shall likewise be entitled to proceed in accordance with the provisions of an Act of Congress approved February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), and an Act of Congress approved March 1, 1929 (45 Stat. 1415). The Authority may enter into agreements to reimburse any State or political subdivision thereof for expenses incurred in the acquisition, by condemnation or otherwise, of property to be conveyed to the Authority for the development of a low-rent-housing or slum-clearance project.

(g) The acquisition by the Authority of any real property pursuant to this Act shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction in and over such property, or impair the civil rights under the State or local law of the inhabitants on such property; and insofar as any such jurisdiction may have been taken away or any such rights impaired by reason of the acquisition of any property transferred to the Authority pursuant to section 4 (d), such jurisdiction and such rights are hereby fully restored.

(h) The Authority may enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or political subdivision thereof with respect to any low-rent-housing or slum-clearance project owned by the Authority. The amount so paid for any year upon any such project shall not exceed the taxes that would be paid to the State or subdivision, as the case may be, upon such project if it were not exempt from taxation thereby.

SEC. 11. Subject to the specific limitations or standards in this Act governing the terms of sales, rentals, leases, loans, grants, annual contributions, or agreements, the Authority may, whenever it deems it necessary or desirable in the fulfillment of the purposes of this Act, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, amount of annual contribution, or any other term, of any contract or agree-

ment of any kind to which the Authority is a party or which has been transferred to it pursuant to this Act. Any rule of law contrary to this provision shall be deemed inapplicable.

STANDARDS

SEC. 12. In making any loan or grant for the development or acquisition of a project pursuant to section 9, and in undertaking any demonstration project pursuant to section 10, the Authority shall be guided by these considerations:

(1) In the case of a low-rent-housing project, that there exists in the community concerned a shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial reach of families of low income, which is not being remedied adequately by private enterprise;

(2) In the case of a slum-clearance project, that there exist in the community concerned slum areas that are not being remedied adequately by private enterprise, and that either (a) the clearance of the area will not make it difficult for the dispossessed inhabitants thereof to secure equivalent dwellings elsewhere at no higher cost to them, or (b) that such inhabitants will be provided for by the development of sufficient low-rent housing, within their financial reach, either upon the site to be cleared or in some other suitable locality;

(3) That the project conforms to a general program formulated by the Authority to distribute the benefits of this Act as widely as practicable throughout the United States, consistently with the needs of the several States and their political subdivisions;

(4) That the form of assistance to the project is an appropriate means of carrying out the purposes of this Act in the particular case, and that the amount of financial assistance to be afforded such project by the Authority will not be in excess of the amount necessary for such purposes;

(5) That the site on which a project is or shall be developed is suitable for the project and has been or will be purchased for a reasonable price;

(6) The assistance, if any (in the form of partial financing, annual grants, land in whole or in part, partial or complete remission of taxes) given to the project by the State or political subdivision in which it is located;

(7) That the advice has been sought, where available, of such planning commission or board (created under charter, statute, or ordinance) as may exist in the locality of the project.

SEC. 13. In order to insure that the low-rent character of housing projects will be preserved, and thus to protect private industry from the competition that would exist, either if such projects were made available to families able to afford decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings without public assistance or if such projects were withdrawn from the financial reach of families of low income, it is hereby provided that—

(1) When a loan or grant is made pursuant to section 9, and when a low-rent-housing project is sold pursuant to section 10 (b), the loan or grant agreement, contract of sale, or deed shall contain an option for the purchase by the Authority of the project involved, in the event of a substantial breach of the covenant (which shall be embodied in such agreement, contract, or deed) to maintain the low-rent character of such housing project. Such option may be exercised within such period (not to exceed sixty years) and upon such terms as shall be prescribed in said agreement, contract, or deed.

(2) When a loan is made pursuant to section 9, the Authority shall retain the right, in the event of a substantial breach of the covenant (pursuant to paragraph 1 of this section) to maintain the low-rent character of the housing project involved or in the event of the acqui-

sition of such project by a third party in any manner including a bona-fide foreclosure under a mortgage or other lien held by a third party, to increase the interest payable thereafter on the balance of said loan then held by the Authority to a rate not in excess of the going Federal rate (at the time of such breach) plus 2 per centum per annum or to declare the unpaid principal on said loan due forthwith.

(3) When a grant or any part thereof shall be made payable in annual contributions pursuant to section 9 (b), the Authority shall retain the right, in the event of a substantial breach of the covenant (pursuant to paragraph 1 of this section) to maintain the low-rent character of the housing project involved, to reduce or terminate said annual contributions. In the event of the acquisition of such project by a third party in any manner including a bona-fide foreclosure under a mortgage or other lien held by a third party, such annual contributions shall terminate.

(4) When a lease or contract for the administration of a low-rent housing project is made pursuant to section 10 (c), the Authority shall retain the right to terminate such lease or contract in the event of a substantial breach of the covenant (which shall be embodied in such lease or contract) to maintain the low-rent character of such housing project.

(5) The Authority may also insert in any contract of loan or grant, contract of sale, lease, contract of administration, mortgage, or any other agreement or instrument made pursuant to this Act, such other covenants, conditions, or provisions as it may deem necessary in order to insure the low-rent character of the housing project involved.

SEC. 14. In order to protect the financial position of the Authority, and to prevent Federal assistance to any low-rent-housing project in excess of that contemplated by this Act—

(1) The sale by the Authority of any low-rent-housing project shall be for a consideration, in whatever form may be satisfactory to the Authority, equal to at least 55 per centum of the development or acquisition cost of the project less such allowance for depreciation as the Authority shall fix.

The amount by which such development or acquisition cost (less depreciation) exceeds the sale price shall be considered the lump sum portion of a grant pursuant to section 9 (b), and the project shall then become eligible for annual contributions pursuant to section 9 (b) and for loans pursuant to section 9 (c). Any obligation of the purchaser accepted by the Authority as part of the consideration for the sale of such project shall be deemed a loan pursuant to section 9 (c).

(2) In the administration by the Authority of any low-rent-housing project, and in the leasing or administration under contract of any such project pursuant to section 10 (c), the Authority shall fix the rental or the consideration for such lease or contract, as the case may be, at an amount at least sufficient to pay (a) all necessary and proper administrative expenses of the project (if administered by the Authority or administered under contract); (b) such sums as will suffice to repay, within a period not exceeding sixty years, at least 55 per centum of the development or acquisition cost of the project, together with interest at such rate as the Authority deems advisable.

SEC. 15. In order to protect labor standards—

(1) The provisions of the Act of August 30, 1935, entitled "An Act to amend the Act approved March 3, 1931, relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings" (49 Stat. 1011), and of the Act of August 24, 1935, entitled "An Act requiring contracts for the construction, alteration, and repair of any public building or public work of the United States to be accompanied by a performance bond pro-

protecting the United States and by an additional bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor for the construction, alteration, and repair for the said public buildings and public works" (U. S. C., Supp., 1934 edition, title 40, sec. 270 (a) to (d), inclusive), shall apply to contracts in connection with the development or administration of low-rent housing or slum-clearance projects owned by the Authority and the furnishing of materials and labor for such projects: *Provided*, That suits shall be brought in the name of the Authority and that the Authority shall itself perform the duties prescribed by section 3 (a) of the Act of August 30, 1935, and section 3 of the Act of August 24, 1935.

(2) Any contract for a loan, grant, annual contribution, sale, lease, or administration pursuant to this Act shall contain a provision requiring that the wages prevailing in the locality, as determined by the Authority, shall be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed in the development or administration of the low-rent-housing or slum-clearance project involved.

(3) The Act entitled "An Act limiting the hours of daily services of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or for any Territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", as amended (37 Stat. 137), shall apply to contracts of the Authority for work in connection with the development and administration of low-rent-housing or slum-clearance demonstration projects.

(4) The benefits of the Act entitled "An Act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes" (39 Stat. 742), shall extend to officers and employees of the Authority.

(5) The provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934 (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 276 (b) and (c)), shall apply to any low-rent-housing or slum-clearance project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this Act.

(6) Any contractor engaged on any project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this Act shall report monthly, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner (within five days after the close of each calendar month, on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor), as to the number of persons on their respective pay rolls, the aggregate amount of such pay rolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 16. The Authority shall have a capital stock of \$1,000,000, which shall be subscribed by the United States and paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any available funds. Receipt for such payment shall be issued to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Authority and shall evidence the stock ownership of the United States of America.

SEC. 17. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, of which \$1,000,000 shall be available to pay the subscription to the capital stock of the Authority. Such sum, and all receipts and assets of the Authority, shall be available for the purposes of this Act until expended.

SEC. 18. Any funds available under any Act of Congress for allocation for low-rent housing or slum clearance may, in the discretion of the President, be allocated to the Authority for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 19. (a) The Authority is authorized to issue obligations, in the



OUTHWAITE HOMES, CLEVELAND, OHIO

SEC PAGE

Courtyards

SEC PAGE

OLD HARBOR VILLAGE, BOSTON, MASS.



form of notes, bonds, or otherwise, which it may sell to obtain funds for the purposes of this Act. The Authority may issue such obligations in an amount not to exceed \$150,000,000 on or after July 1, 1936, an additional amount not to exceed \$150,000,000 on or after July 1, 1937, and an additional amount not to exceed \$150,000,000 on or after July 1, 1938. Such obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, mature within such periods not exceeding sixty years from date of issue, bear such rates of interest not exceeding 4 per centum per annum, be subject to such terms and conditions, and be issued in such manner and sold at such prices as may be prescribed by the Authority, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) Such obligations shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation (except surtaxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes) now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

(c) Such obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed upon their face by the United States, as to the payment of both interest and principal, and in the event that the Authority shall be unable to make any such payment upon demand when due, payment shall be made to the holder by the Secretary of the Treasury with money hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. To the extent of such payment the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holder.

(d) Such obligations shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States or any officer or agency thereof. The Secretary of the Treasury is likewise authorized to purchase any such obligations, and for such purchases he may use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act, as amended, are extended to include any such purchases. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the obligations acquired by him pursuant to this section, and all redemptions, purchases, and sales by him of such obligations shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States.

(e) Such obligations may be marketed for the Authority at its request by the Secretary of the Treasury, utilizing all the facilities of the Treasury Department now authorized by law for the marketing of obligations of the United States.

SEC. 20. (a) Any money of the Authority not otherwise employed may be deposited, subject to check, with the Treasurer of the United States or in any Federal Reserve bank, or may be invested in obligations of the United States or used in the purchase or retirement or redemption of any obligations issued by the Authority.

(b) The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositories, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Authority in the general exercise of its powers, and the Authority may reimburse any such bank for its services in such manner as may be agreed upon.

(c) The Authority may be employed as a financial agent of the Government. When designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, and subject to such regulations as he may prescribe, the Authority shall be a depository of public money, except receipts from customs.

PENALTIES

SEC. 21. All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, or conversion, or to the improper handling, retention,

use, or disposal of public moneys or property of the United States, shall apply to the moneys and property of the Authority and to moneys and properties of the United States entrusted to the Authority.

Sec. 22. Any person who, with intent to defraud the Authority or to deceive any director, officer, or employee thereof or any officer or employee of the United States makes any false entry in any book of the Authority or makes any false report or statement to or for the Authority shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 23. Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Authority or with intent unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 24. Any person who induces or influences the Authority to purchase or acquire any property or to enter into any contract and willfully fails to disclose any interest, legal or equitable, which he has in such property or in the property to which such contract relates, or any special benefit which he expects to receive as a result of such contract, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 25. No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words "United States Housing Authority", or any combination of these four words, as the name, or part thereof, under which he or it shall do business. Any such use shall constitute a misdemeanor, and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$1,000.

Sec. 26. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 27. This Act may be cited as the "United States Housing Act of 1936."

Passed the Senate June 15 (calendar day, June 16), 1936.

Attest:

EDWIN A. HALSEY, *Clerk.*

List of Official Housing Agencies.

1. State and Regional Agencies

The customary duties of these groups are to investigate housing conditions, supervise, and regulate limited-dividend corporations. Several of these agencies have partial jurisdiction over local housing authorities. The functions of an Authority are included in the powers of the Hawaiian, Maryland, and New Jersey agencies.

Arkansas State Housing Board.	Maryland Emergency Housing and Park Commission.
(California) Division of Immigration and Housing.	Massachusetts State Board of Housing.
Delaware State Board of Housing.	New Jersey State Housing Authority.
Florida State Housing Board.	New York State Board of Housing.
Hawaii Housing Authority.	
Illinois State Housing Board.	
Kansas State Board of Housing.	

North Carolina State Housing Board.

South Carolina State Housing Board.

Ohio State Housing Board.

Virginia State Board of Housing.

2. Municipal and Metropolitan Agencies

The majority of agencies listed below have the power to finance, construct, and manage housing projects.

Andalusia (Ala.) Housing Authority.	Lexington (Ky.) Municipal Housing Commission.
Billings (Mont.) Housing Authority.	Los Angeles (Calif.) Municipal Housing Commission.
Birmingham (Ala.) Housing Authority.	Memphis (Tenn.) Housing Authority.
Boston (Mass.) Housing Authority.	Milwaukee (Wis.) Board of Public Land Commission.
Buffalo (N. Y.) Municipal Housing Authority.	New York City Housing Authority.
Cambridge (Mass.) Housing Authority.	Omaha (Nebr.) Housing Authority.
Charleston (S. C.) Housing Authority.	Port Jervis (N. Y.) Housing Authority.
Cincinnati (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.	Red Level (Ala.) Housing Authority.
Cleveland (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.	St. Clair County (Ill.) Housing Authority.
Colbert Co. (Ala.) Housing Authority.	Schenectady (N. Y.) Municipal Housing Authority.
Columbia (S. C.) Housing Authority.	Selma (Ala.) Housing Authority.
Columbus (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.	Syracuse (N. Y.) Housing Authority.
Dayton (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.	Toledo (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.
Detroit (Mich.) Housing Commission.	Warren (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.
D. C., The Alley Dwelling Authority.	Yonkers (N. Y.) Municipal Housing Authority.
Florence (Ala.) Housing Authority.	Youngstown (Ohio) Metropolitan Housing Authority.
Lackawanna (N. Y.) Housing Authority.	

There are also many agencies of a semiofficial character, whose function is chiefly of an advisory nature, which are not listed among these two groups.

Appendix C

PROJECTS OF HOUSING DIVISION

Limited-Dividend Projects.

Alta Vista, Va.

The Alta Vista project, sponsored by Harry M. Lane, was built by the Alta Vista Corporation which obtained a P. W. A. loan of \$84,000. The architects were Stanhope S. Johnson and R. O. Brannan. The general contractor was C. L. Lewis.

Alta Vista is in the Otter River district of Campbell County about 20 miles south of Lynchburg. Adequate quarters for the employees of a rayon factory and a cedar chest company located there were found to be lacking and accordingly the project was developed to furnish the workers with comfortable and convenient living quarters at rentals within their reach. A total of 50 four-room houses of frame construction have been built on a 13-acre site. Ample space for gardens is provided for any tenant who wishes to plant one. The Works Progress Administration has built a swimming pool on adjacent land.

Boulevard Gardens, Woodside, Queens, N. Y.

Boulevard Gardens on Long Island was sponsored by George C. Meyer, president of the Boulevard Gardens Housing Corporation. The project was first submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and later transferred to the Housing Division. The corporation obtained a P. W. A. loan of \$3,450,000. The architect was T. H. Engelhardt and the contractor the B. H. Construction Co. George Koch is manager for the corporation.

The 13-acre site which was formerly vacant land is bounded by Hobart Street and Thirtieth and Thirty-first Avenues. In a neighborhood of striking contrasts—neat, attractive row-houses and dilapidated slums—the ten Georgian buildings of Boulevard Gardens rise from attractively landscaped courts. The six-story buildings occupy but 23 percent of the site. The remaining 77 percent is devoted to parks and a playground. The development is only 12 minutes by subway from Times Square and but a short distance from the Long

Island Railroad. It has 3,615 rooms in 957 apartments. These are divided into 21 two-room, 2 three-and-a-half room, 578 three-room, 240 four-room, 58 four-and-a-half room, and 58 five-and-a-half room units. Recreation rooms and work rooms are provided for the tenants. A complete, modern commercial district of 26 stores has been provided by George Meyer and his affiliated companies.

Boylan, Raleigh, N. C.

The Boylan Housing project was sponsored by Rufus Boylan who set up a limited-dividend corporation, the Boylan Housing Corporation, and secured a loan of \$198,600 from the Housing Division. The architects were Linthicum & Linthicum and the contractor T. A. Loving.

The site selected for the project was a desirable piece of residential property occupied by the old Boylan home and consisting of slightly more than an acre in area midway between the center of the town and the State University, at Hillsboro Street and Snow Avenue. The buildings which cover 30.5 percent of the land are three stories high and are of brick in a modified Georgian style. They contain 54 apartments, totaling 180 rooms. There are 18 four-and-a-half room and 36 three-and-a-half room apartments.

Carl Mackley Houses, Philadelphia, Pa.

Carl Mackley Houses, a community development sponsored by the American Federation of Hosiery Workers under the active leadership of its secretary, John Edelman, was built by the Juniata Park Housing Corporation, a limited-dividend company. With land valued at \$85,000 plus \$10,000 working capital as equity, the corporation received a P. W. A. loan of \$1,039,000 to be repaid over a 35-year period with interest at 4 percent. The coordinating architect was W. Pope Barney, the designers Kastner and Stonorov. William Jeanes, a young Harvard graduate and a strong backer of the project, was appointed its manager.

The 4.5 acre vacant site bounded by Castor Avenue, Cayuga, M and Bristol Streets is situated on a rise of ground opposite Juniata Park which has a golf course. The project is close to schools, churches, shops, and centers of employment. A swimming pool, a wading pool for small children, a nursery school, an auditorium, recreation rooms, and workshops are available to the tenants. The four apartment buildings are three stories high and cover 35 percent of the land. They contain 284 family units which are divided into 84 two-and-one-half, 125 four, and 75 five-room apartments.

Euclid Housing, Euclid, Ohio

The Euclid Housing project, conceived by Mayor Charles R. Ely, cannot be considered as typical. No definite location is stipulated (the houses being scattered at random throughout the town) with



Bird's Eye View

SEE PAGE 12

LAUREL HOMES, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Entrance Court



the consequence that no project actually exists in the true sense of the word. The 52 small detached houses of four to six rooms are constructed on the basis of a 75 percent Government loan not to exceed \$6,000, the remaining 25 percent being provided as equity either in land or cash or both. The land for each house must be owned outright, free of mortgage and clear of title. The houses are sold to be paid for over a 15-year period. A total of \$500,000 was allotted to this project. Except for the fact that the Government itself loans the money instead of merely insuring the mortgage, this procedure approximates, and has been succeeded by, the Federal Housing Administration program.

The Euclid Housing Corporation, a nonprofit organization which promoted the project, first applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan. The request was subsequently passed on to the Housing Division which made the loan. George Mayer designed the houses which were built by various contractors.

Hillside Homes, Bronx, N. Y.

Hillside Homes in the upper Bronx is a fireproof development conceived and designed by Clarence Stein. It was built by the Hillside Housing Corporation under the leadership of Nathan Straus, president, as a limited-dividend project with Starrett Bros. & Eken, builders. It is subject to the general supervision of the New York State Board of Housing. First submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the project was later transferred to the P. W. A. Housing Division, where it received a loan of \$5,060,000. Hillside Homes is the largest of the limited-dividend projects and has been placed under the management of William A. White & Sons.

Foreseeing the difficulty of selecting a built-up site, Mr. Stein sought an unimproved tract large enough to constitute a self-contained community. A sloping 14-acre site, owned by Nathan Straus, facing Boston Post Road and bounded on the other side by Hicks Street, Wilson Avenue, and East Chester Road was selected. Four of the buildings are of six stories with elevators, the remainder are four-story walk-ups. They occupy about 38 percent of the site and contain 4,948 rooms in 1,416 apartments. Community facilities at Hillside include an auditorium, workshops, clubrooms, wading pools, playgrounds, and an excellent nursery school.

Neighborhood Gardens, St. Louis, Mo.

Neighborhood Gardens was sponsored by J. A. Wolf, Lee Johnson, and the Neighborhood Community Committee. A P.W.A. loan of \$640,000 was allotted by the Housing Division to the limited-dividend company, known as Neighborhood Gardens, Inc., to build the project. Hoener, Baum, and Froese designed the buildings. The contractor was H. B. Deal.

The site selected was 2.5 acres of slum land, cleared only 2 years previously for a bus terminal and other buildings which were never constructed. The nine three-story buildings occupy one complete block situated about 5 minutes' walk from the business district of the city, on a site bounded by Seventh, O'Fallon, Eighth, and Biddle Streets. The headquarters of the Neighborhood Association, similar in character to Hull House in Chicago, are only a short distance away. The three-story buildings contain 252 apartments with a total of 641 rooms. There are 30 two-room; 94 two and one-half-room; 88, three-room; 28 three and one-half-room; and 12 four-room apartments. Community facilities with a social hall, library, two club rooms, and a domestic-science kitchen are included together with a playground and wading pool.

Federal Projects.

Techwood Homes, Atlanta, Ga.

The Techwood Homes project was originally submitted by Techwood, Inc., as a limited-dividend project. When it became apparent that it could be handled more expeditiously by the Federal Government, it was included in the Housing Division's program of Federal projects. Techwood Homes is sponsored by the Techwood Housing Advisory Committee, with Dr. M. L. Brittain as chairman; Flippen D. Burge and Preston S. Stevens were appointed architects. The J. A. Jones Construction Co. was awarded the general contract; \$2,875,000 was appropriated for the project.

The area occupied by Techwood Homes is adjacent to the Georgia Institute of Technology. It was formerly a slum district, crowded with run-down insanitary frame shanties, lying between a good residential section and downtown Atlanta. These slums are now replaced by a park-like development, with buildings facing the Techwood Drive leading to the Institute. The buildings occupy but 25 percent of the 25-acre site and are of fireproof construction with brick exteriors and stone trim in a modified Georgian style. There are 23 buildings, arranged in 11 groups: 7 courts of group-houses, 13 three-story apartment buildings, a dormitory, a playground shelter, and an administration building with offices, stores, and equipment for a clinic. There are 604 family units and 189 dormitory rooms for the students of the Institute. The project has 396 three-room, 128 four-room, 53 five-room, and 26 six-room units; 185 garages are provided for the use of the tenants. Electric refrigeration and cooking facilities are included in the equipment. Steam heating is purchased from the municipal plant.

University, Atlanta, Ga.

The University Housing project of Atlanta, Ga., was submitted by University Housing Corporation, a limited-dividend company. On April 11, 1934, the Federal Government took it over under the sponsorship of the University Advisory Committee. The allotment was

\$2,500,000. N. P. Severin Co., of Chicago, were named general contractors; Edwards and Sayward of Atlanta, architects.

Specifications called for the construction of 2,395 rooms, comprising a total of 675 units. These were laid out in two and three-story apartment buildings and group houses arranged in 42 separate buildings and covering 25 percent of the site of 17½ acres. A room schedule of 236 four-room apartments was carefully arrived at as being the size to predominate in this project. There are 248 units of 3 rooms, 100 of 2 rooms, and 91 of 5 rooms. An interesting social feature is the grouping of lower-priced rooms among those of more prosperous tenants.

The site adjoins Negro colleges of Atlanta University on three sides, and is bounded by Parsons, Elm, Maber, and Lawshe Streets and Greensferry Avenue. The area was thickly covered with old shacks and full of the usual slum hazards. Of uneven topography, the project lay-out has been planned with simplicity and character. Common brick and painted cinder block are the predominant wall materials. Balconies are a pleasing feature of most of the units.

Provision has been made for a health clinic, a day nursery, storage of athletic equipment, offices and stores, a club room, and a community house; but the tenants look to the adjoining colleges for other facilities, such as gymnasium, workshop, and auditorium.

Stanley S. Holmes Village, Atlantic City, N. J.

Stanley S. Holmes Village is named for the first chairman of the New Jersey State Housing Authority who was active in initiating the project. The New Jersey State Housing Authority and the Atlantic City Civic Committee for Better Housing of which Mrs. Naomi Craighead Green is chairman are sponsoring the project. J. Vaughn Mathis is chief architect and John McShain, Inc., of Philadelphia, general contractor.

The site of Stanley S. Holmes Village is bounded by Adriatic, Kentucky, Baltic, and Illinois Avenues. It was formerly a bad slum district of frame tenements, most of which were unfit for occupancy. It is near the Negro War Memorial, now used as a playground and community center. The tenants have easy access to schools, churches, and a shopping district. Occupying eight blocks, the development consists of two-story group houses and three-story combination flats and group houses. There are 16 brick buildings, divided into 277 living units, 45 group houses and 232 flats; there are 928 rooms. The flats contain 184 three-room units and 48 four-room units. The group houses have 41 four-room units and 4 five-room units. The Village has central heating, electric refrigeration, and gas for cooking.

Smithfield Court, Birmingham, Ala.

Smithfield Court was sponsored first by the Birmingham Housing Committee. Later the Birmingham Housing Authority, with J. C.

DeHoll, as chairman, superseded the Committee as sponsor. The appropriation was \$2,500,000. D. O. Whilldin was appointed principal architect for the project.

The site of Smithfield Court, bounded by Ninth Court, Third, and Center Streets, and Eighth Avenue, was formerly a Negro slum area lacking proper sanitary facilities. This level area is near the geographical center of the city. Industrial employment is adjacent or can be reached by street car. The city agreed to close streets, surface bounding streets and maintain a community building. Utility companies cooperated by giving permission to move necessary utilities. The buildings occupy 22.5 percent of the 28-acre area. They are one- and two-story group houses and three-story apartments. Provision is made for 1,978 rooms with accommodations for 664 families. There are to be about 120 apartments and 544 group houses. These are divided into 184 two-room, 350 three-room, 90 four-room, and 40 five-room units.

Old Harbor Village, Boston, Mass.

The Government's first effort at housing in Boston, a slum-clearance project, involved eminent domain proceedings and had to be suspended in July of 1935. However, Old Harbor Village, approved August 28, 1935, is being built on nearby vacant land. The appropriation was \$6,585,000. Joseph D. Leland is chief architect.

The current project provides 1,016 dwelling units arranged in three-story and two-story walk-up buildings. There are 435 three-room apartments, 249 four-room, 174 five-room, and 158 group houses. There are no two-room units due to the fact that it is believed foreign-born families, averaging four to a family, will be the chief tenants. General features are electric cooking, lighting, refrigeration; garages; stores; administration building; and 28 social rooms grouped conveniently throughout the buildings.

The site is bounded by Old Colony Avenue, Locust Street, New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad right-of-way, Albert and Hyde Streets. Buildings cover 23.8 percent of the 32.7-acre site. The topography is level, the arrangement of the buildings open and excluding all alleys.

The spectacular feature of the project is its location; generally oriented toward beautiful Old Harbor with its fine bathing facilities; provided with the exceptional recreational features of adjoining Columbus Park. It is within easy walking distance of schools, churches, business centers, with fast transportation to Boston and Cambridge industrial areas.

Kenfield, Buffalo, N. Y.

The Kenfield project is sponsored by the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority, with William L. Collins as chairman. Chester Oakley was appointed chief architect. The appropriation was \$4,500,000.

The site consisted of about 65.4 acres of vacant land under one ownership. This simplified land acquisition and required no commit-

ments from the city concerning street vacations, utility changes, or relocation of tenants. The city promised the use of the recreational facilities in nearby schools and undertook to maintain a park within the project area. The development is on flat ground about 5 miles from the center of the city. It is in an area zoned for residential purposes but within easy walking distance of the industrial districts where the tenants are employed. Community garden space is provided within the area. The site is adjacent to Lang Field and is located between Suffolk Street and Edison Avenue. Social units and garages are included in the lay-out. The buildings, which are one- and two-story group houses and two- and three-story flats, occupy but 11.8 percent of the land; 658 living units with 2,756 rooms are provided. There will be 122 three-room, 290 four-room, and 246 five-room units.

New Towne Court, Cambridge, Mass.

The New Towne Court, Cambridge, Mass., project was originally a limited-dividend development submitted by the Cambridge Housing Corporation. It was later taken over and expanded by the Housing Division under the sponsorship of the Massachusetts State Board of Housing and the Cambridge Municipal Housing Authority. The appropriation was \$2,500,000. Henry C. Robbins was appointed chief architect.

The site of the project is level ground. It was formerly occupied by approximately 300 substandard dwellings of brick and frame construction. The development is easily accessible by rapid transit to all parts of Cambridge and Boston. The 8.8 acres of the area are bounded by Main, Washington, Portland, and Windsor Streets. The 3-story apartments occupy about 22 percent of the site. There are 294 units, 1,172 rooms with 8 social rooms. The units are divided into 92 three-room, 114 four-room, and 88 five-room apartments. Recreational facilities are provided in the basements. Parking space off the main streets is included. Gas is provided for cooking and refrigeration, and heat and hot water are supplied through a central heating plant.

Westfield Acres, Camden, N. J.

Westfield Acres was actively sponsored by the Camden Labor Housing Committee under the leadership of Charles Hollopeter. The New Jersey State Housing Authority and the Camden Housing Advisory Committee, appointed by Secretary Ickes, also serve as sponsors; \$3,000,000 was allocated for the project. Joseph N. Hetel is chief of the group of nine architects.

The 25-acre site of Westfield Acres was formerly vacant land. It is in a good residential district, two or three miles out from the center of town. There is excellent bus service on Westfield Avenue. The area lies at 32d Street, between Westfield Avenue, Lemuel Avenue, Dudley Street and the Camden and Burlington County Railroad. The land is rolling with a small creek running through the property.

Play areas for small children are provided. All buildings are three-story apartments. They occupy but 15.3 percent of the site. Specifications call for 598 living units and 2,200 rooms, which are divided into 285 three-room, 220 four-room and 93 five-room units.

Meeting Street Manor, Cooper River Court, Charleston, S. C.

The Charleston project was sponsored and approved jointly by Mayor Burnet R. Maybank and the Charleston Municipal Housing Authority. Samuel Lapham, Jr., is chief architect; \$1,150,000 was allocated for the project.

The site of the project was mostly vacant land, containing but one block of Negro houses, and bordering a large slum area. It faces on Meeting Street, which is a through paved highway with excellent transportation facilities. The location in the northern part of the city is convenient to the industrial area of North Charleston. Besides being near employment, the development is adjacent to a Negro school and marketing center. The site comprises 21.8 acres and is on approximately level ground. Meeting, Johnson, Nassau, Stewart, America, and Sumter Streets form the boundary lines of the area. The group houses, one and two stories high, with no basements, cover 14.6 percent of the land. Plans calling for 919 rooms and 281 living units are contemplated. The project will contain approximately 54 two-room, 125 three-room, 74 four-room and 28 five-room units.

Jane Addams Houses, Chicago, Ill.

Jane Addams Addition

Jane Addams Houses and the Jane Addams Addition are named in honor of the late founder of Hull House, who recommended the site. The Chicago General Advisory Board on Housing, of which General Robert E. Wood is chairman, serves as the sponsoring body; \$6,950,000 was allotted for the two projects. John A. Holabird is chief architect.

The site for the Jane Addams Houses, which was acquired first, was purchased from the Jewish People's Institute. It comprised 6.5 acres encumbered only by an abandoned auditorium. Later 15.6 acres of contiguous slum area were added, making the site for the Jane Addams Addition. Of flat topography, the site is bounded by Galpin Place, Racine Avenue, Roosevelt Road, Loomis Street, Edgemont Avenue, Throop Street, Taylor Avenue, and Lytle, Arlington, and Sibley Streets. The area is near sources of industrial and commercial employment and served by adequate street-car transportation to all parts of the city. Jefferson, McLaren, and Riis Schools, Hull House with its extensive community program, and Vernon Park are near enough to provide proper school, park, and community-center facilities. The buildings, which are two-story group houses and three-story apartments, occupy about 27 percent of the site. The 4,500 rooms are divided into 450

three-room, 287 four-room, and 86 five-room units; 7 four-room social units are provided.

Julia C. Lathrop Homes, Chicago, Ill.

The Julia C. Lathrop Homes project is sponsored by the Chicago General Advisory Board on Housing, with General Robert E. Wood as chairman. The appropriation was \$6,000,000. Robert S. DeGolyer is chief architect for the project.

The site was largely vacant land of level topography. It is adjacent to the industrial centers of employment of North Chicago and within reasonable distance for those employed in the Loop. Hamlin Park, with a good playground, is convenient to the property, and Lincoln Park a short bus ride away. School and transportation facilities are adequate. The area comprises about 38 acres. It is bounded on the north and east by Clybourn and North Damen Avenues and on the south and west by the North Branch of the Chicago River. The buildings are three-story apartments and two-story group houses and flats. They have a coverage of 21 percent, 985 living units of 3,450 rooms have been provided for. The units are divided into approximately 48 two-room, 459 three-room, 404 four-room, and 74 five-room units. Plans call for 777 apartments, 26 flats, and 182 group houses.

Trumbull Park Homes, Chicago, Ill.

Like the other Chicago housing projects, Trumbull Park Homes is sponsored by the General Advisory Board on Housing (General Robert E. Wood, chairman) and also by the South Chicago Business Association. John A. Holabird is the chief architect; \$3,250,000 was appropriated for the project.

The site was vacant land of level topography. This 22-acre area is situated in one of the most highly industrialized sections of Chicago. It is within walking distance of many industries, but also in the neighborhood of a well-established residential section of a character similar to the development. A good school and a small park containing a swimming pool, tennis courts, and other recreational facilities are immediately adjacent. A street-car line a few blocks away leads to the center of South Chicago. The approximate boundaries are Trumbull Park, Bensely Avenue, and the Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad. The buildings are two-story group houses and flats and four-story apartments, occupying about 18 percent of the area. Specifications call for 1,735 rooms and 460 living units, divided into 166 three-room, 233 four-room, and 61 five-room units. There will be about 126 apartments, 120 flats, and 214 group houses.

Laurel Homes, Cincinnati, Ohio

Laurel Homes is sponsored by the Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority with Stanley M. Rowe as chairman. Under its auspices a cooperative agreement among the architects was made for a limited-

dividend project, but this was later modified into a Federally financed project. Frederick W. Garber is the chief architect; the appropriation was \$6,500,000.

The project is situated in the crowded "Basin District" of Cincinnati. The area was one of substandard housing, overcrowded and with high rates of delinquency and crime. Due to the high land cost the Federal Government could not spend much money for parks and rezoning of streets. The city made a special appropriation to cover these expenses. The site is bounded by Liberty Street, Terminal Parkway, John, and Linn Streets. The area comprises 23.8 acres, with a coverage of 22 percent. The buildings are 3- and 4-story apartments; 120 garages and a community building are provided. There are 1,279 apartments, with 4,106 rooms. The apartments are divided into units of 202 two-room, 688 three-room, 307 four-room, and 82 five-room.

Cedar-Central Apartments, Cleveland, Ohio

The Cedar-Central project is an outgrowth of the original limited-dividend proposals of Cleveland Homes, Inc. When this company proved unable to furnish the necessary equity, the Housing Division took over some of its projects under the sponsorship of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority of which Marc J. Grossman is chairman; \$3,279,000 was appropriated for the project. The architect is Walter R. McCornack and the general contractor, the George A. Fuller Company.

The site area is 18.2 acres bounded by Cedar Avenue, Central Avenue, and East Thirtieth and Twenty-second Streets. Situated in one of the seven major blighted areas of Cleveland, the land was formerly covered with frame houses unfit for habitation. It is part of an area included in a long-range plan of rehabilitation, close to the industrial and commercial areas of the city where tenants are employed. The property is on level ground, well drained. The 19 buildings cover 20 percent of the land. They are 3-story apartments containing 2,312 rooms divided into 654 units. There are 8 two-room, 354 three-room, 226 four-room, and 66 five-room units. Two playgrounds are provided for children. Steam heat from a central plant, electric refrigeration, and gas ranges provide the necessary utilities.

Outhwaite Homes, Cleveland, Ohio

The Outhwaite Homes project is part of the housing plans originally proposed by Cleveland Homes, Inc., a limited-dividend company. It was later taken over by the Federal Government under the sponsorship of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority. The architects are Maier, Walsh & Barrett and the general contractor the George A. Fuller Co.; the allotment was \$3,650,000.

The 20.6-acre site is bounded by Scovill, Outhwaite, and Woodland Avenues, East Forty-sixth, East Fifty-fifth, and East Fortieth Streets. The area was formerly a slum with a predominantly Negro popula-

tion. Within its boundaries are the Outhwaite Social Center, including gymnasium, pools, and large playgrounds; Outhwaite Public School, Kennard Junior High, and East Technology High School. It is close to commercial and light industrial sections. The 16 buildings are two-story group houses and three-story flats. They cover 21.6 percent of the land. Ninety-four garages and store space are provided. There are 2,166 rooms with 579 units divided into 46 two-room, 162 three-room, 301 four-room, 36 five-room, and 34 six-room units. The project has three group plants for heating, electric refrigeration, and gas ranges.

Lake View Terrace, Cleveland, Ohio

Like the other Cleveland projects, Lake View Terrace is a modification of plans originally proposed by Cleveland Homes, Inc. Later, under the sponsorship of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, it was taken over by the Housing Division. Joseph L. Weinberg was appointed chief architect. The Madsen Construction Company is general contractor; \$3,800,000 was allowed for the project.

Title to the streets within the projects was vested by the city in the United States Government in order to rezone the site. The sloping, irregular terrain made necessary considerable extra architectural and engineering services, but affords at the same time an excellent view over the lake. Bounded by West Twenty-ninth Street, River Avenue, Mulberry Avenue, Main Avenue, and Washington Avenue, the area was in need of slum clearance. It was losing population rapidly because of its deteriorated character. Besides having an exceptionally desirable location for view and surrounding parks, it is close to employment centers. The 44 buildings occupy but 17.4 percent of the 22.3-acre site. The 620 units are divided into 170 group houses and 450 apartments. There are 2,291 rooms. The group houses have 26 three-room, 61 four-room and 83 five-room units; the apartments, 246 three-room and 204 four-room units. The buildings, two and three stories high, are equipped with a central heating plant, electric refrigeration, and gas ranges. In each block and on the roofs of the garages there are play areas. The community building provides the recreation center.

University Terrace, Columbia, S. C.

University Terrace is sponsored by the Columbia Municipal Housing Authority, with W. Smedes Hendley as chairman; \$500,000 was appropriated for its construction. James B. Urquhart was appointed architect.

The site of this small project contained 45 houses and 2 vacant lots. It is situated opposite the University of South Carolina, and near a Negro grade school and a Negro high school. No community facilities are provided, because those in the schools were considered adequate centers for indoor recreation. A large park nearby has adequate outdoor play space. The area of 4.1 acres is bounded by Divine, Bull,

Blossom, and Marion Streets. It was previously occupied by run-down frame dwellings lacking decent sanitary facilities. The development is within easy walking distance of the center of town, employment sources, and shopping facilities. The ground is sloping. The buildings are one- and two-story group houses, and two- and three-story apartments. They occupy approximately 26 percent of the land. All group houses have private rear gardens; for flats, gardens are optional. Plans called for 473 rooms with living units for 142 families; 48 apartments, 72 flats, and 22 group houses. Units are divided into approximately 16 two-room, 80 three-room, 29 four-room, and 17 five-room.

Cedar Springs Place, Dallas, Tex.

Cedar Springs Place is sponsored by the Dallas Housing Advisory Committee, appointed by Secretary Ickes; \$900,000 was appropriated for the development. Walter C. Sharp was appointed chief architect.

The site is bounded by Hartford Street, Lucas Drive, Maple Avenue, and Hawthorne Avenue. The area comprises 22.3 acres, part of which is devoted to a play park maintained by the city. Situated on well-drained, flat land, the site, although largely vacant, was chosen because there were no definite slum areas which were suitably located for a housing project. The location is most centrally placed with regard to schools, parks, shopping, and employment centers. The area has been recently rezoned for residential purposes. Social rooms are provided at present, with plans for a future community building. Front and back gardens maintained by tenants will add to the appearance of the development, while reducing the cost of upkeep of larger public open spaces. There is a central heating plant, with gas for cooking and refrigeration. The buildings are one- and two-story group houses, without basements, and two-story apartments. They occupy 15.9 percent of the land. Building plans contemplate 196 living units with a total of 664 rooms. The units are composed of 24 two-room, 96 three-room, 52 four-room, and 24 five-room. Plans call for 96 apartments and 100 group houses.

Brewster, Detroit, Mich.

The Brewster project is sponsored by the Detroit Housing Commission, a local body appointed by the mayor of Detroit. With Mrs. Josephine Gomon as its active secretary, the Commission early submitted several tentative proposals to the Housing Division. After deciding on the present site, \$5,500,000 was appropriated for the project. George D. Mason was named the chief architect of the group of 15 Detroit architects known as the Eastfield Associates.

The boundaries of the site are approximately Rowena, Hastings, St. Antoine, Wilkins, and Beaubien Streets. The city cooperated with the Federal Government in closing the necessary streets within the area. This 8½ block area was populated largely with Negroes who were leaving it because of increasing menaces to health. Space for



Bird's Eye View

SEE PAGE 85

JANE ADDAMS HOUSES, CHICAGO, ILL.

SEE PAGE 86

LANGSTON
WASHINGTON, D. C.



Courtyard Detail

stores and garages is provided in the development. Social units which can easily be converted into living units are included in the building plans. Recreational rooms are located in the basements. The buildings are three-story apartments, and two-story group houses and flats. They occupy about 23 percent of the 28-acre area. Specifications call for 2,759 rooms and 791 living units which are divided into approximately 24 two-room, 415 three-room, 294 four-room, and 58 five-room units. There will be about 481 apartments, 44 flats, and 266 group houses.

Parkside, Detroit, Mich.

The sponsor for the Parkside Housing project is the Detroit Housing Commission, appointed by the mayor of Detroit; \$4,500,000 was appropriated for the development. George D. Mason was appointed chief architect.

The site of Parkside was formerly vacant land in one ownership which simplified the process of land acquisition. After several other sites in Detroit had been abandoned due to various difficulties, this site was chosen because of its location within 5 miles of the center of the city, its nearness to manufacturing plants and its good transportation facilities. It is located in a white neighborhood, with no noise, smoke, or odor nuisances. Chandler Park on its north boundary offers unusual recreational facilities. It is planned to supplement the inadequate school facilities by building a new school with P. W. A. funds. The 30.9 acres are bounded by Frankfort Road, Warren, Gray, and Conners Avenues. The city cooperated in closing the necessary streets. The three-story apartments cover but 20 percent of the land. Space for stores and garages is provided within the area. Until the city can erect a community building, social units will provide indoor recreational space in the buildings. Plans call for approximately 2,843 rooms and 779 living units divided into 48 two-room, 250 three-room, 405 four-room, and 73 five-room units. These units compose 244 apartments, 130 flats, and 405 group houses.

Cherokee Terrace, Enid, Okla.

Cherokee Terrace is sponsored by the Enid Housing Advisory Committee, with Milton J. Newman as chairman. The chief architect is George Blumenauer; \$435,100 was appropriated for the project. The Works Progress Administration cooperated in providing the labor necessary to demolish existing buildings.

Like many small American cities, Enid provided little housing for the low-income groups except cast-off homes, with the consequent result of an acute housing shortage. A blighted district of nondescript frame houses was selected for a demonstration project to show what can be done with large-scale construction and management. The site is bounded by East Main Street, East Oklahoma Street, South Sixth Street, and South Seventh Street. The center of the retail business district is only 6 blocks away, and school and church facilities are

excellent. Enid Springs Park is adjacent to the area. The buildings which are one- and two-story group houses and flats occupy about 20 percent of the 5.7 acre area. Plans call for 351 rooms and 90 living units divided into approximately 18 three-room, 63 four-room and 9 five-room units. Electric refrigeration, a central heating plant, and gas cooking provide the necessary utilities.

Lincoln Gardens, Evansville, Ind.

The sponsoring group for Lincoln Gardens is the Evansville Housing Advisory Committee, with Richard Rosencranz as chairman. The City Plan Commission and the mayor's sponsoring committee for Lincoln Gardens also supported it. Edward J. Thole was appointed the chief architect; \$1,000,000 was appropriated for the project.

The site of the project is approximately 11 acres, located in a Negro area, the worst slum in the city. The nearby Lincoln School, in addition to supplying necessary educational facilities, has a good playground, gymnasium, and auditorium. The area is bounded by Canal Street, Tidrington Street, Lincoln Avenue, and Governor Street. Lincoln Avenue, an important and beautiful street, is much improved with the rehabilitation of this site which is surrounded by desirable Negro residential districts. Several social organizations in the vicinity sponsor social and athletic activities, and provide for clinical services. The city cooperated in the vacation of streets and the relocation of tenants. Rezoning of the property and the contiguous area is proposed in order to maintain the character of the project. The city has undertaken to maintain a playground in the area. Rear-yard gardens are provided.

The buildings, one- and two-story group houses and flats, occupy about 16 percent of the site. Plans call for 607 rooms and 195 living units divided into 36 two-room, 120 three-room, 20 4-room, and 19 five-room units. There are to be 80 flats and 115 group houses.

Lockefield Garden Apartments, Indianapolis Ind.

The Lockefield Garden Apartments project was sponsored by the Indianapolis Advisory Committee on Housing, with William H. Trimble, as chairman; \$3,025,000 was appropriated for the project. The architects are William Earl Russ and Merritt Harrison. The contract was awarded to the N. P. Severin Co. The entire site was acquired by condemnation.

The site was indicated as one of the worst in the city in the 1923 Chamber of Commerce Survey. It was a bad Negro slum district which the city had been trying to clear for some time. The area adjoins a large medical center, including the Indiana University School of Medicine. Negro schools are located near by. The entire site lies within a mile of the principal business district. It is bounded by Locke Street, North Street, Blake Street, and Indiana Avenue. The 23 buildings occupy 17.6 percent of the 22.1 acre area. They are

three- and four-story apartments and two-story group houses. There are 96 group houses and 652 apartments totaling 748 units and 2,538 rooms. The units are divided into 456 three-room, 290 four-room and 2 five-room. Steam heat is purchased from the municipal mains. Electricity provided for cooking and refrigeration. Play areas, stores, and garages are included in the plans.

Durkeeville, Jacksonville, Fla.

Durkeeville was sponsored by the Municipal Housing Board of Jacksonville, with Fred B. Bradshaw, as chairman. \$1,000,000 was appropriated for the project. Mellen C. Greeley was appointed chief architect.

Located on flat-vacant land, the project is bounded by McConihe, Seventh, Sixth, Payne, Myrtle, and Wilcox Streets. Situated in the heart of a Negro district, all necessary utilities were available along Myrtle Street. It is accessible to schools, employment, and shopping centers. Two playgrounds are near enough to be used by tenants of the development. The buildings, which are one- and two-story group houses without basements, occupy 13.3 percent of the 20.2 acre site. A small social unit is provided for recreational purposes. They are expected to provide 781 rooms with accommodations for 239 families. The project will consist of approximately 45 two-room, 113 three-room, 53 four-room, and 28 five-room units.

Blue Grass Park, Aspendale, Lexington, Ky.

The Lexington project is sponsored by the Lexington Municipal Housing Commission, with Charles M. Marshall, as chairman; \$1,500,000 was made available for the project. Hugh Meriwether is the chief architect.

As this site was vacant land under one ownership, the Old Kentucky Jockey Club Track, land acquisition was much simplified. There were no streets in the area to be vacated, nor any tenants to be relocated. The ground slopes in two directions, thus lending itself to a divided project, one part near the white district, the other near the colored. The cost of the land was unusually low. Only 44 acres are to be developed. The remaining 23 acres are reserved for playgrounds and community gardens. The development is conveniently located to transportation, schools, shopping, and employment centers. It is planned to rezone the area and contiguous property to protect it for residential purposes. The buildings are to be one- and two-story group houses and two-story group flats. Plans provide for 286 living units. The 947 rooms will be divided into 40 two-room, 114 three-room, 81 four-room, and 24 five-room units.

La Salle Place, Louisville, Ky.

The La Salle Place project is being built for unskilled workers of the nearby tobacco and motor factories of Louisville, Ky. The site, 1.35

acres of vacant land, lies along the Dixie Highway on the west, McCloskey Avenue on the east, Algonquin Parkway to the south, and Kentucky & Indiana Terminal Railroad on the north. The buildings are oriented away from the industrial zone on the north, toward the prevailing winds from the southwest.

In consideration of the type of adjoining neighborhoods, the buildings have been limited to one- and two-story group houses with one-third basements. They cover 21.4 percent of the site and provide 210 dwelling units of 3-, 4-, and 5-room sizes. These are heated from a central plant. Each has electric lights, refrigeration, gas for cooking, and a rear-yard garden. The houses have been grouped with regard for maximum light and air; for access to the two large social rooms and garage compounds and to nearby street cars.

E. T. Hutchings is the chief architect. The project was approved September 30, 1935 and is sponsored by the Louisville Advisory Committee.

College Court, Louisville, Ky.

College Court project of Louisville, Ky., is so named because of an adjoining Negro college. The project is located close to a block of heavy industries on the west. Within easy walking distance of domestic and all other employment centers, it consists of 5.2 acres of land acquired by purchase, bounded by Florence Place, Seventh Street, Kentucky Avenue, and Eighth Street.

The development, sponsored by the Louisville Advisory Committee, was approved August 7, 1935, with an allotment of \$700,000. E. T. Hutchings is chief architect.

In consideration of the living habits of the tenants, the 125 dwelling units were arranged in group houses of one and two stories, with front yards and back gardens instead of communal gardens. The rooms range from two to five per unit; have group heating, electric lighting, and refrigeration. There are stoops and porches; basements with drying and storage facilities; and one social unit. General garage and shopping facilities are available along nearby streets. Only infants are provided with communal play space. A public park is within reach of adults.

Dixie Homes, Memphis, Tenn.

Dixie Homes was judged by Mr. Max Furbringer, chairman of the sponsoring Memphis Housing Commission, to be the most needed of all projects submitted for that city. The project is located on 42.3 acres of sloping ground lying about 1 mile east of the central business district between Poplar, Ayers, Peach, and Decatur Streets, and will replace an existing slum area. It has adequate schools and has the social advantage of nearby LeMoyne College for Negroes. It is within easy access of domestic and industrial employment centers on the south boundary.

The buildings, designed by architect G. Frazier Smith and his associates, cover 21.4 percent of the site. They are arranged in one-

and two-story group houses, two-story flats, and two-story gallery apartments, providing for 743 families in 2,365 rooms. Equipment includes cooking and heating stoves and ice boxes. Fenced, backyard gardens are provided, tenants being responsible for their maintenance. The gallery apartments have incinerators; the other units, quick collection facilities for garbage disposal. Basements are communal. Drying yards are surfaced and built in the open. There is space allotted for social gatherings; for management, maintenance and repairs; for playgrounds for older children, and for a possible future community building.

Lauderdale Courts, Memphis, Tenn.

In Memphis, on a slum site with about 225 dwellings half of which were dilapidated, the Housing Division is erecting a second Memphis project, Lauderdale Courts. It is expected to arrest the steady deterioration of this area.

The site of 26 acres, 19.5 percent of which is covered by buildings, is bounded by Winchester and Alabama Avenues, Exchange Avenue, Hill Street, and Third Street. Lauderdale Avenue has been extended through the project to cover an existing bayou. The city is to pave bounding streets to the curb line. Work for a majority of the tenants of the area is within walking distance. Business and shopping centers are about one-half mile distant. Markets are convenient; schools are adequate.

The site plan for Lauderdale Courts provides one- and two-story group houses and a few three-story apartments. The distribution of unit sizes and types includes 231 three-room, 213 four-room, 40 two-room, and 40 five-room units. The community building is placed on the first floor of a group building, with exterior openings and with play basement. There are laundries, maintenance, and repair space, garages, heating plant, and project office. Equipment includes heat and hot water, baths, gas ranges, electric lights and refrigeration.

Lauderdale Courts was approved October 1, 1935. J. Frazier Smith is chief architect. The Memphis Municipal Housing Authority and other civic bodies have supported the project.

Liberty Square, Miami, Fla.

The Liberty Square project in Miami consists of 60 acres, 40 of which are to be left unimproved as park area and for further expansion of the project. The site lies on the outskirts of Miami where prospective tenants have been rigorously segregated and have been living without utilities, ready transportation or school facilities. The project is intended to serve as a nucleus that will produce a flexible, well-controlled town, and that will encourage the gradual demolition of slum housing in Miami proper.

The site is a rectangular area included within Northwest Thirteenth and Fourteenth Avenues, Northwest Sixty-second and Northwest

Sixty-seventh Streets. The one-story group house is the prevailing type of building. There are 243 units, comprising 860 rooms, in the following schedule: 30 two-room, 104 three-room, 57 four-room, and 52 five-room units. Floors for the buildings are concrete or tile, as wood floors would require considerable maintenance in Miami climate. Walls are frame, stucco and tile; the roof, wood. No heat is provided. Each unit has bath and toilet; electric lighting and refrigeration; kerosene stoves for cooking; and a combination laundry-tub and kitchen sink. Play areas are individual, fenced yards. A community building, a handstand, a nursery, three stores, septic tanks for garbage, and parking areas, are the general facilities. Bus transportation and a grade school have been provided. Fire protection and garbage collection are furnished by the city—the latter at a nominal fee.

The development was approved October 18, 1934. P. E. Paist is the chief architect and Walter Butler Co., general contractors. It was sponsored by the Miami Advisory Committee on Housing.

Parklawn, Milwaukee, Wis.

Milwaukee is one of the few cities having no pronounced slum area, due to her effective demolition program. The housing problem lay in the shortage of dwellings within the income of low-wage earners. To fill this need, the Housing Division has responded with the Parklawn Project located on the northern outskirts of the city.

The project fits in well with the surrounding neighborhood. It is a rectangular area, almost flat, enclosed by North Sherman Boulevard, West Hope Avenue, North Forty-seventh Street, and West Congress Street. It involved the purchase of 42.1 acres of unimproved land, 17.3 percent of which is taken up with buildings. There are to be 62 buildings in all, made of fireproof material with wood roofs, porches, and having full basements. In type they are group houses of one and two stories, three-story apartments and two-story flats. There are 136 three-room, 300 four-room and 82 five-room units. Central heating, electric ranges and refrigeration, and basement laundry facilities are provided for all dwellings. The project is well provided with play areas and with large front and backyard space. There are 5 stores, a community building included in the dwellings, 83 garages, and a service building. The city will maintain police and fire protection; park areas; and will provide all utilities.

Parklawn was approved October 24, 1934, under an allotment of \$2,800,000. Gerrit J. DeGelleke is chief architect, and George A. Fuller Co., general contractor. The Board of Public Land Commissioners and the Advisory Committee on Housing have sponsored the project.

Sumner Field Homes, Minneapolis, Minn.

Sumner Field Homes project is located at the outer edge of the central industrial district of Minneapolis. The area was definitely slum in character, with ever increasing social menaces. The site

includes 31.8 acres acquired by purchase, and has a building coverage of 20 percent. It is flat terrain bounded by Eleventh, Seventh, Aldrich, Eighth, Bassett, Sixth, and Emerson Streets. The area is sufficient in size and location to be an integrated neighborhood unit.

Under an allotment of \$3,500,000 the project was approved on September 28, 1935. W. H. Tusler is the chief architect. The Sumner Field Project Association sponsored the enterprise.

The project will attract tenants of mixed types. There is already a nucleus for an improved residential area in the existing Phyllis Wheatley House, which promises well-organized community activities.

The buildings are group houses, flats, and three-story apartments. They provide 622 units and 2,263 rooms which are divided into 18 two-room, 268 three-room, 257 four-room, and 79 five-room units. Heat, gas ranges, electric refrigeration, maintenance shops, 160 garages, and 16 stores are provided. A gardener's market, convenient transportation, and adequate schools are available. The dwellings have large rear and side yards. There is an additional 3-block area on the site, which will be transformed into park space.

Riverside Heights, Montgomery, Ala.

A local committee recommended the site of the Riverside Heights project in Montgomery, Ala., after an extensive survey of a number of areas in the city. Its proximity to employment centers and the business district of Montgomery were factors entering into the selection of the present site. It is also situated on a main highway having transportation facilities. The area is bounded by Bell and Eugene Streets, by the Montalla Mills property, and by a bluff on the north.

Designed to meet an acute housing shortage for families of the lower-income group, the project will provide 100 living units in 1- and 2-story group houses. During recent years many families moved from farms seeking employment in the city and with no new homes erected to care for this increase, scores of families are living in abandoned shacks, unable to find better living quarters even in substandard homes.

Engineers were faced with the task of laying out a new community, of providing water mains and sewage outlets and introducing power conduits to the area. Less than 10 percent of the land will be used for buildings, the rest devoted to parks, playgrounds, and individual backyards. Tenants will have the privilege of planting gardens in the rear of their homes.

The group houses will be divided into 18 two-room dwellings, 50 three-room, 22 four-room, and 10 five-room units. Each home will be equipped with electricity, bathing facilities, stoves, and heating units. All buildings will be of fireproof construction.

Ausfeld & Jones, of Montgomery, were responsible for the architectural plans. T. L. James & Co. are general contractors. The Montgomery Advisory Committee on Housing cooperated with the Government in developing the project.

Wm. B. Paterson Courts, Montgomery, Ala.

The William B. Paterson Courts, in Montgomery, Ala., will replace an objectionable slum area with modern, bright, and airy group houses.

Occupying an irregularly shaped tract of land of some 311,000 square feet, it will create a model community composed of 158 houses of simple design. It will have 14 two-room, 89 three-room, 40 four-room, and 15 five-room units. The building space will cover 30 percent of the site.

The development was named after William B. Paterson, educator and horticulturist, who was known as the father of higher education for the Negro in Alabama.

The area is located opposite the campus of the Alabama State Normal School for Negroes and is otherwise bounded by Decatur, Thurman, and South Union Streets.

Architects for the \$459,000 project are Carl B. Cooper and Moreland G. Smith. T. L. James & Co. are general contractors. Montgomery Advisory Committee on Housing cooperated in the operations of the project.

Cheatham Place - Andrew Jackson Courts, Nashville, Tenn.

After a careful study of living conditions in Nashville, Tenn., the Housing Division, with the cooperation of the Nashville Advisory Committee on Housing, deemed it expedient to build two projects in Nashville.

No condemnation proceedings were involved in assemblage of the two slum sites which were acquired by direct purchase.

Architectural plans for the two projects were developed under the supervision of Richard R. Clark of Nashville, chief architect, with Henry C. Hibbs, E. M. Tisdale, Francis B. Warfield, and Emmons H. Woolwine as associates.

Cheatham Place, one of the two Nashville projects, will be composed of 1- and 2-story group houses, providing 332 modern living units at low rents. The site consists of over 20 acres, 5½ of which were added subsequent to the original purchase in order to reduce coverage and more completely round out the project. The modern dwellings will replace housing conditions of the worst type; \$1,700,000 has been allotted for the project.

The buildings will be constructed so as to form a circular mall around a large recreational space. All utilities will be underground, preserving the parklike character of the development. Less than 25 percent of the land will be occupied by houses, leaving the greater part of the site open for landscape and recreational development.

Cheatham Place is located close to the shopping center of Nashville and to an industrial area which affords a source of employment close to the project.

Andrew Jackson Courts, the second project, adjoins Fisk University and is bounded by Jackson, Seventeenth Avenue, Desha Street, and the Tennessee Central Railroad.

The Government has allocated \$1,500,000 for the project which will provide 383 living units, divided into 1- and 2-story group houses and 2-story flats. These dwellings are to be attractively grouped around courts with individual yards and garden space. The development entailed the clearing of some 22 acres of dilapidated, insanitary frame shanties.

Ten Eyck Houses, New York, N. Y.

Ten Eyck Houses is sponsored by the New York City Housing Authority under the active leadership of its chairman, Langdon W. Post; \$12,783,000 was appropriated for the project. The Works Progress Administration furnished the labor for the demolition of the existing buildings. Architects' services were supplied by a group of New York architects under the direction of R. H. Shreve.

The project is located in the heart of Brooklyn in a former slum area of run-down buildings. It is convenient to transportation lines and areas of employment. The boundaries are Leonard, Maujer, and Scholes Streets and Bushwick Avenue. The acquisition of the site was done by the Housing Division, with the assistance of the New York City Housing Authority which under State law has the power to condemn land for housing. The city cooperated in every way possible. It agreed to erect a school and playground within the area and close the necessary streets within the site. The buildings which are four-story walk-ups occupy 33 percent of the 24.1 acre site. The comparatively high density is justified by the location of the project in the city and the comparatively high land cost. The interior courts have been made as large as possible. Stores are provided. There are no garages. Social rooms and a nursery school constitute the only community equipment, but the facilities of the new school are to be available to the tenants. Plans call for approximately 5,658 rooms contained in 1,615 dwelling units. The rooms are distributed into 48 two-room, 769 three-room, 732 four-room, and 65 five-room apartments.

Harlem River Houses, New York, N. Y.

Selection of a site for a low-rent housing development in Harlem presented an unusually dismaying problem. Because of congestion there was no vacant property and real estate was exceptionally costly in that particular area. The New York City Housing Authority sponsored the Harlem project.

Some 574 families will benefit from the development which will be divided into 60 two-room, 259 three-room, 232 four-room units and 23 dwelling units of 5 rooms each.

Bounded on the east by the Harlem River and Macombs Place on the west, it effects a well defined and compact unit. Southern and

northern boundaries are One Hundred and Fifty-first Street and One Hundred and Fifty-third Street.

Careful site-planning has been maintained by Chief Architect A. M. Brown and his associates, furnishing an abundance of light and air. Other features are social rooms, each having outside terraces; supervised nurseries where children may be left while the mothers are away at work; playgrounds including wading pools; and small stores. The natural topography of the project has created a small amphitheater for the entertainment of the tenants. Space will be utilized for a health clinic to be run by the city in the nature of a dispensary and station for preliminary diagnosis.

For a period of 10 years the City of New York will maintain a park and playground on the 125-foot strip of land running between the Harlem River and the project.

Will Rogers Courts, Oklahoma City, Okla.

The \$2,000,000 Oklahoma City project, known as Will Rogers Courts, presented no difficult problems in organization. The 36-acre site was vacant land which was easily acquired, being under one ownership.

One- and two-story group houses with a few semidetached dwellings, will be built, each having refrigeration, hot and cold water, heat from one of the five group heating plants, baths, and modern cooking facilities. There will be a paved area for auto parking. Two acres will be used for community gardening.

Designed to give 400 low-income families comfortable modern living quarters at low rents, the development will overcome a serious housing shortage. The City Council passed a resolution to demolish a number of buildings unfit for habitation equal to those constructed.

The site is bounded by Westwood Boulevard, Rotary Park, Oklahoma City Junction Railway, and the west line of Ribble Addition.

Near one of the city's principal industrial areas, the project will be within walking distance of many centers of employment, while an adjacent car line will furnish tenants with easy transportation to all parts of the city. Two grade schools, one junior and one senior high school are located in the neighborhood.

Dr. G. A. Nichols, prominent Oklahoma City realtor, was responsible for interesting the Government in undertaking a project in the city. An advisory committee was later appointed by Administrator Ickes.

J. O. Parr of Oklahoma City is the chief architect.

Logan Fontenelle Homes, Omaha, Nebr.

Logan Fontenelle homes is sponsored by the Omaha Housing Authority, with Grant A. Benson as chairman. Mayor Towl strongly supported the project. William L. Steele was appointed chief architect. The allotment was \$2,000,000.



UNDER WAY

The site was in an area of substandard housing, with about a one-third Negro population. The location is desirable in that it improves the section between the commercial district and a reasonably good residential area to the north. The original site was bounded by Paul Street to Seward Street and the alley east of Twentieth Street to Twenty-fourth Street. Later an additional area of 2.5 acres to the north was added. The city council passed a resolution agreeing to supply fire and police protection, to furnish utilities at the usual rates, and to waive the requirement for construction permits and for the inspection of property. The buildings which are one- and two-story group houses and two-story flats will occupy about 20.5 percent of the site. The 1,166 rooms will comprise 326 living units which are divided into approximately 16 two-room, 134 three-room, 148 four-room, and 28 five-room apartments; 96 units will be in flats and 230 in group houses.

Hill Creek, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Hill Creek housing project is sponsored by the Philadelphia Housing Advisory Committee, with Dr. John A. MacCallum as its chairman. Walter H. Thomas was appointed the chief architect. The allotment was \$1,800,000.

The 24-acre site is on sloping ground, bounded by Rising Sun Avenue, Adams Avenue, Tacony Creek, and a line about 200 feet northwest of Bingham Street. The area, except for a few old structures, was vacant land in one ownership. The location is in industrial Frankford. The tenants are expected to be the industrial workers from the immediate vicinity. The buildings are one- and two-story group houses, two-story flats and three-story apartments. They occupy 14 percent of the land. The 1,197 rooms provide for 325 living units which are divided into approximately 21 two-room, 106 three-room, 153 four-room, and 45 five-room units. There will be about 45 apartments, 80 flats, and 200 group houses.

Caserio Mirapalmeras, San Juan, P. R.

The Caserio Mirapalmeras project was sponsored by Gov. Blanton Winship and the Puerto Rican Housing Advisory Committee. The architectural work was done directly by the Housing Division, Salvador Quinones was awarded the contract for the foundations; \$775,000 was allotted to the project.

The land was dedicated by the city for housing purposes, as it was formerly municipally owned. Of rolling topography, the area is bounded by Camino Del Sebruco, Calle Mehrhoff, Calle Progreso, and a property line. The one-story group houses occupy 15.4 percent of the 12.5 acre site. The 533 rooms make up 131 living units which are divided into approximately 4 two-room, 9 three-room, 92 four-room, and 26 five-room units. The project is designed to alleviate an extremely distressing lack of decent sanitary conditions among the natives in San Juan.

Caserio Lagranja, Caguas, P. R.

A second project, Caserio Lagranja, was made possible in Puerto Rico by the transferring of \$275,000 to the Housing Division by the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration sponsored by Gov. Blanton Winship and the mayor of Caguas. The project was given preference over others, due to the donation of the site by the city.

Formerly an experimental farm, the fertile soil will lend itself to cultivation in the form of individual tenant gardens. The one-story group houses will occupy about 10 percent of the 10-acre site. There will be approximately 270 rooms or 75 dwelling units grouped around a central plaza.

The project will be inhabited by low-income workers for whom decent accommodations at reasonable rentals are now totally lacking.

Schonowee Village, Schenectady, N. Y.

Overlooking the picturesque Mohawk River Valley, the Schenectady, N. Y., project known as Schonowee Village will house some 300 families replacing a run-down area now occupied by a group of antiquated, substandard dwellings.

The Schenectady Municipal Housing Authority cooperated with the Government in the development of the site through the contribution of a portion of the area now owned by the municipality, and has also agreed to develop a public park adjacent to the area.

The site for the project includes approximately 10 acres located on a hillside terrace lying between Hamilton Street and Broadway and is transversed by Millard Street. Existing major utility lines are available within or along the boundaries of the site, which is within walking distance of Schenectady's principal industries and shopping centers.

The Schenectady project will conform to Housing Division standards, which require maximum amounts of light and air for each dwelling, with ample outside and inside recreational space. Buildings will be located some distance from each other, in order to provide open areas, and will have modern facilities, including heating, 20 garages, hot water, lighting, and kitchen stoves.

The building coverage is approximately 25 percent, the structures being divided into three-story apartments and two-story flats, totaling 955 rooms.

Architects for the project are R. L. Bowen, chief architect, and J. W. Montross.

Fairfield Court, Stamford, Conn.

Fairfield Court is sponsored by the Mayor's Housing Committee of Stamford under the active leadership of Mayor Alfred N. Phillips, Jr.; \$800,000 was appropriated for the project. William J. Provoost was appointed chief architect.

The site selected for the project was vacant except for five buildings. Since there were no streets or alleys existing in the area, the problem

of closing streets was eliminated. This area, bounded approximately by Stillwater Avenue, Fairfield Avenue, Hazel Street, and Finney Lane, is in a decaying residential neighborhood. The site is well located with respect to schools, sources of employment, shopping centers, principal business districts, and playgrounds. The project, although not slum clearance, is justified by the scarcity of decent, low-rental dwellings in Stamford disclosed by the real property inventory. Plans call for three-story apartments and one- and two-story group houses to occupy 24.6 percent of the 4.5-acre site. There will be approximately 535 rooms composing 154 living units. These buildings are divided into 18 two-room, 72 three-room, 37 four-room, and 27 five-room units. There are 113 apartments and 41 group houses. The usual social rooms are provided.

Brand Whillock Homes, Toledo, Ohio

Evidence presented by the Toledo Metropolitan Housing Authority was responsible for the selection of a slum-clearance project in Toledo, Ohio, and the Belmont-Division site was chosen.

The project will consist of two-story group houses, flats, and some three-story apartment buildings. The structures will cover only 20 percent of the total area, the balance to be devoted to lawns and gardens and recreational space. Close to the business section of Toledo, the project will wipe out an objectionable district, the site of the notorious Lucas Alley. Official records show the district to have exacted a heavy toll in disease and crime.

Ample school facilities close at hand, together with a large public park a short distance away, were additional reasons for the selection of the 16-acre plot which is bounded by Belmont and Nebraska Avenues, Division Street, and Canal Boulevard.

The new housing is being constructed in accordance with Housing Division standards which include the latest conveniences such as electric refrigeration, gas stoves, laundry facilities, garages, and repair shops. Harold H. Munger is chief architect.

Virgin Islands

There are three low-rent housing projects being constructed in the Virgin Islands: the Marley and Elskoe projects on St. Croix, and the Hospital Grounds project on St. Thomas. All three are for natives of low income, who live in deteriorated structures and whose employment is primarily domestic service, small farming, and shipping.

The Marley project of Fredericksted, St. Croix consists of 16.75 acres of municipal land donated to the insular government. It was a vacant site, tied to the town on the north side by Fisher Street; adjacent to the Two Brothers' Tract on the south and east; and facing the Caribbean Sea on the west. The Elskoe project at Christiansted, St. Croix, contains 5 acres of purchased land, bordering the town on the east side along West Street. Both sites are sloping, well-drained areas facing the sea. The Hospital Grounds site at St. Thomas, con-

sists of 13.74 acres of dedicated land. About 30 dilapidated houses cover the site, the occupants of which have been relocated by the island government. It is semicircular in shape, flat at the center, and elevated to the hills on the fringe.

Cost and approval: Marley, \$56,900 on December 5, 1935; Elskoe, \$41,800 on March 23, 1936; Hospital Grounds, \$98,500 on December 5, 1935. The Housing Division of the Public Works Administration is doing the architectural work. The Colonial Council is sponsoring the projects.

Type of buildings: All the projects will have one-story double houses. The Hospital Grounds project has a few one-story group houses. All are of minimum accommodations in order to keep down prohibitive rentals. The walls are of poured concrete, the roof of galvanized iron, the interior floors of wood, laid in mastic. There are wood shelves for cooking on each porch. Marley provides for 40 families: 8 of 1-room, 28 of 2-room, and 4 of 3-room size. Elskoe will house 30 families: 8 of 1-room, 20 of 2-room, and 2 of 3-room size. The Hospital Grounds schedule provides 76 units in sizes: 16 of 1 room, 52 of 2 rooms, 8 of 3 rooms. A feature of these schedules is the small size of the units. However, this would seem justified in view of the low rent-paying ability of the tenants, and their custom of living outdoors a large part of the time.

Utilities: None are provided. St. Thomas is the only one of the project towns having public waste disposal. Rocky soil conditions mitigate against water and sewerage systems. Each project is supplied with water for washing and bathing from a central well; and each unit has a reinforced concrete cistern for drinking water. Well water for drinking is too high in mineral content. Also, it is less safe.

General amenities: The towns contiguous to the projects are not large, so that what facilities they offer are within walking distance. Donkey sheds are provided for Elskoe and Marley, where tenants require this type of transportation to the surrounding farms. St. Thomas is not agricultural. None of the projects offers any recreational features other than those of the nearby beaches, nor is any provision made for management except at Hospital Grounds, where two houses in sufficiently good repair are being reserved as a community center. It is expected that a Government agency will take over the management of the projects. School facilities for the projects are adequate.

Langston, Washington, D. C.

The Langston project is sponsored by the Washington Committee on Housing, with Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt as honorary chairman and Canon Anson Phelps Stokes as active chairman. Robinson, Porter, and Williams were appointed architects for the project. The appropriation was \$1,600,000.

The site consists of 13.7 acres of unimproved land in northeast Washington, located north of Benning Road between Twenty-first

and Twenty-fourth Streets. The District of Columbia authorities took action, allowing the Housing Division to simplify street arrangements. The land is sloping. It adjoins a large Negro school group and an area which the National Capital Park Association plans to make into a Negro recreation center, with golf course, swimming pool, tennis courts, and field house. Many large industrial plants are within walking distance of the site. Plans provide for social rooms and basement play space. The buildings are to be two-story flats and group houses and three-story apartments. Specifications call for 1,089 rooms and 317 living units. They are divided into approximately 19 two-room, 161 three-room, 117 four-room, and 20 five-room units. There will be about 158 apartments, 92 flats, and 67 group houses.

Highland Homes, Wayne, Pa.

Unsuccessful efforts had been made by private enterprise since 1912 to clear the congested slum area on which "Highland Homes", P. W. A.'s low-rent project in Wayne, Pa., is being constructed. Following the suggestion made by Radnor Township Commission and the Neighborhood League of Wayne, the property was purchased and work on demolition and foundation construction commenced in January 1936.

The project is to contain three strip units having group houses and flats, and two L-shaped units. These are to be grouped about an open court, with the two L-shaped units facing Highland Avenue, the southern boundary of the 2-acre tract acquired for the project. Other boundaries are the Philadelphia & Western Railroad right-of-way, Finamore Street, and a property line running between the interurban right-of-way and Highland Avenue.

The building coverage will be slightly above 20 percent; the remainder of the area will be landscaped in grass and trees. Further recreational facilities will be provided by a central social room and play areas for children.

The project's 172 rooms will have 8 two-room dwelling units in two-story flats; 16 four-room two-story group houses and 4 five-room two-story group houses. There will be a small area in the rear of each building for tenants to have individual gardens.

H. Bartol Register, of Philadelphia, is chief architect of the project and is assisted by Edmund Krimmel.