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THE LITTLE MOUNTAIN

LOW-RENTAL HOUSING PROJECT
Chapter I

HOUSING AND SOCIAL WELFARE

Hardly anyone will not agree that decent housing is essential for all families in a sound community, and thereby a sound nation. It is the translation of this principle into social policy that has been a story of controversy and of delays --happily a story also of achievements in recent times--in so many countries. In public housing--for low-rental purposes and for all families rather than certain groups--Canada has been a very late starter. Some countries, such as Britain or Sweden, have thirty or fifty years of experience in its various branches; the United States, in a hundred major urban centres, has at least one and sometimes two decades of development, as well as highly-informed professional associations and a growing number of sociological and planning studies to draw on. This should lessen the need to rake over the older and most worn-out arguments about the need for slum clearance, the alleged "dangers" of subsidized developments, and the nature of public housing occupants; but it should also make it easier to interpret and build on experience of our own.

The few examples of public housing which we have, so far, are not in anyway proportional to the need. Housing legislation permitting subsidized low-rental housing has existed in Canada since 1935 (with important variations in the provisions, it is true), but only three substantial projects have been built
and none before 1950—slum clearance proper in Toronto (Regent Park) and St. John's, Newfoundland, and a low-rent project in Vancouver which is not specifically slum-clearance (in the sense that it does not derive from demolition and rehousing on the site). This is "Little Mountain," the subject of the present study, built in 1955 and administered by a new form of public body, the Vancouver Housing Authority. Municipal housing authorities, although projected in the first national housing legislation (1935 and 1937), are rare and unfamiliar in Canada, though the number is now growing. A further development (also pioneered in Toronto since the second unit of the Regent Park rehousing was started in 1957) is making its appearance in Vancouver; a second instalment of low-rental housing is under construction in another part of the city, and this unit, to be named "Orchard Park," will signalize the broadening of responsibilities of the Vancouver Housing Authority.

In these circumstances, a survey of the Little Mountain families, even after so short a history as the project has yet had, obviously recommends itself. Such a study is still likely to be something of an essay in interpretation, however; and those parts of the background of public housing which cannot be taken for granted should be set out first in introduction.

The special housing needs of veterans after the war were recognized, not without effort, in the middle "forties," and several projects have resulted. The special housing needs for old people have come to the fore in the "fifties"—to such an
extent, indeed, that the many local undertakings in communities throughout Canada raise the need for stock-taking and coordination of policy. But general low-income housing is another matter. Recognition has been reluctant, but several ingredients have crystallized recently. First, the need of housing assistance for people whose basic handicap is low income continues to demand restatement. Unfortunately for all concerned—including senior governments, municipal councils, and taxpayers, as well as the families in need—the concept of "low income" is now blurred, because it has been changed steadily by unrelenting inflation in prices, building costs, and real estate values from 1945 to the present. There are many middle-income families whose income is now so "low" that they cannot afford to make a down payment and take on a home-ownership mortgage. Who should be a renter rather than a home owner? Whatever the answer (it is not in any case the primary concern of the present study), there is not much doubt that it is a much larger proportion of the urban population than it used to be. What is perhaps even more to the point is that there are large groups in every major city who have always been renters or tenants, and many will continue to be. There is

1 The comprehensive review of the national picture undertaken by the "Curtis" subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Post-War Reconstruction (Housing and Community Planning; Report IV. Queen's Printer; Ottawa; 1944), with the prewar situation as a starting point, suggested that the best working assumption would be that 50 per cent of urban families could be regarded, and aided, as potential home owners. (This can be validated fairly easily from the statistics of income levels, prevailing prices and costs, and National Housing Act provisions of that time.) Currently, few authorities place the proportion of potential home owners (urban) as high as 30 per cent and some have put it as low as 20 or 15 per cent.
need for good rental accommodation indeed, not only because it is realistic for low and middle urban income-levels, but because it is basically more convenient for many kinds of people—workers who are not employed on regular jobs, couples without children who are not ready to "take on" a large house (or even a small or suburban one), university students, "business girls" and other white-collar city workers, widows who cannot undertake the maintenance work of an owned "single-family" house, and so on. Rental housing, in short, must be freed of the suggestion which still clings to it in some quarters that it is "poverty housing."

Urban and industrial centres—and these are becoming more and more the core of Canada—need "good" landlords, responsible and enterprising landlords, even large-scale landlords. And some part, at least, of public housing must be seen in this context.

On the other hand, some poverty elements undoubtedly do remain in low-rent housing. Public housing, in part at least—whether large or small part must depend on social policy developments of the future—is a welfare measure: its administration, its place in the community, its contribution for the tenants, its whole balance of pros and cons, will not be properly assessed unless this is fully appreciated. Whatever else public housing is, it shares certain elements in common with hospitals and schools—and some, more utilitarian, with good sewers, street lighting, sanitation, delinquency control, and parks.

**Effects of Sub-Standard Accommodation**

Public provision is needed, fundamentally, for three
reasons. And it is for these reasons that it has developed as a branch of government in every urbanized country in the world: (a) because substandard housing is detrimental to human welfare, (b) because decent housing is beyond the budget of several groups, and (c) because of the shortage of moderate and low-rental accommodations, notably of new building but even of new and old kinds under the impact of rapid urban growth. These inferences may obviously overlap, and they frequently do; but it is helpful in the interests of clear exposition to treat them singly.

Housing "environment" is both the house itself in which the family lives and the children grow up, and the surroundings of that house—which take on more and more significances as a child gets older and learns more from other children and other adults. The consequences of a poor physical and social environment have often been shown to extend beyond one generation of adults. Although early investigators looked mainly at the immediate and material conditions, later studies have more and more emphasized the totality of the home situation, including the emotional atmosphere, and the extensions of the home, through the community, into the nation.

What are basic family needs for decent housing? They comprise a long list of items, some of which are obvious and others not; they may be all too easily taken for granted by those who have been fortunate enough to have had their own needs met.

Among the physical needs for adequate housing are sound
construction of the accommodation with suitable protection against fire, electrical or gas defects, some protection from home injuries and traffic hazards. Proper temperature control, adequate natural and artificial light, and adequate space for play and outdoor recreation are also essentials. Sanitary facilities must also be of a certain calibre. It is important to have adequate pure water supply, facilities for laundry and modern bathroom facilities. Food storage facilities as well as other storage space are important. And lastly, adequate and healthful sleeping and living space is necessary.

The most important psychological need in housing is allowing for the opportunity for each family to lead a normal family life and a normal community life. The difference between the tired mother and the happy mother, the mother who can "never find a place to put anything" and the one who is proud of the neatness and appearance of her little suite, needs no deep psychology to appreciate. Adequate privacy and pleasant surroundings, not only in the house but in the immediate district, likewise, are a vital part of "mental health."

From household to play group, to school, to gang or community centre, "community" for the child is a succession of group experiences. A desirable community thus means one with facilities and services, but also with people for whom "welfare" and "community" have practical significance.

In urban centres, convenience in getting to work, school and shopping is clearly a vital test of a "good district."
In current terms, the automobile has become so predominant on the streets as well as in people's minds (or on their television sets) that the view is apt to be held that transportation problems disappear "so long as people have cars." It is not necessary to recall the morning and evening traffic jams, and the distances of suburban commuting, to confute this; it is more relevant sometimes to remember that mothers and children--and old people--are still the most frequent pedestrians. Good housing and good neighbourhoods mean areas not only where walking to school or shopping is safe, but desirably, where it is pleasant. These are still neglected ideas, lost in the real estate scramble, which particularly need careful and imaginative appraisal for low-rental housing.

Overcrowding, it is sometimes assumed, is an unpleasant feature confined to the dark tenements and long street-rows of European centres, with some reminders that larger American cities like New York and Chicago have reproduced them. North American cities are generally spread more widely; western cities--and it is true of Vancouver--particularly have much lower densities. But overcrowding can be a major ill, the moment a large or small house is divided into a number of rented rooms; the pressure on space and facilities and maintenance is always cumulative and it can become intolerable. Of this kind of overcrowding there is plenty, as every social welfare agency has abundant evidence. In the "Strathcona" district of central Vancouver surveyed in comprehensive detail in 1947-8, the rates of overcrowding were: 28.1 per cent in shared single houses, 58.8 per cent in rooms,
and 72.6 per cent in apartments, and suites. Health and zoning by-laws mean little in such surroundings; though typically the amount of sanitation inspections, "trouble calls," fire runs, etc., are higher per capita here than anywhere else.

Districts with deteriorated or substandard accommodation are usually subject to other stresses and strains. Ugliness, neglect, and decay erode the sense of well-being and pride. Inadequate heat, lack of hot water, the necessity of sharing bathroom facilities, create frictions even in families in good circumstances. Added to bad cooking facilities, laundry obstacles, difficulties in keeping the place clean or tidy, they may be disastrous.

It is not always the outright slum that deprives people psychologically. The district which has no unity, which is just a sprawl of ill-shaped houses and lots can be the human equivalent of the weed patch. Individual growth is heavily influenced by environment. The "transient" (or slum) area of obviously wretched accommodations most directly influences the child in his school performance. But in less ill-favoured districts, attitudes to school may still be prejudiced by housing deficiencies. It is not uncommon for some children to attend three or four schools in one year. This may be one of the

---

1 Marsh, L. C., Rebuilding a Neighbourhood. University of British Columbia; Vancouver; 1950. Much of course depends on the measurements or indexes used in defining "overcrowding." These are explained in the report, but substantially concur with the statistical methods which are now standard in almost all censuses. There are many possible indexes of housing deficiencies other than overcrowding.
forgotten results of the vain search for better accommodation. Like his family, such a child may find it impossible to "belong" or to accomplish enough in his school year.

Again, play is inhibited by lack of play space. If the child is allowed—or diverted—into destructive channels outside, he is endangered by traffic, dirt, and older children. If he constantly remains indoors, he and his brothers and sisters and his parents (particularly his mother) can find no relief from one another. Values in such an upbringing are "individualistic" in the selfish sense of the word; initiative, likewise, means "looking out for oneself." Anti-social practice is easily condoned. "Authority" means teachers, police, investigators, and other aliens.

Citizenship, so frequently held up as an educational ideal, is much more at the mercy of quarrelling households and apathetic neighbourhoods than we have yet realistically recognized. Irregularity of employment and tenancy may be basically unsettling. Responsibility has little opportunity of developing among the inhabitants of substandard accommodation, for all these reasons as well as from sheer lack of time for affairs beyond the hand-to-mouth concern of the family—economic difficulties, health problems, marital discord. Slum areas have few spokesmen in civic affairs. It is no accident that the champions of better housing for the whole community are people with enough imagination to see beyond their own districts.
The Budget Aspects of Housing

Families do not live in the shadow of such influences by preference—true though it may be that they sometimes become accustomed to them. Mostly they live in inadequate quarters—whether an isolated unit (sometimes in a "good" district), or in a whole district characterized by such conditions—because they cannot afford anything better, or cannot find anything better at rents which are within their budget.

Studies which have investigated the reasonable proportion of its income which a family should devote to rent have ranged back and forth over the "rule-of-thumb" of twenty per cent for shelter. It comes remarkably close to being the safety rule for prewar families of low or even moderate incomes, say up to $2,500.00 under prewar conditions; it might well be up to $4,000.00 under present times, if the proper qualifications (as to what is "shelter," and what are the consequences of diverting from the safe rate, etc.) are kept in focus.

It does not follow that a wealthy family should only spend twenty per cent for its housing; such a family might well afford fifty per cent of a large budget. What is more relevant is that prewar studies of the lowest income families showed that something much less—perhaps fifteen per cent or less—might be imperative for them if the other elements of health and decency were to be maintained. United States public housing projects were pioneers in setting a statutory percentage of eighteen for the larger families in such projects. At the other end of the
scale, Canadian practice for the assessment of mortgage capacity for middle-income payers under the Housing Act has now established twenty-three per cent as the safe working unit. Yet there is little doubt that many home-purchasers of the present day are paying more than this for their housing—very commonly thirty and thirty-five per cent of a budget already strained by other credit purchases.

In this context, it is significant to read from a fairly recent survey of housing budgets of a group of families on social assistance in Vancouver:

"For a low-income family, if housing should cost much more than the prescribed twenty per cent of the total income, there is insufficient money left to meet the cost of the remaining necessities... The twenty per cent shelter specification is a mockery to families who are spending up to forty to fifty per cent of their income for rent; and yet this excessive expense may be a prerequisite if they are to find housing suitable for their family or in many instances housing which, though not suitable, is the only type available. The cost of shelter holds the real key to the entire functioning of the family, and it is impossible to manage economically without gearing to this basic requirement."¹

Below certain levels of income, in short, a family cannot afford to pay even twenty per cent of income because there will not then be enough money left to buy food, clothing, fuel, and light. On the other hand, twenty per cent of these low incomes is not enough to get decent accommodation built. It was this realization which was put to the measurement test in several

prewar and post-war studies in the United States.¹

For the poor families, the burden of high rent (as it must seem to them) is sometimes assumed by the Social Assistance departments. If either the scheduled "rent allowance" is not enough to cover the actual rent or a self-supporting family itself pays too high a rent, the effects are the same. Lack of money for food and fuel may lead to physical health problems. Poor health is made particularly serious if there is lack of money to buy medical care. Lack of adequate clothing has social and emotional consequences for everyone in the family. Sufficiently prolonged lack of money for the "laces and graces"—to say nothing of security and savings—increases the likelihood of tensions between the various members of the family and may pull some below the human or "normal" level.

An item for the taxpayer to consider is that if Social Assistance departments pay too much for wretched accommodations, public funds are then subsidizing bad housing,² which cannot help their clients and may indeed depress their morale further. It is

¹ A good example is quoted in This is Public Housing, the 1948-9 report of the Seattle Public Housing Authority: An income survey made along with the Real Property Survey (Seattle 1939) showed that "of the families living in the substandard housing, 9,928 had incomes so low it would be impossible for them to obtain anything that could be described as a decent home without assistance."

² Nathan Straus, in one of the most important U.S. reviews of public housing experience of the "forties" (The Seven Myths of Housing. Knopf; New York; 1944.), made this point forcibly: "Welfare officials reported that in every community in which an investigation was made, the relief funds expended for shelter were, in effect, a subsidy for the continued occupancy of substandard dwellings."
interesting, therefore, to see this aspect of the matter put in
a more positive as well as an up-to-date manner in a recent
Vancouver report, a review of the Adequacy of Social Assistance
Allowances recently completed by a special committee of the
Greater Vancouver Community Chest and Council. Grappling with
the complexities of the present market for the cheaper kinds of
rental accommodation, it had to measure three kinds of rents:
(a) the rents currently paid by families on social assistance;
(b) the prevailing rents of apartments in general, including new
buildings; and (c) the rents of public housing (of which, at that
time, Little Mountain was the only example). Typical results are
(in part) as follows (May 1958):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Groups</th>
<th>Current Rents</th>
<th>Social Allowance Families</th>
<th>Little Mountain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couple, without children</td>
<td>$65.20</td>
<td>$42.03</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman, two dependent children</td>
<td>$81.30</td>
<td>$47.80</td>
<td>$26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man and woman, three dependent children (etc.)</td>
<td>$95.45</td>
<td>$55.65</td>
<td>$36.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are enough to illustrate the main issues: (a) high rents
which are out of the reach of poor families; (b) the search for
cheap accommodation on the part of the social assistance families,
which is only in part successful, for, as the Report says, these
rents "do not allow for the fact that much of the existing
accommodation is inadequate," (and at another point refers to over

1 Adequacy of Social Assistance Allowances in the City of
Vancouver (litho., Community Chest and Council, Vancouver, 1958)
p. 43.
900 cases paying more for rent than their actual rent allowance); and (c) the direct relevance of Little Mountain rents in solving the budget problem of the lowest income families as well as providing good accommodation which is not available in any other way.

It is important to note further that the Report, in seeking to compute an adequate minimum allowance for social assistance families, is unable to utilize the public housing rentals, not merely because only a very few social assistance families are housed in the project, but because of the hundreds on the waiting list and the impossibility of assuming "enough construction of this type . . . to close the gap between demand and supply in the foreseeable future."  

Finally, the extensive statistical investigations of this Committee give important background to the subsidy situation as it applies currently to Little Mountain. Broadly, minimum "economic rental" (to cover costs) is taken at $75.00 a month, while the average rental which Little Mountain has to maintain is $45.00 a month. The net subsidy, in other words, which must be averaged over all suites is around $25.00 a month. This is important as the financial or "business" aspect of the rent scale discussed further in Chapter III and elsewhere; but it is also the measure of the cost of subsidized housing. A fair evaluation

---

1 Adequacy of Social Assistance Allowances in the City of Vancouver (litho., Community Chest and Council, Vancouver, 1958) pp. 43, 37.
2 Ibid. pp. 40.
of this subsidy should take into account current commercial rents, as well as the welfare benefits which are not measurable in dollars. The Report may be referred to once more for its bearing on progress in social understanding with which this Chapter began:

"All of these provisions and fiscal arrangements represent a commitment on the part of government, to assist citizens of modest means to achieve an environment which has at least minimum amenities and facilities for healthful living and child raising. In the broadest sense, it is an investment in one particular aspect of human welfare, undertaken upon the request of a sufficient majority of Canadian citizens. It is apparent that no other agents could undertake such long-term, extensive commitments."  

Capacity to Pay Rent

The distribution of income is the basic information for understanding why so many families cannot begin to consider home ownership, why they cannot pay current rent for new apartments (which are high rents to them), and why they accept "second-hand" housing of all kind, ranging from moderately good to outright slum. In prewar terms, this was examined extensively in the "Curtis" Report, already referred to.  

1 Adequacy . . . City of Vancouver. (Community Chest and Council) p. 42. Current rents for apartments, surveyed and computed according to age of buildings (for May, 1958) were as follows: apartment blocks 30 years old or more, $72.00; 11-29 years old, $90.00; 1-10 years old, $94.00.  

2 Ibid., p. 39 (Italics added)  

3 Housing and Community Planning, e.g., Chapter 5, which analyzes average incomes and rents of all wage-earner tenant families in urban Canada divided into three ("upper," "middle" and "lower") groups. In 1931, the average incomes of the lower and middle groups were $703.00 and $1389.00; the typical rents were $17.00-$20.00 a month, and $24.00-$26.00 a month.
summarizing the U.S. situation for the same era, indicated how two-thirds of all housing produced by private enterprise ... is built for the upper income-third. Only one-third of the new homes are within the means of families in the middle income group, and three-fourths of these are concentrated in the top half of that group."

The most illuminating facts for today (whether this means 1959, or the last decade) are the representative statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Earnings</th>
<th>Canada Number</th>
<th>p.c.</th>
<th>B.C. p.c.</th>
<th>Rent (b)</th>
<th>Cost (c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $1,500</td>
<td>301,800</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Under $25</td>
<td>Under $3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1500 - 2000(a)</td>
<td>282,400</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>$25 - 33</td>
<td>$3750-5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2000 - 3000</td>
<td>850,700</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>$33 - 50</td>
<td>$5000-7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3000 and over</td>
<td>449,100</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>Over $50</td>
<td>$7500 &amp; up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,884,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Strictly, $1500 - $1999 and so on; (b) 20 per cent of budget, on monthly basis; and (c) at 2.5 times annual income.

SOURCE: Earnings figures from Canadian Census, 1951. Figures of appropriate rents and costs added for illustrative purposes.

for (a) the incomes of urban wage and salary earners (i.e., employees) on the one hand, and (b) families who are currently able to take advantage of the assisted home-purchase provisions of the National Housing Act (Tables 1 and 2). The significance

---

1 Straus, Seven Myths of Housing, p. 141.
Table 2. Representative Income Situations of Home Purchasers
(National Housing Act Loans)
1954-56

(a) Average costs and incomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of dwelling</td>
<td>12,335</td>
<td>13,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of loan</td>
<td>9,344</td>
<td>10,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down payment</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>3,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total family income</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>5,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income of head of family</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>5,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Distribution of borrowers according to income (head of family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>1954</th>
<th>1956</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $3,000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 - $4,000</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000 - $5,000</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $6,000</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,000 - $7,000</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $7,000</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Total number of borrowers in 1954, 26,982; in 1956, 47,593.
of facts such as these has been considered in relation to the families who were applicants for Little Mountain when it was inaugurated, in a separate study already referred to.¹ Since typical incomes of these families were $136.00 to $203.00 for broken families, and $200.00 to $270.00 for complete families,² it is readily apparent that they are not in the home-ownership class, and that appropriate rents would be nearer the $25.00 to $50.00 range than the much higher prevailing rates.

It is helpful, for practical purposes, indeed, to ask: what kind of families are most likely to have difficulty in paying even moderate rents? One of these is the "broken family." Obviously, it is more likely to have housing difficulties because here there is only one parent to perform the dual functions of homemaking and breadwinning. A married woman is not only less "free" as a worker; she may have no particular skills and experience to offer in the labour market. The family relies on inadequate support payments, compensation payments (for industrial fatality), and/or in the case of desertion, on inadequate public assistance. If the homemaking role is supplied by a housekeeper, her pay lowers the amount available to the family for other needs. Whether the parent takes the role of breadwinner or homemaker, the broken family is always searching

¹ Wheeler, Michael, Evaluating the Need for Low-Rental Housing. Master of Social Work thesis, University of British Columbia, 1955. Chapter 1 of this study cites housing costs for the owned and rented units (as in Table 2 in the present text); and the distribution of income for Vancouver wage-earners (analogous to Table 1) is discussed in Chapter 4 (pp. 89-94).

² Ibid., p. 127
for housing economies. And cheap rent usually means poor accommodation. As Michael Wheeler's study intimated, "... the relatively low average rent ($36.00 a month) paid by broken families may also be regarded as an index of the inferior quality of their accommodation. For such low-income families as these, the choice is severely limited, and they tend for the most part to occupy the poorest accommodation simply because it is the only kind available at a rent which they can afford."¹

Large families are doubly in difficulty, not only because the pressure on the family income is heavy, but also because accommodation for large families is particularly difficult to find. The "Curtis" Report showed that large families were the worst off from several points of view—overcrowding, rent, deterioration, scarcity. The review of the Little Mountain applicants in Mr. Wheeler's study indicated that the large family's special needs keeps it in the continuing market for obsolescent housing: "Clearly a minimum rent-paying capacity is necessary before the large family can expect to find accommodation suited to its needs, and all the evidence suggests that this is certainly not less than $60.00 a month."²

Disabled persons are another group, whose reduced earning-power is the obvious barrier between them and expensive housing. "A significant portion of the families" (among the

¹ Wheeler, Evaluating the Need . . . Housing, p. 63.
² Ibid., p. 62.
applicants for Little Mountain), wrote Mr. Wheeler in 1955, "are handicapped in one way or another." And these, of course, shade into the broken family if the husband is completely incapacitated.

In the United States, the minority groups, particularly negroes, have always been among the worst-housed because so many factors reduce their incomes or their earning-capacity; but segregation, one of the marked features of slum districts, has added its weight. Canada is not free enough of prejudice and discrimination to be complacent on this score; and public housing is always an acute test of whether non-discrimination is genuinely believed in or is a matter of lip service.¹

Finally, there are the aged. As already indicated, the claim of old persons as proper beneficiaries from assisted or subsidized housing has come to be accepted more readily than almost any other "category" (though it still lags in practical provision for single persons). Frequently, their incomes are low because earning-power has ceased altogether; but other special problems are the product of inflation. Pensions, retirement allowances, savings, which may have once seemed sizeable in dollar terms, have been halved or decimated by spiralling costs. Old folk for such reasons reflect another special facet of the housing problem: they are frequently found clinging to an old and decaying property because "it is all they have." Mounting

¹ Fortunately, the negro population in Canada is small, but other non-white groups are important in British Columbia, and there are several minorities of European origin. Because Little Mountain is not an on-site clearance project, there have been relatively few applicants of minority racial origins.
maintenance costs and local taxes are growing burdens on their frozen budget, and they dare not sell because the newer property they would have to acquire is priced completely beyond their range. An exceptional few have profited from the real estate boom of the post-war decade, but the more characteristic pensioner is a person who has always depended on rented accommodation. Rising rents, increasing shortage of good "rooms," and the continuing demolition of old houses which had been the principal source of low-rental quarters in the past, has brought more and more of them to desperate straits.

Fundamentally, as underlined above, the aged are not, or should not be, a "category." Their housing needs derive from income deficiency, and their eligibility should be on all fours with other families. The practical issue is not really whether they should be admitted to public projects such as Little Mountain—in general, this has been conceded, although there was confusion on the subject at first—it is whether low-rent housing projects should—or some would say, can—be designed so as to be suitable for all age-groups. It was not possible in the present study to give special attention to this, but some sidelights were inevitable, and they demand further attention.

1 Angel, J. H., and McKinnon, D. F., Housing Needs and Preferences Among Senior Citizens. Master of Social Work thesis, University of British Columbia, 1957. This thesis, based on West Vancouver experience, illustrates the housing problems of old people of this type (as well as the pros and cons of their reactions to senior-citizens housing projects).
Housing Legislation and the Housing Shortage

It may well be asked why, if the need is so great, there has not been a great expansion once national legislation was provided. Why has the shortage of good low-rental housing continued? The full answer is a long and complicated one; but some parts of it are clear, in the light of abundant evidence. It has never "paid" (i.e., been a commercial venture, covering costs, and making a profit) to build new low-rental housing. The great supply of cheap rental units, at least in North American cities, including Vancouver, is from conversions, the "filtering-down" of old properties of all kinds. Old properties (with increased density of occupation) can be profitable—in the special case of the slums, with maximum density, minimum upkeep, and minimum taxes, notoriously so. But if the city population grows, urban and industrial demands for wage earners increase, and little new rental housing is built, even the rents of the old properties go up; and the better units among them become scarce. This is what has been happening to Vancouver in the post-war world. There has, unquestionably, in the last five years or so, been a much-needed boom in apartment building—a boom indeed of spectacular dimensions in some instances. But at $80.00 to $150.00 and $200.00 a month, this is "high rent" housing—for practical purposes it might just as well not exist for the people who can only afford to pay $20.00, $25.00, $35.00, $40.00, or even $60.00 a month for rent. Nor will this housing "filter down": it has indeed been accompanied, on an unprecedented scale,
by demolition.¹

The great majority of units which are available for rent, and at low rates, are of the "less eligible" and often converted type—rooms over stores, in attics and basements, single rooms in old houses with shared bathroom facilities. Heating, lighting, laundry, bathroom facilities, storage space, are usually insufficient. This accommodation is scattered; it is not always in poor neighbourhoods, but it may have other disadvantages, such as being close to noisy intersections, industrial developments, railway yards, vacant lots, and so forth. Moreover, in order to obtain lower cost accommodation, families may often "double up" in the better units to share the rent. Even in a new or well-built residence, this may be unsatisfactory in that the overcrowding results in lack of privacy, and opportunities for normal family living are frustrated.

If the scarcity and inadequacy of low-rental accommodation was restricted to only a few families in a community, a few charitable ventures might be enough to meet the situation. This was actually the "solution" pioneered half a century or more ago in some countries such as Britain and Denmark. Private ventures still have value, such as contributions of projects such as those of the service clubs, the churches, and Mr. Winch and his associates in Vista continue to show in British Columbia. But even here, government financial aid is imperative. Local

¹ Most of this is not even a secondary kind of "slum clearance"; often (e.g., in the "West End") moderately good apartment houses have been razed to free the sites for the new developments.
government management is the "Keystone of the Arch" for modern provision: though fortunately, the employment of full-time salaried staff can be combined with the service of public-spirited citizens serving unpaid.

As Regent Park concludes in its review of the need for rental housing for the lower income groups, the "only certain method is through the intervention of government or governments at different levels, as agents of the community. The numbers to be served are too great, the administration is too complex and the financial requirements are too vast for the operation to be carried on directly by citizens and their voluntary associations. Moreover, it has become generally accepted that . . . the serious shortage of low-rental housing has become (a) problem of nationwide scope."¹

A balanced addition to the housing supply requires all kinds of accommodation, and all kinds of "enterprise"—single houses, groups, apartments, limited dividend projects, small landlords, and large corporations. But it needs low-rental housing very badly if the always underprivileged of housing are not to be, in the post-war cities of Canada, more underprivileged than ever. This requires a new kind of landlord, because good properties must be managed; and if subsidies are required (as they certainly are if rents are to be low enough to house the people for whom the accommodation is designed), the public interest is even more involved.

¹ Rose, Albert, Regent Park. University of Toronto Press; Toronto; 1958; p. 25.
The Local Housing Authority, in this context, is no more a revolution than the Parks Board, as a device for managing and developing; than the School Board is now, though it was revolutionary enough when compulsory education came to England a century ago. However, it is fairly obvious it is a more difficult undertaking, on its human side, than either parks or schools. It will need sympathetic as well as critical study, and probably expansion and development as time goes on. The present study, it is hoped, will be helpful in itself, but also as pointing the way to other studies of this important welfare resource.

Method and Procedure of Recent Study

This study is a departure from the traditional thesis pattern in that it is one of the team projects, inaugurated in the 1958-9 session, in which the research project is directly sponsored by a member of the School of Social Work faculty (in this instance, Dr. Marsh, director of research of the school). A further circumstance is that two of the three students who worked in this project were recipients of Housing Bursaries awarded annually by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for approved housing studies directed by university personnel. Accordingly, Dr. Marsh took more than usual part in the direction of the study and preparation of the report.

Although at the outset, the thesis called for three researchers to devote themselves particularly to (a) welfare factors, (b) recreation and community contacts, and (c) administrative and
managerial matters, and this "division of labour" was followed at first; the three students concerned were then able to pool their interests and enquiries increasingly as the study developed and shared equally in all phases of the completed study. (Dr. Marsh, however, takes primary responsibility for views expressed in this introductory chapter.)

After initial discussions with representatives of the Vancouver Housing Authority and the Manager of the project (Mr. Sutherland), a plan of study was agreed on. Relevant questions for a sample set of tenant interviews were discussed, and a structured interview type questionnaire finally evolved after critical sessions, and an initial "tryout" on a few families. (The final form is reproduced in Appendix B.)

Before this was completed, a skeleton card index was made up for all tenants (and later destroyed) to (a) provide a set of primary statistics (including the "Original" spot-maps, Figures 1 and 2), and (b) "anchor" the base of the study and guide the stratification for the sample. Careful attention was paid to establishing the family "types" (statistically speaking) who are most characteristic of the project population. A sample of approximately one-in-four was finally decided on and chosen as representatively as possible in respect of (a) complete, (b) broken, and (c) pensioner families but also the types of accommodation, and (d) the geographical subsections of the project (shown in Figure 3 and Table 4 of Chapter II).

Several visits were made to the tenants, the interviews
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(covering 65 questions, some with additional subsections) lasting from one-half to more than two hours, depending on the interest of the tenant and ability to expand on the questions, which were used only as a guide. Tenants were always given the opportunity to refuse to be interviewed or to make arrangements for a more suitable time. The majority of persons saw the researchers when first called; a few (approximately fifteen per cent) made appointments for another time. Only one tenant refused outright, even to hear what the study was about. The characteristic receptions were cooperative, often of considerable interest in the study.

Contacts were made with the school principals, P.T.A. members, and representatives of the South Cambie Community Centre Association in the course of neighbourhood exploration and assessment. Literature on the management of public housing (particularly in Britain and the United States) was consulted for background orientation, and in suggesting questions and in interpretation of some of the answers. Bulletins of the Vancouver Housing Association, and annual reports of the Vancouver Housing Authority were of great aid at many points. One of the members of the team was able to visit the Yesler Terrace housing project in Seattle and meet with members of the staff of the Seattle Housing Authority. Differences between an old-established project such as this, dating from 1941; the major Canadian slum-clearance project of "Regent Park," Toronto; and special features of "Little Mountain" have been kept in mind throughout.
It was not intended that this study should give special attention to (a) the history of the establishment of Little Mountain, though such a "social action" analysis deserves to be separately undertaken and compared with that of Regent Park and public housing campaigns in other cities, such as Winnipeg; (b) the financial aspects; or (c) the architectural and planning aspects of the project, though these are equally important, and demand study. Even this attempt to give definitive content to the welfare aspects of a particular kind of public housing project has had to stop short of developments of analysis (e.g., cross-analysis of response in relation to type of housing, previous residential history, etc.) which would have been desirable if time had permitted. It is hoped that follow-up and comparative studies may be feasible in the future.
Chapter II

LITTLE MOUNTAIN: THE PROJECT AND ITS OCCUPANTS

The preliminary plans for a low-rental housing project in Vancouver were drafted in 1950, thanks to the continued activity of the Vancouver Housing Association, a citizen body concerned with housing needs. It was accepted provisionally by the City Council of the day; seven acres of land were purchased for the development; and construction was first projected to begin in the spring of 1951. Five years were to pass, however, before "Little Mountain" project, as it is now known, became a reality, able to report on its first year of operation. There were many reasons for this delay; and the full story of the effort to equip Vancouver with its pioneer piece of publicly-managed, publicly-subsidized, low-rental housing is a chapter in community organization and "social action" which would take more research and space than is provided for in the present study.¹

The larger background of the low-rental housing movement, associated in earlier days with slum clearance (the new context of "urban renewal" is a post-war innovation) goes back to at least 1935. This was the period of new Housing Acts passed by the Dominion Parliament, a House of Commons Committee; and

¹ Some of the comparable history in Toronto is told in: Rose, Regent Park, Chapter 5, "Citizens in Action."
many local surveys, the Bruce Report in Toronto, the joint report of the Board of Trade, and the Civic Improvement League in Montreal. Vancouver had its counterpart in the first educational work of the newly-formed Vancouver Housing Association, and earnest attempts by a small group of citizens to launch a slum-clearance project under sections 3 and 4 of the then Dominion Housing Act of 1935. Similar efforts being made in Winnipeg, Toronto, and Montreal were finally brought to naught by the outbreak of war in 1939.

Renewed attention, not only to slum clearance but to the accumulating shortage of decent low-rent accommodation, was directed to the subject in 1946. The need for a survey to present basic information and demonstrate concrete plans was met, when advantage was taken of the research funds made available under the post-war revision of the National Housing Act to undertake and complete the so-called "Strathcona" survey in 1947-8. The actual proposals for construction, advocating a total neighbourhood development rather than a set of housing projects per se, were never officially accepted by the City; though it is interesting to record that the most recent survey, completed in 1957 under the new "urban renewal" clauses of the Housing Act, confirms the essentials of the proposals. The area, by its character and location, is recommended as suitable for partly residential rebuilding; and rehousing projects (less extensive

---


2 National Housing Act; Part VI, Section 36.
than proposed in the "Strathcona" report, but comprising nearly 400 units) are now actually on the drawing board.

The important feature of Little Mountain as a low-rental "rehousing" project is that it is not part of a direct slum-clearance programme. The acquisition and clearance of existing sites has always been the most difficult and usually the most costly step in "traditional" slum clearance; and the fact that other sites, not in the old central, built-up areas but still far from the suburbs, have been available in several Canadian cities (even in old metropolitan areas like Montreal, but more particularly in Western Canada) has also favoured the idea of starting public housing elsewhere than "in the slums." When construction on some hitherto unfavoured sites in the Little Mountain district of the city was presented in this context, the City Council of the day accepted this as a "pilot project." The "piloting" was fairly explicitly recognized as relating to experience in managing low-rental housing, and perhaps in financing; there was less explicit suggestion at the time that downtown slum clearance could be further postponed until more was known of the pros and cons of this "experiment."

In spite of this special location factor, the management, in general, has had to set up and administer all the arrangements and operations which have become familiar in a dozen countries in which public housing and slum clearance has a long history. Tenants have to be selected, usually from a huge waiting list. A public authority has to administer policy and to
carry out the functions of a landlord. Sooner or later, the many "human" or "welfare" aspects of large groups of occupants must receive consideration. But what differences will appear if the new occupants come from a great range of scattered areas throughout the city? And is administration simpler if it is not complicated by the necessity basic to slum clearance, of giving some priority to original residents in the demolition area? Is it likely to appear that "typical slum dwellers" (if there are such people) will not in this instance bring their problems to complicate the life of the new units? This may be offset by the fact that a traditional slum-clearance project makes the contrast between the old and the new—which perhaps might be more fairly called the good and the bad—much more evident, and accordingly keeps the objective of the civic development more keenly in their minds. Questions of this kind were kept in mind in formulating the questionnaires for the present survey, but they are difficult questions to answer, and it may be wiser to warn in advance that this survey, too, has something of a "pilot" quality. Other surveys may be necessary, to follow up some of the "leads" or to establish some of the indications more securely.

Administration

While essentially a local asset which in every way is an important part of Vancouver housing, it is interesting to note that both the financial arrangements and the administrative authority for Little Mountain constitute a partnership between all three levels of Canadian government. Because of this procedure under which Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation (in effect,
an agent of the Dominion government) must operate, and since municipal action can be taken only with the sanction of the appropriate provincial government, the statutory basis for the Vancouver Housing Authority is provincial legislation; but the Authority is trustee for the three-fold "partnership," described as such in the technical literature.

"Local Housing Authorities are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of the Province, and are composed of public-spirited citizens of the municipality. The members of the Housing Authority act without remuneration, as trustees of the partnership of governments which owns the housing. They should be broadly representative of the community, and the members should bring enthusiasm and understanding to the problems of management. . . . The Authority is expected to exercise its own judgement in dealing with local questions, but should assistance be required or matters of general policy arise in which consistency as between Authorities is necessary, then enquiries shall be addressed to the province for the Partnership."

The Orders-in-Council, which set up the Authority, name the members, fix their terms of office and designate which member is to act as chairman. By-laws adopted by the Authority provide for hiring of staff, provide for office-space (often on the project), and the frequency with which meetings will be held. The manager, on behalf of the Authority, is responsible for the legal details of signing lease agreements with the tenants; the orientation of tenants as to their responsibilities in regards to rules, rents and income reviews; and periodic inspection. As explained later, periodic income reviews which are an important part of the "proportional rent" policy are also his responsibility.

1 Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Manual for Guidance of Housing Authorities. 1953.
To assist the Housing Authority and the manager in their jobs, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has prepared a manual,\(^1\) which covers most details of (a) administration, (b) accounting, and (c) maintenance. In effect, this is the governing document for the local Authority. Also, the manual sets out a number of recommended procedures developed from experience and a series of legal forms and documents for the everyday operation of the housing project (including application forms, and notices to tenants to quit their premises). Probably the two most important matters of policy on which this manual has contributed exact and detailed statements—which would otherwise raise many questions for decision for a new administration, and which in fact continue too difficult even for local housing projects confined to old people—are (a) the definitions of what is to be interpreted as a "family" for low-rental occupancy, and (b) the proportional rent scale. (Both of these receive discussion in the chapters which follow.)

The first statutory authority, set up in August, 1953,\(^2\) was composed of five members with differential terms of office.


\(^2\) It may be noted in passing that local Housing Authorities were brought back into the National Housing Act in 1949, after being a specific part of the machinery for low-rent housing and slum clearance in the prewar versions of the Act, and omitted in the 1944 Act. The Act, facilitating action by the provincial government of British Columbia, was passed in April, 1950. Vancouver appointed a temporary Housing Authority in May, 1949, but its main function at that time was to conduct a survey intended to establish the size and the need for rental and ownership housing in the city.
to aid continuity. The pioneer members were: Mr. S. E. Clarke, (chairman); Mrs. Gordon S. Selman, (vice-chairman); Mr. H. Adair, (acting secretary-treasurer); Major Oscar L. Erickson; and Mr. P. R. U. Stratton; and it is no accident that at least three of these had been active members with one Vancouver Housing Association as well as involved in many other community welfare services. Mr. D. Donald Davis became chairman in 1957 (after two years as a member), and Mrs. Selman was recently appointed chairman for 1959. Due to some quorum difficulties with a board as small as five, the number was enlarged to seven this year.

Mr. C. G. Sutherland has been the manager of the housing project since its opening. His staff includes a full-time secretary and the resident caretaker. Initially, Mr. Sutherland interviewed the applicants for admission to the project and also inspected the housing they lived in at the time. From the beginning, however, the flow of applications has been so heavy that the services of other personnel to visit homes of applicants have been necessary. From time to time, staff have been taken on a part-time basis to cope with the tide of applicants.

Facilities

The Little Mountain Housing Project accommodates, in all, 224 families in groups of row houses and apartments; there are 48 three-bedroom row houses; and the apartments are divided into 48 with three bedrooms, 92 with two bedrooms, and 40 of one-bedroom size. The lots, which were much more effectively
regrouped from the originals on the site, form an L-shape structure on the east side of what is now Queen Elizabeth Park. They extend from 33rd Avenue to 37th Avenue, bounded on the west by Ontario Street and on the east by Main Street (see Figure 3).

All the buildings are of stucco and frame construction, the exteriors being painted white or a pale yellow. The building style is "modern" but very plain. The units are set on the property in a spacious and pleasant manner with plenty of grassy areas. From a planning point of view, it is an interesting site, because it stands midway between a district marred by a maze of ill-developed streets (i.e., off Main Street) and the Queen Elizabeth Park area, now completely transformed into one of the best developed and landscaped sections of the city. The Little Mountain project itself, however, has helped immeasurably to stabilize and improve the appearance of the district; and the basic plan was designed to free the group of buildings from traversing streets and lanes. In practice, the best efforts of the architects have not prevented one of the streets from being used hazardously by drivers trying to "beat the traffic" (Figures 9 and 10); and the main streets adjacent to the project are crowded with speeding cars at the rush hours.

Some of the landscaping features which were originally envisaged disappeared with the budget "cuts" imposed on the plans during the three years before construction. So, also, did the community centre which was regarded as essential by some
Figure 3
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advocates of the project. Play facilities have been provided, however, and somewhat improved. Sections at the backs of the apartments have been "hard-topped" for children's play space (Figure 8); at four points there are sandboxes, and sturdily-built swings (Figure 6). These were not in the original construction but were provided by the Authority through careful budgeting. The internal street pattern includes parking bays for cars, but in insufficient number. There are no garages, but some tenants rent garage-space for their cars from neighbouring homeowners.

Each unit is equipped with its own bathroom, electric stove and refrigerator. (Kitchens are illustrated in Figure 4.) Heat, cold and hot water, are included in the rent. Laundry facilities are in every basement, which in the case of apartments is shared by a separate unit of four families. Furnaces are located within some basements, thus heating a number of units from one location; but this adds to the shortage of extra basement space, which is at a premium. Some assigned locker space is provided for each family.

The Occupants

It should never be forgotten that the contribution of public housing is only properly assessed when comparison is made with the living accommodation of the residents before they came to the new project. Moreover, it can usually improve the lot of only a fraction of those in need. Priorities have to be determined to single out the most urgent from the waiting list. This part
of the picture has been extensively reviewed in a previous study.¹ When Little Mountain was inaugurated, there were over 600 families on the list. On January 1, 1958, the number of approved applications awaiting current vacancies was still over 400. Because there is some "turnover," the number of people who have lived in Little Mountain is already much larger than the normal capacity figure of some 880 persons in the 224 units. From the time of opening till January, 1958, it is possible to count 1600 as having been housed here during the five years or so.

There are various important ways of trying to highlight the population of this special community. It is essentially a family project—perhaps more than most people realize, though this was certainly its intention. One of the consequences of this is that there are a very large number of children. Obvious as this may be, a reminder is in order that privately-owned apartment blocks do not normally house many children²—families with children, and especially young children, may even be excluded by the landlord. Many private apartment blocks, likewise, cater primarily to single persons and couples including retired couples. The information in Table 3, showing the present distribution of the younger tenants of all ages from infancy to

---


² There are a few noteworthy exceptions such as the "Dolphin Court" especially designed for the purpose in Kerrisdale.
Table 3. Number, Age Groups and Distribution of Children in Little Mountain Project (As of 1958)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete families</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken families</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken families</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete families</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken families</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete families</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken families</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete families</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken families</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For identification of Areas I to IV (a division made for convenience of description only), see Figure 3.

Table 4. Family Composition Residents of Little Mountain Project (1955 and 1958)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1958</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>P.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Complete&quot; Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with (a) 1 or 2 children</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 3 or more children</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Broken&quot; Families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with (a) 1 or 2 children</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 3 or more children</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner Couples</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals **</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Detail for 1955 not sufficient to give classification by family size.
** Including five "other family" groups in 1955, two in 1958. Totals exclude caretaker, also a few suites changing occupancy at time of count.
twenty years should be seen as much more than mere figures: there is a great deal of social and welfare significance here—implications for the adult tenants of this neighbourhood, the schools, and the future.

Much is apt to be made of the "broken" family in popular accounts; but, as already pointed out, many complete families may have housing problems because of inadequate income. It is only to be expected that Little Mountain has a large share of "broken" families, i.e., families with only one of the parents (more usually the mother) in the home. The number counted for 1955 was 65 or a little under thirty per cent of the total. In 1958, about one-third of the occupants were identifiable as among the original tenants when the Project opened in 1955. These are families, that is to say, who have lived at Little Mountain continuously for four years or so. Among these, the proportions as between complete families, broken families and pensioner couples were: 59, 30, 11.

The great majority, therefore, are "ordinary families." This is still true, even though the number of broken families in residence has increased as time has gone on (31 in 1955, 44 in 1957, about 70 today).

Some of these changes which are consistent with the purposes and character of public housing, but have also been influenced by policy decisions, are a somewhat larger number of (a) families who have been or are dependent on social assistance, and of (b) pensioners. "Social assistance families" were ruled
(by the City) as ineligible in 1955 but are officially eligible today. (The justice of this provision is beyond question if it is recognized that the prime requisite for eligibility is not the social status of the family, but its income and currently inadequate housing.) The development of policy in respect of aged couples is also worthy of note. Unfamiliarity with public housing (and perhaps the familiarity today of "old people's housing") has led some to suggest that projects such as Little Mountain are not intended for pensioners. But old couples are "families" (just as young couples are!) and their eligibility is due to income, not age. Of course, whether the facilities are properly designed for old people is another and highly relevant matter. The same applies to the surroundings and environment of the project—which includes larger numbers of children than usual. European public housing has accommodated itself to these conditions a good deal more than North America, so far, by design which provides for three generations rather than two.¹ And, as indicated later, there is material at Little Mountain for both of the two opposing schools of thought—the one, that old people like to see families and children about them; the other, that they want to be "left in peace."

From where has the new community of Little Mountain been drawn? This is so important, in view of its difference from

¹ The argument for providing housing projects for all family and age groups has been cogently put forward by Lewis Mumford in his article, "For Older People--Not Segregation But Integration" (Architectural Record, May, 1956; pp. 191-226), and this view is noticeably gaining more attention from welfare agencies in recent years.
traditional slum-clearance, that a special study has been made, distinguishing not only the three different kinds of "families," but also the original pattern of distribution at the time the project was opened and a more recent one (1955 and 1958). Both maps (Figures 1 and 2) show a wide scatter, with perhaps slightly wider scatter for the 1958 map (perhaps due to wider knowledge of the project). Tenants of the project have come from almost all over the city, though particularly from the east and north. The maps show some clusters, as for example Broadway to Fourth Avenue between Burrard and Main Streets. This is a deteriorating residential area which is becoming industrialized. Other points represent pieces of "second-hand" rental housing where family dwellings have been divided into furnished rooms and suites, where zoning laws protecting one-family dwellings have not had any force, and so on.

On the other hand, it is astonishing at first sight that there is a total absence of people from the Strathcona area, where a slum-clearance project has been mooted for twelve years. One can only speculate as to the reasons. Possibly, publicity for the project has not been effective in that area; maybe language barriers have interfered. There may have been applications from this area which had to be denied because the applicant did not have a high enough income. Housing may have been so deficient that the inspectors got the impression that applicant families could not adjust to new housing. There are, of course, a large

---

1 Each map records previous residence for all tenants for whom such information was available.
number of single men in the area who would be ineligible. The most likely consideration, however, is that the residents of this area are not interested in making application unless the rents are low enough to attract them away. From the previous surveys it is known that a large number of Strathcona residents like the area and wish to remain there. The conclusion to which this seems to point is that slum clearance in such an area as Strathcona can only be achieved by clearance and re-housing on the site.

The other side of the story is that a good low-rental project can draw families to it from many areas, if it has any reasonable location. Little Mountain, it can be said, is particularly favourable for this because it is central and yet close to the eastern side of the city.

The New Neighbourhood: Assets and Liabilities

What of the new neighbourhood into which Little Mountain has to fit, and which it is, itself, helping to create? As yet, Vancouver is, unfortunately, not very "neighbourhood minded." There are some outstanding exceptions (such as Shaughnessy and the West End, though even these are not as well-defined as some references to them assume); but there has been too much unplanned and haphazard development of sections and streets and lots in the past to establish clear patterns for the

1 Marsh, Rebuilding a Neighbourhood, p. 11. "Forty per cent of the families, both owners and tenants, were definite in wanting to remain in the area; while only twenty-one per cent were equally decided that they wanted to live elsewhere."
city. This raises a difficulty at the outset. It is important to find out how people like this new district, perhaps how they "adjust" to it—if some meaning can be given to this term. But is there so little of established district amenities in the places from which they have come, that they have little or no standard of reference by which to judge their present "translation"? At least, a number of exploratory questions have been tried out in the present study. And at least there is one firm basis for judgement on these matters, even if it is sometimes true that adults—especially harassed or "cooped up" mothers—"don't care much, because they hardly get outside the house."\(^1\)

Children need neighbourhoods; and in one way or another, for good or for ill, always help to make them. This is one of the less familiar reasons why recreation is so important for the family. From an early age, children go to school—in other words, they learn to inhabit the world beyond the home. The significance of this is recognized in the general approval given to district community centres. The gap, in thinking or in planning, which often still remains is to make such centres service-units for the whole family and for all age groups (see also Chapter IV). A public housing project opens up special opportunities and some special problems in these directions. The present study can only claim to be setting up the first "radar."

As planners and social welfare experts have come to

---

\(^1\) The interviews discussed later (Chapters III and IV) revealed that there is a sizeable number of parents who never have moved much "beyond their four walls." This is a kind of "privacy" sometimes brought about by living in substandard homes and districts.
observe them, well-developed neighbourhoods should have safe streets—which means a differential approach to kinds of streets, and to boundaries—a school or schools; playgrounds of more than one kind (for different age groups, etc.); shopping facilities (not necessarily centred); nursery, kindergarten or day-care units for pre-school children; churches; some health facilities; a branch library; and other various recreational activities with appropriate space or buildings. Open space and greenery of all kinds are really urban essentials; but, obvious as this may seem, they are frequently so rare or neglected (or excluded as expensive "frills") as to appear to be luxuries.

The most significant community resource is always the elementary school, and it is good fortune that one is conveniently adjacent to the Project. The district has for ten to fifteen years required an addition to this school (General Brock Elementary School), but it was not until the building of Little Mountain that action was taken. In June of 1955, two months after tenants first took occupancy in Little Mountain, four portable classrooms were erected at General Brock; and in the course of 1956, they were replaced by a new addition. It consists of seven classrooms incorporating an art room and a library, a combined lunch-activity room and a gym auditorium. The contribution to welfare these facilities make cannot be overestimated.

One-third of the students (191 out of 618 children) attending General Brock School are from Little Mountain, so that
"the Project" is well known there. The School Board and the local principal were cordially cooperative in extending hope in the present study. And it was encouraging to find, increasingly as acquaintance developed, how large a contribution to the School's P.T.A. has been made by mothers from the Little Mountain families.

Older children have had to go a fair distance to King Edward High. But here, too, the School Board has taken cognizance of its "new constituency." Charles Tupper High School, at 23rd Avenue and Prince Edward, is to be ready for occupancy by December, 1959. The majority of Little Mountain 'teen-agers will be able to attend there, as well as grades seven and eight boys and girls from nearby Van Horne and General Wolfe schools.

There is no nursery school or kindergarten in or near the Project, though a volunteer effort to provide one (referred to later) was kept up for a year and a half. The obvious need for a community hall has been in many people's minds, and opinion on this subject was canvassed from various angles. In the project, the distinction between open space, play space, (and perhaps even parking space) is not always clear. Baseball is frequently played on the lawns. The need for supervision was expressed by most families with small children, particularly to differentiate the pre-schoolers from the school agers (since the older ones tend to dominate the younger ones). Large fenced-in areas for two- and three-year-olds have been suggested by mothers who constantly have to watch this age-group, who as yet do not
understand the meaning of traffic and danger.

Within short travelling distances, there are, of course, the special resources of "Little Mountain" proper, the high ground in the geographical centre of the city which gave its name to this district. Protected from early real-estate developments by its gradient, and further by being the site of one of the city's reservoirs, it has now become one of the great scenic and landscape attractions of Vancouver, thanks particularly to the tenacious industry and foresight of the Parks Board personnel who have transformed an ugly quarry into a delightful garden. Queen Elizabeth Park and the Arboretum, a timbered area, add further to this resource. It must be remembered that it is far more readily available to the car-driver than to the pedestrian; and it provides for adults rather than children who want ball grounds or space for boisterous activities. This, fortunately, is provided by another nearby area, Riley Park (see sketch map, Figure 11), which will become an even more welcome summer "Mecca" when a swimming pool, now projected, is complete.

Shopping by the residents is mostly done around Main, long overbuilt with a ribbon of miscellaneous stores, with clusters of newer stores particularly at 26th and 41st Avenue intersections. Newer, large-scale, real-estate developments in the Cambie area may or may not affect the shopping habits of the Little Mountain community, depending on ease of access and the quality of goods to which the new stores are oriented.

For the most part, transportation is not considered a
problem. A bus route is located adjacent to the Project. The persons finding it a difficulty are usually those returning to former churches, schools or friends on the weekend. A fair proportion of tenants have cars and many of them have worked out arrangements for "lifts" or "car-pools" for transportation to work. Main Street, in any case, is central for much travel, especially north and east; it was once literally the main street before great new residential and commercial areas were opened up further and further west.
Figure 4
Modern, well-planned, kitchen.

Figure 5
Interiors can be comfortable and attractive.
Figure 6

Lots of "wide open spaces"--some equipment.

Figure 7

A crying need--outside clotheslines.
(Drying rack is permitted.)
Figure 8

Hop scotch—or roller skates.
(A blacktop play surface.)

Figure 9

"Raceway" used by drivers trying to beat the traffic.
Figure 10

A slack period on a busy street.
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Chapter III
FAMILY WELFARE

Welfare begins with income, and all too often, limited income can circumscribe even the aspect of welfare. To the picture which has so far been presented of the kinds of families who make up the new and maturing Little Mountain community, it is now essential to add the income dimensions. To simplify this somewhat, and yet still show an important differential, the families are shown in only two groups rather than the three followed out in Table 4. "Normal" families are, of course, families with two adults, but this may in such a classification include a pensioner couple. It may also include a household which is tantamount to a broken family—lacking the normal breadwinner because the father is disabled or in some other way not a wage-earner. The resulting facts are simply stated. The median income of all the two-parent families is $250.00 per month; of the one parent families, only $175.00 per month. At current cost of living, and especially for families with several children, it is not hard to visualize their general eligibility for this kind of housing. There are exceptional cases, of course. Four families, at the time of this count, had incomes exceeding $400.00 per month; one family (an elderly couple), was living on less than $100.00 per month. Probably among the most important statistics are those of average family size: three children for both the "upper" and "lower" groups (excluding the
pensioner couples for this particular figure); 2.5 in the middle group.

Table 5. Distribution of Tenant Families According to Income

(Little Mountain, 1958)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>Families with:</th>
<th>% Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 adults</td>
<td>1 adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 - $199</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 - $299</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 and over</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the proportionate rent scale (discussed below) and certain other related considerations, income differences are more important in a project such as Little Mountain than they would be in the kind of slum-clearance housing which is most characteristic in Britain in its earlier stages of public housing, and projects in public housing in the United States before the War. A very low income ceiling (e.g., $1200.00 per year in some early U.S. examples) confines the project inevitably to marginal or virtually social assistance groups, and indeed amounts (as wiser observation has perceived) to a form of segregation. Coming later in the day, Canadian public housing has avoided this common mistake; and such projects as have been built so far (there are still very few besides the Toronto pioneer, Regent Park) are proceeding with a moderately-wide income range. Keeping this in mind, it will be convenient
to refer to "low-income," "middle-income," and "high-income" families at certain points in the interpretation of questions espoused, though clearly these terms must be understood in a purely relative sense, i.e., in relation to the statistics of Table 5.

Judging from the sample families, the correlation between income and family type is marked.\(^1\) Over 55 per cent of the low-income families were broken families, and in only three of twenty-three of these was support maintained by the earnings of a remaining parent. Four low-income families were retired couples on private industrial pensions or old age pensions. In half of the low-income "complete" families, the husband (the only wage-earner), was unemployed and was dependent on either insurance or social assistance. The other "complete" families were supported by husbands with various disabilities whose earning abilities were thereby reduced.

\(^1\) The first two income-groups are amalgamated as "low." Comparison between the total population and the sample, judged by income distribution, is as below. The sample thus covers the low-income groups as a whole and the threefold differential remarkably well, but under-represents the very poorest families.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>All Families</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $150</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 - $199</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200 - $299</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 or more</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the "middle" families (incomes from $200.00 to $300.00), one-third of the family heads were in some way disabled. Only one broken family was included in this group. One family had no income from the husband's earnings, but had an employed son supplementing the allowance received by both parents. The majority were "complete" families, supported by the earnings of the father; but it is noticeable that no mothers were employed (possibly because of family responsibilities).

In the "upper" group, are typically complete families, with the main support from the employed father. One broken family (out of seventy-two) was the exception, rising above $300.00 only because of the grandmother's pension. Another revealing example was a family with two wage-earners, the wife's earnings being enough to bring the figure over the $300.00 mark.

Throughout all the groups, workers are not confined to manual wage-earners, and there is a fair sprinkling of white-collar occupation. All of the heads of families work full-time except in the low-income group, when one in four had part-time jobs only. Questions were asked about satisfaction with present employment and the hopes of improvement, but were not pursued sufficiently to be able to report any marked pattern. A small minority felt they were working in their chosen field: only one (a civil servant) definitely did not need a better job. Some wanted "steadier" work, or "better pay"; one or two longed for "a trade"; one or two were pessimistic of improvement because they were aware of their educational deficiencies.
It is significant to record that the great majority of the families have never been able to consider home-ownership. The exceptions are mainly among the retired couples, several of whom completed the purchase of a lot and house in their earlier years. A reminder is hardly necessary that property prices were so much lower "in their day." There were two illustrations of other characteristic exceptions—a widow (now a pensioner), and a family-head whose partial disability forced him to dispose of his mortgage. About half among those who had always lived in rented accommodation cherished the desire to "have a home of their own," in spite of their fairly realistic views of their financial inability to do so; though there is also some evidence of confusion (which is not confined to public housing dwellers) between "owning a home" and living in a separate single family unit (i.e., a house or duplex, not an apartment). Several of the women in the broken families, for example, voiced their feeling that they "wouldn't be able to keep up a house without a husband around." A few among those interviewed were realistic and articulate on the unlikelyhood of their finding as good accommodation as they now have, anywhere else.\footnote{In the upper-income group, one in three said in various ways that they were planning "as best they could" to buy a house eventually. In the middle-group, two out of the fifteen had already learned from experience that they could not afford it, as they found they could not keep up the payments.}

The Proportional-Rent Scale and Family Budget

"Low rents," whatever these may be, are of course, the very essence of public housing. Their recognition as a direct
contribution to family welfare is underscored in Canadian public policy by the adoption of the so-called "professional system," first worked out in a special study by the University of Toronto School of Social Work in 1948, by Mr. Humphrey Carver and Mrs. Allison Hopwood, later applied to Regent Park when this became the first Canadian rehousing development and since adopted by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for general application. The basic study, from which the scale emerged, surveyed the major rent schemes evolved in Britain, the United States, Australia, and some other countries; and adopted the principles to take account not only of a wide income range, but also of family size. In effect, the well-known working rule of "20 per cent for rent" (to which a number of studies gave general validity, at least for prewar lower-income groups) is by this scale given detailed, graduated flexibility. Its importance is such that the Scale itself (in its most recent Central Mortgage and Housing version) and some of the major sections of the Carver-Hopwood study already referred to, are reproduced in Appendices A and C.

The broad principles are well-known to the tenants, and of course, periodical income-checks are a necessary feature of the administration. Tenants understand that the "A-family," with $200.00 per month income and three children will pay more rent than the "B-family" which has $200.00 per month but four children. Also the "B-family" will pay more rent than the "C-

1 Carver, Humphrey, and Hopwood, Allison, Rents for Regent Park: "A Rent Scale System for a Public Housing Project." (Published by Civic Advisory Council, City of Toronto, 1948.) See Appendix A.
family" which also has four children, but only $175.00 per month. However, the understanding of some of the refinements is not always clear, it would appear from some of the responses to questions.

All tenants interviewed were asked if they considered the rent-scale fair: the differential in the replies is probably significant. All those in the low-income group thought the scale was fair. One-fifth of the middle-income families thought it was not fair; as did one-third of the upper-income families. As a cross-check on the understanding of this question, it was asked if rents should be increased when income goes up. In the low-income group, five out of twenty-three thought not; in the middle-income group, five out of fifteen, and in the high-income group, seven out of twelve thought it should not be increased. Interpretation is important here. The net count is still that two-thirds of the families accepted (and presumably must have understood) the principle of rent increase on a proportionate basis. (It may be fair to suppose, in addition, that a few who knew better voted "No" in the hope that this was an opinion poll which might influence later policy!) Another side of this story is that the upper-income families are particularly worried by any increases in expenditures, actual or potential. These families, perhaps because of the present higher-wage picture, seem to be increasing in numbers in Little Mountain. Many of them are subject to the surcharge which is thoroughly explained in Appendix C. This surcharge is rather "unpopular" and may partially explain why some families do not feel that
proportional rent-increase is fair.

The most frequent complaint about the rent-scale was on the basis that it did not allow one to save or to "get a little ahead." This, of course, is a reflection of the improvement in earnings which has taken place for many people in recent years—and of concern with inflation. Unfortunately, the counterpart of the scale—a reduction when income declines—was not equally discussed with all families interviewed. (It was clearly understood by some who had had recent unemployment.) A related idea which was put forth many times was that Family Allowances should not be included in computing net income for determining the rent to be paid. (This is referred to again in the concluding chapters.) The frequency of this qualification did not relate to the amount of income; neither did it relate to agreement nor disagreement with the concept of the progressive rent-scale. The facts would seem to favour two possible conclusions: that the tenants do not fully understand the workings of the rent-scale; or that they did not feel free to offer much criticism of it. To this, it is important to add that every one of the fifty families interviewed believed they understood why the income investigation was necessary. And only two families out of this total (4 per cent) thought it was not conducted reasonably.

There is some evidence that budgeting pressure has grown so much for all "ordinary" families that the ability to judge the Little Mountain Rent-Scale objectively suffers in
consequence. The ability to stretch the incomes to cover expenses was related to income level. More low-income families found budgeting the same as before they came to Little Mountain, and more high-income families said it was harder to budget than before they moved into the Project. On the other hand, the immediate problems of setting up the new home were decidedly more urgent among the lower-income groups. In the low-income families, 55 per cent had had a serious budgeting problem upon moving into the Project. Reasons given for budget difficulties were illness, time-payments, having to buy furniture, having many bills, having no credit, and having been burned out of their previous accommodation. In the middle-income families, one in four had budget difficulties on moving in and of the high-income families, one in three had had initial budget problems.

There was much less variety than might have been expected in what was considered to be the "most difficult budget item." No less than 76 per cent of the respondents plumped promptly for food or groceries as the most difficult budget item. Sixteen per cent of the sample listed food and clothing together as their big budget problems. Only one family, in the low-income group, specified clothing alone as the most difficult item; another felt that electricity was their most difficult. Remarkably, only one middle-income family and one high-income family said time-payments were the budget items presenting the greatest problem.

When every allowance has been made for the fact that
mothers, with large and growing families, of all people are most likely to view mounting grocery slips with alarm, there would appear to be evidence here that these families do not have much to spare after the "immediates" have been paid for.

When asked to compare their rent in Little Mountain with what they had paid before, the great majority of low-income families said it was lower. One in five, however, found the Project rent higher. In both the middle-income and high-income groups more people paid higher rent in the Project than they had paid before. In the middle-income group, one in four were paying less rent; one in six, about the same. In the low-income group only was appreciation voiced for the lowness of rent or for the compensatory value of higher rent for good shelter ("It costs more--but it's worth it"). More detailed enquiry and some educational work would seem to be indicated here. To begin with, comparisons of rents is not at all accurate unless it is properly defined. Little Mountain rates include standardized rates for some of the utilities; also, a progressive scale is applied to service charges. It is likewise reasonable to make some allowance for the quality of accommodation obtained, especially as we know that most of the previous housing of these families was seriously sub-standard, if not in construction and facilities, certainly in size. On the other hand, it may well be that one of the results of the continuous upward revision of costs and rent

1 There is perhaps some room for the unorthodox suggestion that chain-stores sell so many things nowadays with so much stronger appeal, that "groceries" is a much larger item than it used to be.
schedules which Little Mountain experienced before it was actually built was that the rents were set too high to offer the optimum benefit for the poorest families in the city. The $5.00 difference between a median shelter rent of, say $40.00 and $45.00, may seem little to build up the rent revenue of the Project; yet it may have disproportionate effect in keeping out some of the most ill-housed families.

Reactions to the New Accommodation

Although Little Mountain is a strictly utilitarian project with no "frills" of any kind, to families who have previously lived in sub-standard housing the new suite or row-house could hardly be anything other than a vast improvement. To some, it still seemed a godsend, a "too good to believe." Those who have lived there for a year or two were able to make a more detached and sometimes critical appraisal.

In answer to the question "Do you have more space than in your previous accommodation?", thirty-nine tenants thought this was so. Four felt there was the same amount and only seven thought that there was less space. The majority of the families also felt that there was plenty of space for everyone. Those dissenting stated that there had been when they first moved in, but they now required another bedroom.

Of the things which the tenants liked best in their new accommodation, the adequate and efficient supply of heat received the most frequent mention. Spaciousness, cleanliness, and adequate play space for children were next. Other features that
families enjoyed were the hot water, the brightness and newness, and the "modern conveniences." Tenants were also pleased with the privacy of self-contained units, the adequate storage space, and having their own basement space. Two other things which were mentioned by families in the low-income group were the "feeling of security that a fair landlord gives" and an address of which to be proud (they might have said "of which they didn't need to be ashamed"). One tenant, only, replied that they hated the whole project but could afford nothing better because of illness in the family. This tenant was a previous home-owner.

There did not appear to be any significant differences in the appreciation of the new suites among the tenants when considered as income groups, or as between the three kinds of family groups.\(^1\) It is noted, however, that in the income group of less than $200.00 per month, 75 per cent of those interviewed mentioned the good heating supply. This was mentioned by 50 per cent of the middle-income group and only 31 per cent by those in the highest income group.

In answer to the question "What took the most getting used to?", 22 per cent replied that it was "a pleasure." There were several other answers, however, that indicated problem areas in project living. First among these (24 per cent) was the playing (sometimes described as "fighting") and noise of the many children in the Project which made life unpleasant at

\(^1\) Whole families with both parents and children; broken families or those with one parent and children; and pension couples (as in Table 4).
times. Secondly (20 per cent), "living so close to so many people" is not too easy.

Children playing up and down the stairways, in the basements, and outside contribute largely to the disturbance. Many tenants are understanding of the noise; and some with larger families are under the strain of continually having to remind their children to be less noisy. Some tenants considered they are privileged because they live in a "better" section of the Project among quieter, "good" people; others admitted they were not so fortunate. Only one mother admitted that her own boys were a disturbance.

A large number of the tenants in the apartment blocks claim the units are not soundproof. They say that the noise is not bad between suites on the same floor but is dreadful between upper and lower suites. Several wondered why money hadn't been spent on proper soundproofing, since this would alleviate the majority of annoyances.

Many families feel they have more privacy at Little Mountain than previously, but that the row houses are the better accommodation with regard to this. The neighbours are not so apt to hear "if you have a fight with your husband or raise your voice to your kid." Families, often having come from less crowded neighbourhoods, complained of the "gossiping" and "jealousy," and of course, the "crowds of children," which make living in such a large project less quiet and private than they would prefer.
Although 60 per cent of the families feel that there are no longer any things they still find strange or different, there continue to be some things that are annoying or frustrating. The older couples complained of the lack of a safe or comfortable place for them to sit outdoors, and the lack of any private garden from which the "unruly" children could be kept. This is a much-needed resource which every experienced old people's project has become aware of. Some mothers, on the other hand, complained of the "fussiness" of the old people who turned any harmless group of children into a dangerous gang. And this showed their insight by suggesting that they encourage the misbehavior of the children by their open disapproval.

Furnishing the new suite presented problems to more than one-half of the families interviewed. Some commented that they had felt "crowded" in their previous home, but found they didn't have enough to make the new suite comfortable and attractive. One in four of all families stated they had had very little furniture initially, but have added to it through purchases, whether outright or on credit. Two families in the sample, and there are probably others throughout the Project, received help from their churches. Some of the purchases described were quite large, such as bedroom or living room suites or rugs; others, quite small, such as curtains, linens, or side tables. Three families had been "burned out" of their previous homes and had to purchase total furnishings.

Among those who had satisfactory initial furnishings,
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the percentages in the two lower income groups were just under 48 per cent; even in the highest income group, only 60 per cent had had enough to furnish their unit from the start. It is important to note that the great majority of the families had to sell or store their own stoves and refrigerators.

When asked about the special points of the Project accommodation, and the things generally referred to as "modern conveniences" as compared with their previous homes, 60 per cent of the tenants were enthusiastic, describing Little Mountain as very satisfactory, much improved, or excellent. Most of the others found the accommodation largely satisfactory but had numerous suggestions of things that could be improved. The dissenters were staunchly upheld by two families, each previously home-owners, who felt that nothing in the Project was as good as before. Although many details were mentioned, there do not appear to be any significant variations in the type or numbers of things regarded as not satisfactory, as between the tenants divided into income or family-type groups.

The faults that the tenants can see in the Project accommodation divide into three categories: (a) problems with electrical appliances, (b) matters of cleanliness, and (c) deficiencies of design or of an architectural nature. There were a particularly large number of complaints about the electrical appliances used in the Project apartments. The electric stove is regarded by many as being too small for family needs and too slow for efficient cooking. Next in order, for some the refrigerator
is criticized as being too small, and the one thing that is "always needing repair."

With regard to cleanliness, several mothers stated that they realized the children coming in and out increases this problem, but they did feel that more frequent redecoration would be helpful. It was also noted that although the walls get dirty very quickly from the dust in the neighbourhood, they can not be washed as the quality of the paint on them is too poor.

Whether the architects, the builders, or the cost-reduction pressure is to blame, some design faults were clearly picked up by enough tenants to make their recording important. The main complaints seem to be: (a) that much of the accommodation is too small, (b) the kitchen is too crowded when the family is eating, (c) the bathrooms and bedrooms are too small, and (d) more storage and cupboard space is badly needed. There were several suggestions, also, that built-in ironing boards and broom closets would be helpful, as would out-door clotheslines.

Neighbourhood Facilities: The Residents' Viewpoints

There seems to be general satisfaction that the elementary school serving Little Mountain is so close by, and though the high school is much farther away, it is not considered inconvenient. The children who find distances inconvenient are the few exceptions who are still attending schools in their former districts. That one new high school is being built closer to the Project is well known and welcome.
The need for nursery schools and kindergartens is well known, especially to those who helped to start and maintain one in the beginning. While it existed, it served the area from Main to Ontario, from 30th to 38th Avenues, even though the main promoters were from the Project; and there was much disappointment when the minimum number of children, 25, could not be maintained; and due to financial difficulties, and lack of cooperation, it ceased operation.

Grocery shopping is done primarily at 28th and Main Street, where the large chain-stores are especially popular, or at the smaller shopping centre at 41st and Main. A few tenants, those with cars, say they travel as far as 14th and Main to do their grocery shopping. One notable exception is a family who buy from their relatives who farm on Lulu Island and deliver from there. Most families report that grocery shopping is neither far off nor inconvenient. A few use deliveries. Several mothers stated they enjoy the walk; a very few, however, find shopping at these distances inconvenient— with children the process becomes uncomfortably long.

Other kinds of shopping are accomplished for the most part in downtown department stores, the three or four main ones in the Vancouver area all being specified. District stores are occasionally visited on Main and Fraser Streets. The new shopping centre being built at 41st Avenue and Cambie Street evidently interests many of the tenants, as they feel it will be near for them.
The questionnaire asked "How do you get on for church?", to avoid any suggestion that the question was "Do you go to church?" or "Should you go to church?" The response showed that church or religion is by no means remote for many of them. A fair number of tenants have found a church conveniently located for them. But many others have not; they don't want to seek a new church and have to return many miles to their former church. Some families attend regularly, others occasionally; a few parents have accepted the compromise of staying home while their children go to Sunday School. One Sunday School, a flourishing one, is held right within the Project. It has to take place in the apartment of one of the families. They are waiting to transfer to another apartment block with a large basement, which will then be more suitable for the now small but expanding congregation.

Transportation problems seem to be rather few for all members of the families. The bus line is convenient, and the service is reported as good. Except that some men get lifts to work, the car drivers were not fully compassed in the subject. Two groups of persons handicapped by low incomes, pensioners and working mothers, complain of the high cost of bus fares. Families attending former churches have extra transportation expenses, as well as the few students who attend former schools. Mothers sometimes complained that bus transportation was difficult with small or tired children.
The Children

The special importance of children in a family project such as Little Mountain has already been pointed out. It is valuable to note what differences children and their parents find in living in the Project as compared to their previous residence.

Mothers with young children seem to manage quite well with babysitting when they shop or go out. Most mothers stated they shopped when the children were in school, taking the little ones with them. Some said they take turns doing the shopping with their husbands, and only two said they leave their younger children in the care of their older ones.

The consensus of opinion on babysitting was that this is no problem. It would appear that the neighbours willingly help each other in this; four women mentioned the particular neighbour with whom they shared babysitting duty. On the other hand, two people expressed the view that it was difficult to get a sitter "if you're at all particular" and said the neighbourhood 'teen-agers could not be trusted. Significantly, only one person mentioned that her children's grandparents were glad to babysit at any time. Significant, too, ten per cent of the mothers said they "go out so rarely" that they really know nothing about the problem of leaving the children.

A change in school can be a serious item in a child's life, and questions were asked in the hope of finding out whether
most Little Mountain children had difficulties, and also whether they have gained from their new school (and by implication, their new home-school relationship). Among the families whose children like their present school better than their old one, the main reason given for this was that there was a "gang" of children who got along well together, and of whom the mothers approved. There was some mention, however, of the superior school facilities, cafeteria, gym, etc., (more particularly since the new addition); and one mother stressed the fact that slow learners were given special help at this school. A small minority did not like this present school, and there was agreement that it was because of the "rough gangs" of children in them. One mother has placed a child in a private school because of this, although she finds the additional expense very difficult.

In trying to estimate whether home life had taken on more meaning since the change of housing, the questions swung from play to time spent in the home, the children again being regarded as a significant index. Questions were asked about homework in the hope there might be some response indicating whether the home environment helped. Rather surprisingly, many parents did not seem to think of any homework differences between the present and previous schools. But others did not attach any importance to the question, or replied that they thought it was the same. (There is the possibility here that homework is not taken very seriously by the children!) Several parents did comment that they thought the homework situation was better in the Project
regardless of the amount of it, as the children could have a separate room in which to study.

The mothers of children were very responsive on the subject of play space. Practically all appreciated the "black-topped" areas, the swings and sandboxes, and Riley Park as favorite and suitable play places. In the Project, however, the problems of the children's play involves the lack of fenced-in areas, and the noise and nuisance of the children in the halls and basements, especially when laundry was being dried. The fact that the children fight a great deal, and that there are many "roughnecks" around was mentioned more than once.

School-aged children were thought to have ample opportunities for sports and organized play. Apart from the schools, it seems that the fathers take an interest in organizing games for the boys and that the children usually "get whatever they want." However, some dissenting views were that the school did not provide enough variety here or, on the other hand, were too interested in emphasizing "the team." It was suggested by almost all tenants that more supervised play in the area would be a great asset.

Regarding the changes in family life made by different housing, the first reaction was to say that the children spend about the same amount of time in the home now as they did before. Some of the more thoughtful respondents decided that their younsters did spend somewhat more time at home now; and several reasons, both positive and negative, were given for this.
Several felt that because they are so comfortable in their present suites, and because their suites are spacious and pleasant, the children "do not feel the need to be out" so much. Other opinions, however, were that their children stayed in because of fear of the rough and noisy gangs of children in the area, or because there was "so little to do" recreationally in the neighbourhood. Without knowing the children, these facts cannot be fully assessed; but they deserve attention. To be weighed in this balance also are the families who thought their children were home less now than in their previous homes (12 per cent). They believed this to be the result of the children getting older and finding more friends to go out with. These parents maintained there was "more to do" in this neighbourhood, and that the children were able to play outdoors more because of the "decentness" of the neighbourhood. Whatever else this shows, it is a reminder of the importance of age when generalizations are being made about "children."

There did not appear to be any great difference in the amount of attention the children received from their fathers in the Project as compared with their previous housing. Only nine fathers felt that they gave more attention to the children now; and some explained, reasonably enough, that they had less to do in the way of upkeep in the Project. Eighteen mothers, however, felt they were giving more attention to their children now. The reasons for this were positive and negative. Although some mothers felt that they were probably more patient and less "cranky" than they used to be, due to the easier housekeeping,
others again expressed the thought that the children needed more attention because of the many different "types" of children in the Project and their habit of jeopardizing each others' well-being. One mother was quite sure that since they moved into Little Mountain, both she and her family have been in "better condition" because of the great improvement in their physical surroundings. The thoughtful awareness of pros and cons of the answers certainly reflects the fact that "welfare" to these mothers includes very clearly what is happening to their children.

In summary, there can hardly be any doubt that improved housing is a great platform in family welfare areas, putting parents and children in "better condition." Equally, however, there are many welfare needs, some individual, some group, and some community oriented, probably present that cannot be met through improved housing alone, but this may be a bridge to other improvements. The next step in the review is to examine community aspects of welfare factors.
Chapter IV
RECREATION, SOCIAL, AND COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES

Recreation and the use of leisure time make up a very large part of today's living. They are important in the home and in the community at large. They raise questions of many kinds of facilities--hobbies which are personal and individual; sports and "get-togethers" which are group matters; some active or outdoors, some passive or indoors; some requiring buildings and equipment, some requiring little more than people. A lot of the content of "community" depends on social contacts--whether they are rich or frequent, or meagre or rare. Much of the feeling of belonging, or not belonging, to a neighbourhood, and whether the project is isolated or insulated from the district in which it is located, will depend also on social contacts. Finally, recreation is a varied matter with some meaning for everybody--toddlers, school children, 'teen-agers, husbands and wives, oldsters--necessarily with unanimity. But that all this is part of public housing--and sometimes a neglected or forgotten part--is certain. Accordingly, questions were asked about recreation in the interviews with tenants which interwove between home life and recreation.

Home Life and Recreation

Hobbies or sports within the family can be engaged in in three places without going far afield: the living unit; the basements, mentioned by one-fifth of the tenants; and on the lawn.
or open space around the housing project. (There is no community building in the Project.) Adult activities within the apartment or house consist of sewing, knitting, and reading, together mentioned by just more than one-fifth of the tenants; "music" (of various kinds), and parties, the latter three being the most frequent in which both husband and wife partake. Musical evenings are spent in two apartments in particular, both of which have pianos. Children's activities also include parties as well as stamp collections in which one or two fathers engage. For the most part, children play with one another; secondly, with their toys which include "playing house"; and to a limited extent, collect coins, make scrapbooks, and build model boats and planes. Of significance is the fact that interests such as sewing and housekeeping become more of a hobby and less of a need with the old age pensioner, particularly the woman; she has no family for which to care and has longer time in which to perfect her art. Older men, too, have greater time to enjoy themselves and to tinker with tools; also, stamp collecting, reading, and carpentry take on much more value. Mothers with no husbands (i.e., widows) frequently report they have no hobbies or sports. A few would like to pursue sewing, for instance, "if they had a sewing machine," but financial circumstances make this out of the question.

Fathers and children apparently use the basements for recreational activities more than mothers, who use it predominantly for work, particularly laundry. Dances for both adults and 'teenagers are occasionally held in basements as well as within the
living quarters; one-tenth of the tenants confirmed this. Carpentry is carried out on a small scale by some of the more enterprising men. Ping pong, in two basements; roller-skating, both in the basement and outside; and one or two model train sets were mentioned. Outside, youngsters predominate, the most notable activity being baseball. Several tenants said it was difficult to discourage younger children from digging in the flower boxes.

Over half of the tenants agree that these activities can be carried out at Little Mountain Project more easily, or with the same ease, as in their previous homes. About a fifth disagree, saying it is more difficult. Visiting, judging from the tenants' reports, is a well-known pastime. Almost all tenants have friends or family who visit them. Most have other people's youngsters as well as their own for parts of the day. The older folk tend not to have children in to visit unless they are relatives, for they do not appreciate their noise.

Practically all tenants listen to the radio; seventy-five per cent have TV sets, and nearly half have record players. One resident has a collection of 1,000 records. 'Teen-agers, characteristically, have the "latest hits." One or two tenants listen to records for the blind, preferring to hear the "digest" type of magazine. A few mothers prefer to have their children and their children's friends at home watching TV because "then they are accounted for." TV, with the exception of the late afternoon programs for children, is primarily watched in the evening,
frequently by the whole family. Some of the old timers are unable to afford this luxury, but, for those who can, it is a favorite pastime. Those tenants without TV, particularly the older residents, rely considerably on their radios.

Outside Contacts

Most leisure time activities attended by the total family take place in the summer. Picnics and trips to Little Mountain, Riley Park, and the beach take top priority, being enjoyed by almost the entire sample. Visiting, camping, fishing, and boating are carried out to a lesser extent, i.e., one-fifth of the sample. Stanley Park and the north shore mountains are visited by the occasional family. Bus trips are a favorite for a few. Primary weekend activities include shows and church where children attend Sunday School. Sports are carried out to a limited extent among families. More often it is brother and sister who skate, father and son who play ball, and husband and wife who bowl. Weekday family recreation is practically non-existent, with fathers and some mothers working, and children at school. Evenings are spent at home. A few family visits are made, primarily excluding father. Also, a few shows are attended.

Fathers attend clubs and groups less frequently than mothers. Bowling and church are attended by a few—one-tenth; also legions, lodges, unions, and discussion groups, altogether accounting for another tenth. The following are carried out by fewer still: night school courses, accountants' association,
postal club, navy reserve, AAA, DVA; one tenant acts as a safety counsellor. To a limited extent, mothers and fathers attend the P.T.A., church, and bowling together. Special groupings of both parents include White Cane Club, Senior Citizens' Association, Junior Chamber of Commerce, CCF Coop., and the Chinese Clan Association; just over one in ten couples belong to one or more of these associations.

Children's groups are usually separated by sex, such as Cubs, Brownies, and Guides. Most boys play some form of ball, participate in gym activities; and a few, one in twelve, belong to such organizations as Sunset Memorial Community Centre, Y.M.C.A., Kivan Boys' Club, and Seaforth Cadets. A small minority of girls, about four, take skating and dancing lessons and, fewer still, participate in gym activities. Both sexes, to a fair extent, attend Sunday School, to a lesser degree, Young People's, kindergarten, and the skating arena. 'Teens go around together, enjoy dancing and listening to records.

Social contacts are gained predominantly through old friends, many through clubs, some through church and a number through work. Project neighbours and library contacts account for a few.

**Community Comparisons**

The districts in which the present tenants lived prior to coming to Little Mountain include predominantly South and East Vancouver, the West End, Broadway, east of Granville, and to a lesser extent Kitsilano. A scattered few tenants once
lived in Dunbar, Shaughnessy, Burnaby, Surrey, and Lulu Island. Five (representing ten per cent) declared they had lived "all over the city." (See Figure 2.) Apartment living accounted for well over half of the sample. Of these, basement suites numbered nearly fifty per cent; houses accounted for one-fifth, rooms for a minor percentage. Of the families that had previously resided in houses, the majority were two-parent families; they being, generally, the higher income families, and single-family homes being the most expensive.

Half of the tenants were inclined to state, at first, that they do not miss anything in Little Mountain district, but as much as one-fourth of the population were immediately aware that they "miss their friends." Some of them preferred the former neighbourhood, though there were not many comprehensive reasons. One referred to "scenery," another somewhat surprisingly to the former neighbourhood's genuine concern for family and child welfare. One mother emphasized her preference for the "Oriental family unity" that exists in the East end of the city. Almost one-fifth of the tenant population missed their former church, easy accessibility to the beach, outside clothes lines, a private porch, or a basement.

A variety of answers appear for the things tenants were glad to leave in the old district. Receiving the most common approval was "the leaving of the old place with its dirt, cold water, and little or no heat." Poor facilities included wood-burning stoves, shared bathrooms, crowded conditions,
inadequate fixtures, and lack of cupboard space. The neighbourhood surroundings were well recognized grievances, both physically, e.g., poor shopping area, unpleasant industrial development, fire hazard buildings, heavy traffic, and lack of playgrounds; and socially, e.g., "tough people," and "undesirables."

No less than half replied that they do not revisit their former residential district. Yet approximately three-quarters of the tenants have friends in the old district. Twenty per cent go back occasionally to visit a neighbour or one particular friend; another twenty per cent return regularly to visit relatives and friends. Most of the friends, on the other hand, visit Little Mountain, half of them coming occasionally or frequently.

Nearly all children like the district, and a few "very much so." One reason given was that there are so many children from whom you can choose your friends. Half of these children have no complaints; the others add up as follows—"missed friends at first," "no beach around," and the inevitable strangeness of new surroundings and the inability of a few children to join in, or stand up for their own rights. Two large families, composed mainly of girls, complained of two or three "rough boys" in the Project that made their daughters wish to stay inside most of the time. These mothers were anxious to make it clear their children "are not sissies." The extent to which new groups, clubs, etc., could affect these situations was not
discussed.

It is interesting to find that the majority of tenants feel they belong to a new neighbourhood at Little Mountain. Reasons given for this include the coffee visits among some of the mothers, and the agreeable babysitting arrangements. Others refer to the "sharing a way of living" which is to be found in the use of basement and laundry facilities, and alternate cleanings of the hallway by some tenants, as was found in one apartment unit. The rejectionists declare that the Project is "just a place to live," that there is no neighbourhood feeling or that families "keep to themselves" and so do not communicate too readily with other tenants. It is, of course, reasonable to remember here that much the same might be said--and expected--in a private apartment block.

A number of tenants consider that they belong to the Project because this is where they have their closest friendship ties. Those who live closest to the Project boundaries, however, frequently find their closest friendship ties cross boundary lines. One family associates principally with neighbours across the street; another is most happy in "being able to look out at real houses." A majority of tenants call Little Mountain a community. The remainder do not consider it a community for a variety of reasons which include the following: "Shelter is the only common tie"; "Tenants do not feel for anything"; "There is no community as far as organized activities go." It may be noted that the complete families tend to be more outspoken, both
positively and negatively; in many instances, husbands and wives support one another in their comments.

**Associations and Organizations**

The outstanding large-scale activities in which the tenants have been involved are the Little Mountain Co-operative Kindergarten, the flourishing P.T.A. of General Brock elementary school, and the senior tenants' library. The kindergarten story is a very significant one, which would warrant more study. It was enthusiastically organized by a few enterprising parents; opening in September of 1955, it ran for a year and a half. An apartment basement was furnished with children's tables and chairs; a full-time teacher was employed (for $100.00 a month) and two mothers assisted each day. Unfortunately in 1956, due to lack of financial support from parents and insufficient interest, this venture was forced to close down. Such remarks as "Why should I pay to send my child to kindergarten when my neighbour's children who aren't going are fine and happy?", and "Why should I do all the work; nobody else wants to do their share!", exemplify why the kindergarten venture failed. Also, the fact that the kindergarten "organizer" moved away has a relevant bearing on its discontinuance.

General Brock School has been noted in the past few years for its active P.T.A. There are nearly 200 members and a high percentage attend all meetings which usually have some form of entertainment or a large spread of food and sometimes both. Enthusiastic project leaders account for 35 per cent or
seven out of twenty executive members. Tenants report that 70 per cent of the P.T.A. membership are Project dwellers. Some of these Project dwellers, it is reported, are forming a clique in "self-defense" against P.T.A. home-owners whom they feel are "looking down on them."

A proud feature of Little Mountain is a library, organized by the older residents, which occupies one of the apartment-house basements. It has been in operation since May, 1955; every Monday afternoon from 2:00 until 3:00 elderly residents may visit the library and usually do. Annually in May, a large tea is held for the library patrons within the basement adjacent to the library; this event is looked forward to with delight by all concerned. The lady who runs the Grouse Walk library has a new purpose in life now. Five years ago she was a retiring person who felt that life held nothing more for her; the library has supplied this purpose.

One unmet need of the tenants is an organized playground. Two-thirds of those who were asked thought that an organized playground would be a great asset, although it was often stipulated that the supervision would have to be very close and, indeed, it would be impossible without it. Another maintained that "mothers don't make good supervisors, as they are too preoccupied with their own home duties." Some believed that as Riley Park is so close, this is sufficient. In this connection, mothers with preschoolers, in particular, expressed concern about traffic hazards both on and off the Project property; some
drivers coming east from Little Mountain use the north entrance on Ontario as a means of cutting off the busy intersection at Main and 33rd, and "park there when the baseball season is on, too!"; a number appear to exceed the speed limit in approaching and Project and Main Street.

Sixty per cent of the respondents thought a volunteer cooperative play group or day-care group would be an asset to the Project. This seemed to be very intelligently understood: it is, of course, needed most by the mothers who have young children to look after. It was mentioned that mothers like to get together for some useful purpose but that a vote might be necessary to insure the cooperation of all; also that it would have to be well organized, and that perhaps professional supervision would be helpful.

Although the residents can see the need, some are quite pessimistic, nevertheless, about this type of organization being successful. They state that there is really a lack of interest and that the burden would fall on a few. The failure of the previous kindergarten probably influences this. It does seem that the need for some organized facilities of this kind is understood by the majority of the mothers.

The Need for a Community Centre

In questioning tenants regarding their interest in and need for larger facilities for meeting purposes and for carrying out certain activities, the following information was obtained. Sixty per cent of the tenants stated that they could do with a
workshop or hobby centre. Among these, a few wives spoke for their husbands and sons. A small percentage saw such a facility as being part of a community hall or centre. Most tenants who advocate such a centre favour a separate unit because more facilities would then be available; it would be a gathering place for different kinds of interested groups, and there would have to be provision against noise. The few who prefer a basement facility do so because of convenience and small-scale operation. In a few basements, there are workshops already in existence.

Approximately ninety per cent of the tenants replied that there was a need for a community centre or hall. This was one of the highest "votes" in any aspect of the enquiry. The most frequently recognized need was for a group for children; the need for a group for 'teen-agers followed closely. Next came the recommendation of groups for adults with a few special groups for the aged high in priority. Children's groups include pre-school and kindergarten, Sunday School, and sports. 'Teen-age activities requested were dancing and swimming. Adults preferred to have social "get-togethers" including cards, bingo, dancing and talk, discussion groups concerning Project and family concerns, handicrafts such as sewing, and sports such as bowling, ping pong and pool. Young mothers, it is to be noted, are in favour of programs for themselves, while their children are being cared for.

When the families were queried about the possibility of tenants organizing their own recreation through something such
as a "Little Mountain" Social Club, their opinions were also sought as to whether recreational facilities should be for the use of the residents of the Project only, or for the people in the wider district. This question turned up a variety of feelings which ranged from extreme misanthropy to extreme gregariousness. In the sample of fifty families, there were five who did not approve of a social club for the Project and did not approve of a community centre for the wider neighbourhood either. Comments which accompanied their answers included "People are too nosy, anyway," and "People are friendly enough, anyway"—which, it might be argued, cancel each other out! A characteristic view, however, was "I doubt if any cooperative venture would succeed."

Seven respondents who disapproved of a social club for the Project thought a centre for the district "might work out." Following are sample statements: "It would do for the majority but not for us." "We need outside interests to avoid the tight-knit feeling." "If it was built in the Project, no one else would come." "We get to know each other too much already." "I'd never go near it." A lot depends on how the questions are asked and on whether one is speaking to a mother harassed with two children or a lonely old pensioner.

Perhaps one reason that the tenants wished to include those outside the Project was a fear of becoming too closely involved with their immediate neighbours. "It is too easy," they state, "to get involved in other family's affairs and to gossip."
Most tenants claim that they know as many tenants as they want to know; yet the newer residents express a desire to meet the other tenants. All the residents are most willing and anxious to "meet" the total neighbourhood. They recognize the opportunity here for becoming a part of the greater community rather than remaining a separate entity. The larger neighbourhoods will, in turn, be encouraged to become acquainted with this "unusual" phenomenon.

Developing Community Strengths

Recreation is a many-sided phenomenon. It is essential that it be met both in the home and in the neighbourhood. The family setting is where the child first learns about people, develops skills and forms attitudes, all of which go into the making of recreation. This is one great asset in good housing. But for further development, the child must expand his knowledge of his environment; this means associations with other children in such settings as the playground, the school, sports, clubs, etc., which unite to form, for him, his "neighbourhood."

Facilities for group activities have been discussed as desires and needs of the tenants, both for themselves as well as their children, though children, perhaps typically, get a large share of this attention. Among the projects mentioned were some form of organized group for pre-schoolers, such as a cooperative play group or an organized playground. One suspects that if a kindergarten were proposed and given sufficient support both externally and internally through such means as finances and
parent education, it would flourish. Second in importance was a hobby shop; third, a community centre; and fourth, a "Little Mountain" Social Club.

In support of the latter two desires, such comments as "We need outside interests to avoid the tight-knit feeling" and "We don't want to be isolated; we see too much of Project people," were given. This shows the expressed wish of the majority of tenants for facilities open to the total Little Mountain district. Of course, there are a few distrustful comments, such as "Rowdies would get in and wreck it." And this note of realism has "cropped out" in many other ways. The tenants of Little Mountain have had some hard knocks from life. In spite of the prejudices which are still voiced in some quarters, it is doubtful if they "expect privileges."

Whose task is it to develop recreational resources--the government's, the community's, or the individual's? City governments sometimes provide neighbourhood recreation facilities for public housing directly, or by aiding community centres. Private efforts are sometimes helped by such organizations as the Kiwanis Club which has operated in Vancouver through its Boys' Club Association. Social and recreation facilities are sometimes acquired by neighbourhoods through local self-interest, and "social action." A number of resources might be tapped in such an endeavour. The community centre plan for Vancouver is such a resource, but this depends on strong local interest and participation--as well as the raising of substantial funds. This
might be a severe test of whether "Project" and "district" populations could get together for a community end.

Two schools of thought are at odds here: (a) People such as those now living in Little Mountain Housing Project coming from, in large part, unorganized districts or slum areas, devoid of individual initiative and need for participation in neighbourhood objectives, require care and assistance in leadership to get anywhere. (b) Given sufficient encouragement and support in pursuing projects directly related to people's needs and interests, leadership will arise from their own ranks. This is the democratic approach to programming that social group workers are trained to encourage, and it has not been wholly non-existent.

Such projects as the cooperative kindergarten, and the senior tenants' library, have been met by leadership from within the Project. Individual initiative developed a few smaller groups, such as the sewing club and the Sunday School class. However, the warmer association, through which better understanding and greater tolerance develop, require more "push" than individual initiative can ordinarily supply. Recreational activities and social events might help to provide the sort of "climate" necessary. Minimum facilities must first be provided for these activities which can develop most easily alongside current interests.

The "community hall issue" must also be seen in neighbourhood-development terms. Authorities in the field of
Housing and Community Planning agree that housing projects can be integrated into the wider community through shared social and recreational facilities. "There is general acceptance in the United States and Britain of the view that rehousing developments should be utilized as an opportunity to raise the level of such facilities in the community any facilities which are built in the rehoused area being, of course, made available for the residents of other areas. Because of the importance of developing low-rental projects on balanced neighbourhood principles, community halls and similar buildings are almost indispensable in the total plan."¹ The Seattle Housing Authority's aim for several years has been to encourage a community feeling that crossed project boundaries. Their Annual Report in 1945 declared that "although most residents were new to the city and experienced a feeling of insecurity, they were able to find stability in a community which offered them the chance to integrate into the city itself." And again, "It has never been our desire to set up an organization or activity complete or self-sufficient within a project. But it was rather our view to provide additional recreational facilities in communities whose population had suddenly grown beyond their existing facilities because of the addition of a housing project."²

¹ Housing and Community Planning, Report of Advisory Committee on Reconstruction (the "Curtis" Report). King's Printer; Ottawa; 1944; p. 200.

² Housing Authority of the City of Seattle, Housing the People; "Sixth Annual Report." 1945.
At Yesler Terrace, a large community building with gymnasium-auditorium, hobby and craft rooms, meeting rooms, a kitchen, and shower rooms, has been in existence since the very beginning of the project in 1942.\(^1\) Outside equipment includes swings, basket-ball court, nursery school facilities and space for larger games. These facilities which were considered essential, have proved their worth again and again. Integration of "project" and "community" is encouraged by having leisure-time facilities available equally for tenants and residents of the wider neighbourhood. Even agencies, per se, such as the Boy Scouts and the Y.M.C.A., have been invited to use the community buildings.

Leisure time programmes in housing projects, it is frequently reported, have accounted for a reduction of absenteeism on the job, less damage of dwelling units because of better tenant maintenance, decrease in juvenile deliquency, better health for residents, and better care for children.\(^2\) The experience of Seattle's Yesler Terrace project in recreation and social activities is a model. Prior to 1956, the Parks Department and the School Board provided some outlets in neighbouring facilities. In 1956, a complete "Neighbourhood House" was moved onto the project, so services will be offered in a much wider range than before. Serving residents within and adjacent to the

---

1 Housing Authority of the City of Seattle, Third Annual Report. 1942; p. 15.

2 Housing Authority of the City of Seattle, Housing the People; "Sixth Annual Report." 1945; p. 23.
project, it has been able to emphasize the development of interpersonal relations in groups. Families and individuals are served in such ways as family counselling, job-referrals, and home-management classes. Cooperation and participation in the work of the neighbourhood and community has been stimulated generally. Some of the interests at Neighbourhood House include its bi-monthly newspaper and its Bulletin Board. Upon arrival at Yesler, tenants are presented with a folder describing neighbourhood programmes, including an invitation to meet their Community Council. This sort of welcome helps new tenants to feel "part of things" in a hurry. Most planners, architects, and welfare-minded citizens (who have been active in most housing campaigns) strongly favour recreation centres as part of public housing projects, but cost-cutting, and sometimes unenthusiastic local governments have led to inadequate provision being made. Even in well-planned Regent Park (Toronto), facilities have not been adequate to the demand. But the Regent Park project area is "alive with such activities as preschool groups in the Tiny Tots' Playgrounds and teenagers' dances on week-ends." By arrangements with the Authority, a community centre is operated by the Toronto Department of Parks and Recreation. Albert Rose comments, "There can be little question that the residents of the area and their friends are making almost continuous use of the facilities of the neighbourhood. . . . There is, in fact, such a considerable use of community facilities that outside groups or persons have had to be excluded from the use of the
playground and from dances or other social functions. . . ."¹

The need of a district centre or building has not gone entirely unnoticed by the larger community in Vancouver. The Board of Parks and Public Recreation, responsible in part for Community Centres, has drawn up plans for such a resource within the region of Little Mountain, that of South Cambie. This is part of a plan for a city-wide distribution of community centres, each to serve, as nearly as possible, a similar sized area and population. When the South Cambie Community Association raises $15,000.00, the Board of Parks and Public Recreation will match it by an equal grant; "The rest of the funds required are raised by placing a tax by-law before the voters of the polling divisions to be included in the area to be served by the proposed Community Centre."² Concerned persons both inside and outside of the Project advocate Riley Park as the most suitable spot for the location of a Community Centre. Not only is there a large number of families nearby, but Riley Park is an almost ideal physical setting with a park area and a swimming pool (under construction). Swings, sandbox, jungle gym, and a wading pool now serve the many children of the district. Summer activities are supervised by the Parks Board. Housing project tenants make good use of Riley Park in the summer.

¹ Rose, Albert, Regent Park. University of Toronto Press; Toronto; 1959; p. 189.

In Vancouver, generally, the need for meeting places and recreation facilities for every neighbourhood is well recognized and has a history of achievement. One centre after another has been financed and built in the last decade. But its place in public housing—and for that matter, urban renewal plans—is by no means secure. The Vancouver Housing Authority, which can now speak from five years of experience, in each of its annual reports, has reiterated the need for some sort of community building. The Little Mountain district is deficient in facilities of the "neighbourhood house" type. The tenants of Little Mountain, too, expressed their view with emphasis. There is a little disagreement on whether the facility should be for use of Project tenants only, or for the community at large; but more people seem to favour the latter view. They say, "It should be for everyone; nobody would go if it was 'just the Project.'" Probably, two facilities are needed; one, a hall on the Project big enough for most of the adult tenants to meet together at one time (part of this hall could, perhaps, be also used as a shelter for children's play on rainy days). The other is a neighbourhood facility in conjunction with Riley Park. It is important to add, again, that a social worker with a knowledge of group work and recreation would turn such facilities into long-range assets. A social worker as a part of the staff of a neighbourhood house would, of course, be a resource for the wider community, but such a worker should certainly be permitted to "cultivate" the Project population particularly. Last year's report of the Authority desired "again to draw attention to the
pressing need for a building in which a program of character-building, educational and healthy social activities for all ages could be carried on. ... The only organized tenant group activity that has survived the almost impossible conditions arising from the lack of meeting space is the Grouse Walk Library, flourishing (now) for almost five years."¹ It would be unfortunate, however, if this gap were to be visualized as a lack of a building only. The services of a qualified social worker might have enabled some of the other tenant-organized activities to survive, and might have helped into being other group activities which are at present only dimly-perceived desirabilities.

In specifically stating the requirements of recreational services for the Project and district, there are three types: (a) preferably a small building on the site, (b) a neighbourhood house, and (c) a community centre. Within the Project, at Ontario and Oriole Walk, is an area of land most suitable for the erection of a small building. Due to the sloping terrain, this ground is difficult to play on, and so is seldom used; however, a building would command a central position, and accommodate cars beneath its main room. Such a plan was drawn up by the Vancouver Housing Authority prior to the construction of the Project; it was to include the caretaker's quarters and pay for itself through his rent. However, the government has not given its approval. This building, though

small, would also be open to residents not living in the Project. A second type of facility required at or near Little Mountain, also for the use of the entire district, is that of a Neighbourhood House. Here, intensive service in the form of individual attention and small group activities would perform a preventative function. The third requirement for the district is a Community Centre, which usually provides recreational services on a large scale. Such facilities as gymnasiums and badminton courts are basic needs for the general public of every community.

Statistically insignificant but of great social importance is the suggestion from some tenants that they should be permitted a degree of democratic self-government. This self-government might originate through recreational interests; or it might be considered wiser to have a separate group concerned with non-recreational matters. Self-government is recognized as a valuable administrative tool in many fields. High school and college student bodies are encouraged to develop self-government. British and Canadian war-prisoners have developed their own government in war prisons, almost automatically. When people have some say in the management of affairs vital to them, they involve themselves more deeply and develop feelings of responsibility. In high schools, this has helped to improve

---
1 It is not intended to "turn the tenants in on themselves," but to induce them into forming groups and "getting out of their shells." Thus, helpful discussions and constructive activities could commence—a beginning must be made somewhere and sometime.
behavior and control vandalism; and in war-prison camps self-government can help to improve tenant care of public property in housing projects and "smooth out" inter-family relations. A tenant organization can be an ally of management and provide an excellent channel for communication. The organization should not become a pressure group, fighting management on every new matter of policy. This is another area where the services of a skilled social worker are invaluable to help the group to a constructive orientation. It might, with favourable fortunes, consolidate the principle that good housing is not just "paying the rent" but is a contribution to citizenship.
Chapter V

ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIAL POLICY

All good housing requires management. Even the single family house requires maintenance, gardening, and making decisions around the critical subject of the budget. Apartments obviously require far more management and are thought of without question as a business, i.e., requiring a landlord. Public housing is much more than any of these. Who is the "landlord"? And what special circumstances affect the tenants? If these questions are not sympathetically understood, the implications of public housing for the local community and the nation can not be properly perceived.

What is readily apparent from the preceding chapter is that "management" and "administration," sooner or later, are touched by all the concerns which have been reviewed under the heading, so far, of "welfare" and "social life." There is a "business side" and a "social side" to management of course; and it will be well, certainly for purposes of examination and analysis, to keep them apart initially. Indeed, this division will permit a number of important matters still not so far presented to be dealt with a little more systematically.

Rents and Eligibility

To begin this assessment of "business" and "welfare" in public housing, it is as well to enter the reminder, at the
start, that public housing is necessary. It has been long delayed in Canada and in Vancouver. Perhaps we have made a few gains from this late start. But there still seems to be much to learn from other communities as well as from our own experience. The starting point—that public housing is necessary because there is not enough decent, healthful housing for important sections of the population if they are left "to find it for themselves"—means that this kind of housing is in part, at least, a social service: by no means a social service in the same sense as social assistance, or even the old age pensions, but a community sharing at least of some of the characteristics of schools or hospitals.

Today it is widely recognized that a great many forces, beyond the family's power to influence, affect the ability of the family head to support his family. In the related welfare fields of medical care, financial security in old age, and others, it is recognized that collectivization of risk and subsidization of economically disadvantaged persons is a desirable way in which each citizen can take some responsibility for the welfare of all the group. Government participation and leadership are accepted in these fields. Public housing, however, is not yet as familiar.

Public, subsidized, low-rental housing is not merely a logical necessity but a greater one today because of another fact: the rising cost of housing. Doubtless, production techniques today are more efficient; use of new materials and
new uses of familiar materials have been experimented with to keep down the cost of new home construction. Nevertheless, the cost of a single-family dwelling is beyond the means of most families, and it could well be two-thirds of the urban population. Apartments and row houses are part of the answer and here the answer has, in fact, been accepted more readily for special groups--old people, and public projects like Little Mountain--than for "private families."

These factors (and others) restrict the ability of average families to afford decent, healthful homes. Through the agency of government, those who can afford it are able to help those who cannot afford adequate shelter. This sort of help is essential to the task. However, some method of relating eligibility and rent to income is necessary to restrict help to those who need it. Stated differently, those in worst need of housing should be housed first; those who can afford to house themselves should do so; the subsidy must be kept small to ensure continuing public support of the public housing concept.

Public housing policy, then, is (a) to limit eligibility by establishing minimum and maximum incomes for applicants and (b) to limit subsidy by relating rent to income and need.

Limiting eligibility to those with at least a "minimum income" is intended to keep public welfare responsibilities compartmentalized. That is, "social allowance" should be sufficient to enable recipients to rent adequate (not luxury)
housing from private landlords. Public housing should not have to subsidize inadequate "social allowance" financing. To permit it to do so confuses two "welfare" areas. Limiting eligibility to those with not more than a "maximum income" is intended to restrict public housing to those who need it. "Maximum incomes" for public housing is analogous to "minimum incomes" for eligibility for home building loans guaranteed by C.M.H.C. Also, keeping minimum and maximum income fairly well up tends to reduce the cost to the taxpayer of public housing. The more tenants who pay at least an "economic rent" (rent calculated as covering per unit share of operating and construction costs), the less the project as a whole makes a deficit on annual operating costs.

Limiting the amount of subsidy is accomplished by means of various "rent scales" which usually show a close relationship between rent and income and, more recently, a consideration of the increase of need with the increase of family size.

If Little Mountain housed only those who are small income earners or who are recipients of one or another form of public aid, then public relations would be a simplified task. Both residents of the Project and residents of the broader community would understand easily that those who lived there were people who needed public housing help. However, fifty-two families, or almost one-fourth of the families living in Little Mountain, have incomes of $300.00 per month or more. Some of these families have voiced uneasiness about living in Little
Mountain because the public thinks they "are all paupers who pay hardly any rent." On the other hand, their less affluent neighbours complain that Little Mountain "shouldn't be for people who earn $2.00 per hour." The families with more than $300.00 income may retort that they "are subsidizing all those social assistance families." And some have suggested that they are "paying twice for Little Mountain, once in taxes and again in higher rents." Many families, both poor and not so poor, complain that "family allowance is for children's shoes and medicines and should not be considered in figuring rents." These various expressions emphasize that the "Canadian formula" is actually a good one—better than excluding moderately high earners from the benefits of community provision; it, nevertheless, puts a high premium on full tenant information.

"Public" understanding of public housing needs to be furthered so that it is widely understood that the housing shortage and the high cost of housing are as important in the subsidized building of housing as is lowness of income. This is a difficult task because many will feel that "anyone who earns more than I do can afford to own a home." But it is not honest nor productive to "duck the question," "evade the issue" by letting the taxpayers think they have bought housing for paupers only. It is necessary to help "low-income" tenants see that "high-income" tenants are not undeserving interlopers but a planned part of the picture, reducing operating costs and thereby making the project financially feasible. Perhaps if pressures on "high-income" tenants from both sides are reduced, they will
feel less bitter about the extent to which they "subsidize" low-income families. Careful explanation to them may help them to see that though they enjoyed a very favourable and protected situation when their income was lower and they needed it more, now that they are paying more rent, they do get housing comparable to that available outside. Some lowering of cost of private housing for sale and rent may help them, too, as still more public housing is built. It should be fairly easy to explain to tenants that Family Allowance is paid to families with children to help them with all costs, including housing. The "Carver-Hopwood" scale does include Family Allowance and does not permit deduction of income taxes in the computation of net income. Some of these explanations to tenants might be made by printed material. It is essential that they be made.

It may appear that the eligibility and rent policy is keeping some people out who should be in while letting in some people who should be kept out. Actually this is probably not the case. Many of the over $300.00 families are large families, and the per-person income is not high after all. Owning their own home would for many of these people be difficult or impossible. When insurance and taxes, repairs and upkeep, landscaping and furnishing are added onto payments on principal and interest, the real cost of home ownership soon appears as considerably higher than one-fifth of income.

Seen in the perspective of the whole Project-population, the eligibility and rent policy in use in Little Mountain does
not over emphasize the higher incomes. Actually, the numbers of broken families and families with a partially disabled wage-earner has been, and still is, increasing. Some of the reason perhaps is that eligibility minima and maxima have stayed unchanged in an inflationary period so that more ordinary working people have come to earn monetary wages higher than the entrance maximum for Little Mountain. Another part of the reason is that broken families tend more often to stay in Little Mountain while more of those leaving are two-parent families. If there is, in fact, a trend, it could well be accepted as desirable. But further experience will be needed to establish the facts.

Admissions Policy

After the application has been made, an inspection visit is made to the applicant's home. The home and surroundings are evaluated in regard to such factors as overcrowding, inadequacy of heating equipment, absence of safe and suitable play space for children, overlong distance from place of employment, presence of smoke or noise nuisances in the neighbourhood. The inspector assigns points to the dwelling in accordance with this evaluation, and it is this point rating which provides the most significant criterion for entrance eligibility. These applications, with inspection reports, are considered by the seven-member Board of Housing Authority and may be passed onto a waiting list (about 400 applications now). Credit rating and

1 See Appendix D for copy of the inspection report form.

evaluation of housekeeping are also important considerations. When a vacancy occurs, the Housing Manager can consider four of five high-point families and if the applications are not a year old may get a new credit rating but omit a re-inspection. Priority assignment by the Housing Authority is always done on an impersonal basis, applications and inspection reports being identified by number only. This rules out the personal, emotional factor and the necessity for Board action removes the possibility of anyone bringing pressure to bear on the manager or individual board member for admission of a "pet family."

The Rent-Scale

As already explained, the Carver-Hopwood "progressive" rent-scale is basically used in the Little Mountain Project, and adjusts rent according to income and family size.¹ A family of three persons and $300.00 per month income will pay more rent than the same size family with only $200.00 income. And a family of three with $200.00 per month will pay more rent than a five-person family with the same income. The Carver-Hopwood scale is related to a Canadian standard of living study; though this standard primarily was computed in Toronto, and there are constant problems in the post-war world in considering how far this should be kept up-to-date with continuously rising prices.

¹ The scale now in use differs from the original Carver-Hopwood scale only in that a revised set of minimum incomes for entrance eligibility are used and a new set of service charge computations are used for the lower income brackets. "Service charge" is a misnomer for a charge laid against apartment-block tenants for heat, hot water, and refrigeration. It does not apply to row-house tenants who must provide these "services" to themselves.
In general, this accepts the working rule that the amount a family can pay for rent without reducing its standard of living below a "decent and healthful" level is about one-fifth of income. Higher income families can afford to pay a bigger rent, but only proportionally. This is taken into account in the Carver-Hopwood scale to the degree that some rents approach one-fourth of income with further allowance for family size. Conversely, there are families with such low incomes that they cannot pay one-fifth of it for rent without suffering on food and clothing, etc. On the other hand, families who can afford to pay $75.00 or more per month for rent (i.e., families whose income equals five times seventy-five or more) can compete for rental housing on the private market.

Under the present Little Mountain regulations, which are still basically related to the principles of the Carver-Hopwood scale, there are both minimum and maximum income limits for eligibility to enter the Project. Present regulations further provide that tenants may stay in the Project if their incomes should rise beyond the entrance maximum. In this event the tenant pays a rent surcharge equal to thirty per cent of the amount by which his income exceeds the maximum. This development is one that has been necessitated by the continuous rise in costs and prices which has characterized the last ten or twelve years. The income considered in using the Carver-Hopwood scale is total net income, and Family Allowance must be included. This appears to be a sore spot with many of the families living in Little Mountain. They argue that Family Allowance is supposed to be
spent directly on the behalf of the children on such items as clothing and food and instead is being "taken away from them" by the Housing Authority. It must be said flatly that there was never any intention to exclude the use of Family Allowance for housing; and the official view of the Authority that Family Allowance payments "are provided to assist families to pay for their housing among other necessities,"¹ is quite incontestable. This does not mean, however, that there is no need for information, "interpretation," and education. Perhaps more effort should be taken to explain the standard of living computation on which the rent-scale was based and the inclusion of Family Allowance. These are Social Advantages, moreover, whose values need to be kept alive by information and perhaps discussion. It is advantageous to have tenants with a wide range of incomes because in this respect at least, the tenants are not different from the population in the surrounding private-family housing area. From the taxpayers' point of view, it is advantageous to have relatively high-income families in the Project to offset the less than "economic rents" paid by low-income families. Payments of more than an economic rent by some reduces the amount required to subsidize the overall public housing operation.

However this may be, the "progressive" rent-scale, certainly the surcharge featured with it, appear as disadvantages to the tenant with relatively high income. He complains that he

is "subsidizing the social assistance families" or that he is "paying twice for public housing, once in taxes and again in high rent." Another complains he will never be able to save, or "get ahead of the game," because a five dollar raise causes a three dollar increase in rent." But there are analogues here--between the home owner who puts in improvements, only to be assessed with higher municipal taxes, or the earner whose salary has gone up, only to find that he must pay more income tax--which would at least be worth discussing. It still remains to be credited that the tenant gets excellent housing for a price he can afford to pay. The Authority, in turn, gets the greatest possible income that is consistent with a good standard of living for the tenants.¹

Perhaps it needs to be re-emphasized that eligibilities and rent-scales, whether in relation to income or family size or both, must be so managed as to retain an emphasis on low rent in public housing. The facts are that too many people earn too little, and too many houses cost too much. Low-rent housing policy is more necessary than ever; indeed, concepts of "low rent" now are higher than they ever were! But the other face of the problem must be examined too. Low rents are not economic rents, do not pay the living units share of costs. As conceived at present, so-called "low-rent" projects must include a fair

¹ It can be argued that one of the disadvantages of the traditional rent-scale is that the income of the project cannot be easily forecast (as compared with graded rents, where each unit has a fixed rent). Over a period of time with housing experience, however, it is doubtful if this problem is beyond present-day budgeting skills.
proportion of high rent (which may pay more than the living unit's share of costs). These high rents (relatively) help to balance off the loss involved in low rents and reduce the amount by which taxpayers must subsidize the project. This is necessary for taxpayer acceptance of public housing, and it may, nowadays, be unfortunately necessary for modern welfare policy in housing. It does, however, make possible more misunderstandings. Nearly everyone, public housing tenants and general public alike, would understand and sympathize with public housing which was restricted to social allowance recipients and earners of very low wages. But is this feasible? And is it any longer reasonable? When higher rents and self-supporting citizens are involved, it becomes essential for management to give adequate explanation to both low-rent and high-rent tenants and to the public as well, so that all will understand housing policy and accept the existence of high rents.

The "Canadian formula" (as the Carver-Hopwood progressive rent-scale may be called) is really something of an innovation; and Little Mountain and other Vancouver projects may need to collate some of the explanatory statements for public use. For example Professor Rose's remarks, the comprehensive report on the Regent Park Project, are appropriate: "There are some individuals or families in extremely poor circumstances, supported entirely by public assistance payments. There are some individuals or families who are relatively well off; who can save sufficient money to purchase a home or an automobile if they wish. Most families are in more moderate circumstances.
All these families or individuals live side by side in the accommodation they require yet pay a rent in accordance with their income and family size; the rents paid for adjacent dwellings may, indeed, vary considerably.¹ This diversity of financial circumstances may be a healthy thing for the project, but only if it is carefully managed so that hard feelings are avoided.

Inclusion of high-income families may raise local questions within the project or in the neighbourhood. It may be felt that high-income tenants occupy housing "they don't really need," thereby keeping out some tenants who should be let in. Probably this is only a case of deceptive appearances as many of these "high-income" tenants have large families. Furthermore, their incomes are "high" only in relation to the "lowness" of incomes common among the rest of the project population. It is exceptional for the income to be large enough to permit their undertaking a home-ownership mortgage, when present costs are barely within the reach of the top income third of the population.

Actually "high-income" families comprise only one-fifth of the total population of the Project. "Low-income" families still predominate; and among these, broken families and families with a partially disabled wage-earner are on the increase. As already suggested, this may be desirable beyond

¹ Rose, Albert, Regent Park. University of Toronto Press; Toronto; 1958; p. 189.
argument. It may be, in other words, that these families, if they were forced to depend on "what they can find around the city"—meaning namely what they can afford (the various expediencies and inadequacies which have been revealed so clearly in the evidence of the original applications)—would be the most ill-housed families in the community. It is this situation which Little Mountain is designed to avoid. On the other hand, it is necessary to consider in an enlightened vein the claim of large families to low-rental housing privileges. In other words, the balance of the various low-income groups in the community continues to demand review. The facts are rarely sufficiently available, but public housing projects are highly important barometers. Vancouver is not yet accustomed to the social welfare resources which it has now established, and is in process of expanding. The present survey is only a beginning in what should become a series of studies, coordinated with the Community Chest (just about to establish its own research department), the Social Services Departments of the City of Vancouver and adjacent municipalities, and other health and welfare agencies.

One suggestion is closely related to the rent-scale and to the admission policy. Given an eligibility "frame" of minimum and maximum incomes, there is still a lot of room for manoeuvre within the admissions policy. In the first years of

---

the Project, the policy was to admit low-income families in relatively small numbers, but not to admit families who were supported by social allowance. This policy has been changing to allow a heavier proportion of low-income tenants and to allow some social allowance recipients. The increase in numbers of broken homes (only one parent) is an indication of this. Some people believe this has lowered the tone of the Project. Some of the higher income groups favour a return to the stricter admission policies to "keep out the riff-raff." The higher income group also sees as desirable a downward revision of rents or at least the fixing of a maximum rent which would not increase beyond a certain amount even if income did increase.

A number of people, both retired couples and younger couples, objected to a ruling affecting mostly older couples. According to this rule, if one of the couple dies, the survivor must move out because Little Mountain has no facilities for single persons. The retired couples interviewed in this study feel that their present suite is "home," and they want to stay where they are until they die. Rules do not permit this. The rationale for this ruling must be that with such a severe housing shortage it would be wasteful to permit the survivor to occupy living space which could house two persons. The latest rent-scale revision from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation includes income eligibility figures and rent amounts for single persons, so it is to be hoped that a more humane policy will become acceptable for Orchard Park.
Landlord and Tenant Relations

Landlord and tenant "relations" in general implies a certain amount of responsibility on the part of both. The relations between a public Housing Authority and its tenants clearly raise special aspects of this and are no exception. It may be well, at the outset, to refer separately to matters which are more directly the "business side" of the equation, and those which belong to the "human side." Both, of course, are important aspects of good management.

For the protection of both parties, it is necessary to define in detail the responsibilities of both. This is done by means of the lease, a legal document requiring the signatures of the tenant and representatives of the Housing Authority. Responsibilities, however, begin before the signing of the lease. In completing an application for housing income-statement, the prospective tenant undertakes responsibility for the accuracy of the information he is giving. The Authority undertakes responsibility for the proper use of that confidential information. It is the Authority's responsibility to be sure that tenants understand the terms and importance of all documents they sign, including the lease agreement. The lease includes responsibility of the tenants to give notice before vacating the dwelling and terminating the lease. The amount of rent and the place and time of payment are also spelled out. Normal wear and tear is officially recognized and approved by the lease, even though it is not defined. The tenant is forbidden to sublet any portion of the dwelling or to take in lodgers or roomers. He
may not make alterations or improvements. He is required to take good care of plumbing, heating, lighting, and refrigerating equipment, and must pay for repairs other than those occasioned by normal wear and tear. The tenant is held responsible for window breakage. To give weight to administrative rulings, to make it possible to enforce them, the Authority collects a deposit from new tenants. When the tenant gives notice for termination of tenancy, the dwelling is inspected. If the premises have not been abused but show normal wear and tear only, the deposit is returned to the tenant.

The Authority, too, must give notice if it desires to terminate the lease, to evict the tenant. The Authority is responsible for "landlord" repair. This covers normal wear and tear, the breakdown of equipment for causes not traceable to tenants' abuse or neglect, for breakage not caused by tenants.

Tenants may not keep dogs or cats and may keep birds only with the permission of the manager. This ruling about pets undoubtedly causes concern and some hardship. What is the family to do with its dog or cat when it enters Little Mountain? The stereotype runs, "what is a boy without a dog?" It could be said, "what is a child without a kitten?" There are, on the other hand, the obvious sanitary objections against the shared use of the same lawns by dogs and people. It is to be noted that forbidding of pets is not a universal ruling in public housing projects. With a few definite rules, the Seattle Housing
Authority is completely permissive.¹

Tenants' rights became a major issue in Toronto's Regent Park² on the subject of television. It was perhaps more of a novelty in 1950. According to the Rules and Regulations, outside TV antennae were prohibited; they made an unsightly appearance, and TV itself was not for the underprivileged, suggested some of the critics. It was argued by others that a family's income should be available for any expenditure they wanted to make providing their rent was paid. The wheels of progress could not be halted, however; television antennae of all descriptions sprouted from roofs overnight like mushrooms after a rain. In the interests of safety and appearance, the Authority did what had been earlier requested and permitted the installation of a master antenna to which tenants in each building could connect. Thus, television came to public housing.³

In this unpleasant fashion the Toronto Housing Authority

¹ Seattle Housing Authority, Your Guide to Living at Yesler Terrace, p. 5. "You may keep a dog or cat but first get a Pet Permit from the office (as required by your lease), and be sure your pet is licensed as required by City Ordinance. Keep your pets indoor at night and remember that Seattle's Leash Law requires all dogs to be on leash when they are off your own premises."


³ This was still a sticking point with C.M.H.C. at the time of Little Mountain construction and no master antennae were installed. Later, however, the Authority concluded a contract with a private firm, agreeing that no other firm should be permitted to erect antennae and that tenants would be prevented from erecting them privately. Eight master antennae now sprout from Little Mountain roofs. Some tenants object to hookup charges because they can get good reception of two or three channels by use of so-called "rabbit ear" antennae.
discovered that the right of tenants to decide how to spend their money can be circumscribed only to an extent.

**Maintenance and Appearance**

Maintenance is an important issue in public housing management, and there are two schools of thought— one, that to secure efficiency all work should be done by paid staff; the other, that cooperation in some kinds of maintenance (e.g., cleaning, gardening) develops the interest and "sense of belonging" of tenants and also helps to keep down costs.

It may be argued that public housing is "on parade" constantly; it should be kept neat and clean as part of public relations. Perhaps the public shows little direct interest in public housing projects and is unaware of the level of project "housekeeping." But this could be developed. Some public housing projects in U.S. cities are proudly advertised "show-places" in the community. Naturally this demands a budget and a considerable amount of cooperation. The Parks Board could be an invaluable ally in supplying advice and perhaps plantings to make a housing project a real advertisement. Certainly, such a programme could not hope to be successful without the involvement of the tenants. At Little Mountain, budget mindedness prevailed and original landscaping plans were cut back a number of times with present landscaping provided for in the "shoe-string" construction budget. Maintenance of the grounds is handled by the regular maintenance crew, and tenant involvement is minimally represented by a few flower-box and door-step plantings.
At Little Mountain, the resident maintenance staff takes care of a number of repairs which are within their scope as regards tools and skills. Plumbing stoppages, lock replacements, the repair of broken windows are typical of jobs handled by the maintenance staff. Commercial repair companies take care of furnace and refrigerator repair.

Naturally, the degree of maintenance varies according to the kind of accommodation. The row houses come closer to being self-contained units. These are two story buildings with basement to attic. Each row-house tenant has responsibility for his entire living unit, including its own independent heating plant and refrigerator. In the apartment blocks, front and rear entrance halls are common to all tenants in the block. Refrigerator and heating devices both run from central units. Because of these facilities in common, the Authority takes responsibility for more of the maintenance, and the Authority's maintenance crews take care of cleaning the basements and entrance halls.

Table 6 shows the maintenance record for a typical year of Project operation. Averaged out, these 553 calls represent about two and one-half calls per living unit (or one call per unit each four and one-half months). On the whole, this is a very good record and falls down only in regard to window breakage for which about $20.00 per month must be budgetted for glass (labour not included). This is much the same situation as obtained in schools, also places with a high child population,
where glass breakage is looked on as a natural consequence. Some of this glass breakage represents the seeking of the neglected child for attention. Some, too, represents the aggressive expression of a wrathful child striking back at playmates who exclude him, parents who dominate him, or authority in general.

A small amount of breakage is due to children who do not live in the Project. The manager states that frequently older children breaking a window during ball playing may take up an on-the-spot collection and bring him thirty-five cents. This does not cover the cost, but is appreciated as an expression quite in contrast to wilful breakage. This same remarkable consideration is shown by some 'teen-agers who, in springtime, come to ask if

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric stoves</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locks (replaced)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows (charged to accidents)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerators</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light fixtures, etc.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water tanks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry tray cracks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>553</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a grassy plot is dry enough not to be mired by their first baseball games. Most of the wilful destruction is done by small children, five to eleven years old, who are not well supervised. Sometimes, wired glass panes are used to replace panes broken too often; and when even these are methodically hammered out, a sheet of plywood is tried. Admittedly, this sort of thing, though troublesome, is rare.

General Facilities

It was difficult for many of the persons interviewed in the survey to voice any opinions that sounded critical of any aspect of the Project. This seemed to be true whether the opinion had to do with the living unit, the grounds, the neighbours, or the management. Asking for suggestions for improving any future projects was a more successful technique in eliciting usable criticism. Replies group, generally, around three aspects of Little Mountain and public housing. These are (a) interior design, (b) exterior design, and (c) policy. They will be discussed below.

(a) Interior Design: This subject separates into two parts, living units not requiring structural change, and improvements to be incorporated into plans for new projects. About half (23 persons) say that more frequent interior redecorating is necessary. Knowledge of the ways in which efficient house design can simplify housekeeping is expressed when housewives say they want a truly washable enamel wall finish and linoleum on children's bedroom floors. Some housewives who prefer large
quantity buying feel that a larger refrigerator is desirable. Many tenants think that exterior doors are drafty but say that a little weather stripping would solve the problem. One mother suggests that the usefulness of basements could be increased by a partition between laundry and play area.

Design and layout deficiencies seen by the mothers include the desire for more space and a desire for different room arrangement. These problems inter-relate and also relate to the need for "cost-trimming" which was uppermost at the time the Project was planned. Where one room can be enlarged by reducing the size of another, the relocation of a wall at the planning stage may not cost much. However, costs will be increased if the size of all or most rooms must be increased and none may be made smaller. From responses to the questionnaire it is evident that an increase in total size of living units would be desirable. Many women suggest that they would prefer larger basement storage, larger bedrooms, larger bathrooms, and larger kitchens. The expressed need for a larger kitchen is related to the curious desire of many families to maintain one room for company entertaining. The family, living in a row house, eats in the kitchen although room size and layout do not provide room for a kitchen table and chairs. The dining room is saved for company. This is reminiscent of the New England "front parlor" and the Scandinavian "finrum."

Another "layout" deficiency is seen, by many mothers, in the location of the bathroom relative to front or back door.
Little children playing outside must track through the living room, and in row houses, must climb the stairs, too. Ideal design, but quite beyond reasonable desire in public housing, would provide a second water-closet and wash basin on the ground floor close to the entry.

Choice and use of materials is involved in another group of suggestions. These again seem to relate to "economy" oriented designing. "Dry-wall" construction, lack of sound-proofing, window-sash design, and absence of a living-room door are frequently seen as undesirable by tenants. Preventing the transmission of noises through walls (or floors) requires a more costly method of construction. Nevertheless, the family may have a right not to be disturbed by the neighbour's noises. "Dry-wall" or gypsum board construction with seams "taped and spackled" is lower cost than "hard plaster" walls. However, the deteriorated appearance of these taped seams when they have cracked open is one of the housewives' most frequent complaints because it defies all efforts to "make the place look nice."

The difficulty of cleaning the windows is another housekeepers' plaint. The metal window-sash in use at Little Mountain open out in a casement style; and from inside, it is almost impossible to clean the outside of the windows.

(b) **Exterior Design**: Exterior to the living units, the most frequent expression concerns the need for outside clotheslines. Many housewives feel the lack of outside drying lines as a real hardship and say, "Clothes dried outside in the sun smell so
good." Many housewives comment on the need for better facilities for drying clothes; in fact, this lack is voiced more often than any other and includes the need for better facilities indoors as well as outdoors. Clothes hung in the basement dry eventually, but two or three days is too long for a child's overalls to be drying when wardrobes are limited. Admittedly, lines full of washing may spoil the looks of a place, but the need is there and cannot be answered by saying arbitrarily that no laundry is to be hung outside. Umbrella-type clothes drying racks and collapsible clothes-horses are permitted outside, but obviously cannot fill the need for an active family.

Play facilities for older children and leisure time facilities for adults are considered almost as important. Definite recognized needs include such items as supervised playgrounds, ball fields for boys, sunbathing roof, and a community hall with games rooms and workshop.

Although not many people saw them as needs, certain items seem to be very important and could and should be effected at Little Mountain. A group of them is easily seen as arising from a feature of the Project design which the architects (and many housing experts) see as a distinct advantage. Unquestionably, buildings can be grouped more attractively and children can be protected more easily from automobiles if existing streets are vacated and no streets run through the Project. This is a pleasant feature of Little Mountain design, but it does create certain problems. Street lighting was
previously a city responsibility; but with normal street patterns halting at Project boundaries, the responsibility for lighting the meandering "walks" (which replaced streets) is with the Authority. Low light standards were provided, and these soon fell prey to vandalism; so some better provision is needed. With street patterns not holding inside the Project, it is very difficult for guests and delivery men to find addresses. More and better street signs and better-located house numbers would not completely solve the problem but would help. Closely related to this is the need for reorganization of parking areas and garbage facilities. This is largely a motorized culture with guests arriving by automobile. But it is often only the backdoors that are accessible from the automobile. Street disruption in the Project makes it difficult for the guest to drive his automobile close to the home of his host. A shortage of parking spaces makes it impossible or at least difficult for the guest to park at this nearest point; and when he alights from his vehicle, he has to walk past the garbage-can enclosures which are frequently very untidy.

Only one of the sample families suggest that private yards for row houses might be desirable. This is perhaps one of the most satisfying features of row houses and has been increasingly developed by British and Scandinavian public housing designers. Little Mountain tenants agree, almost unanimously, that row houses are more private and soundproof than apartments as regards living inside the unit. However, they seem unaware that through careful fencing and planting, a similar privacy
might be extended beyond the house walls. The one woman who suggests a private yard does so because she would like to be able to have grass and flowers: "with things as they are," the children trample them.

A few of the suggestions about "exterior design" apply to things which are fixed in the design and layout of the Project. They are seen, by tenants, as requiring consideration in the planning of any new projects. Again, some of these deficiencies seem to arise out of "economy-mindedness." Present locations of furnace rooms and incinerators is undesirable. Instead of being housed in a separate building, the furnace rooms serving a group of buildings are built into the basements of apartment buildings. About one in thirty suites is located directly over the furnace room and is subjected to the discomfort of high temperatures which can be controlled only by opening windows. Incinerators, too, are located adjacent to living units. When they are open (which is often) for charging with more garbage, the smoke and fumes frequently find their way into the homes.

Several people think that the row houses at Little Mountain are ugly but would look better if they conformed to the style of the apartment blocks. Some people feel that a new project should include more row houses and fewer apartment blocks. This suggestion comes more frequently from families with children. Retired couples like the apartments but feel they would rather live on a separate project where children wouldn't annoy. Some
of the families with children agree that older people should be housed separately. The desire for privacy reaches an extreme in the suggestion that more future projects should be separate houses like the Fraserview-Veterans Project.

(c) **Policy:** In conclusion, a few suggestions with managerial implications may be brought together here. One was that the Authority should have the apartment cleaned after one tenant vacates and before another tenant moves in. At present, tenants who vacate are expected to leave the apartment "as clean as they found it." Perhaps this business of cleanliness is largely subjective, so that the tenant's judgment is the only criterion. This is the setting, out of which the complaint or suggestion grew--a succession of tenants each one leaving the apartment slightly dirtier than before. It is an interesting trait of certain women when leaving any apartment, to clean meticulously so that no one can criticize them in their absence. These women seem to be the ones who clean, with equal determination, every square inch of any new housing they occupy before they can settle down.

Television antennae provoked one suggestion. This family suggests that each family should be permitted to erect their own. At present Little Mountain Project provides a master antenna to which the tenant may connect. This tenant feels the fee is too high. The Regent Park experience, referred to earlier, shows the danger involved in a negative policy situation. On the other hand the monopoly given by the Authority to some "antennae
entrepreneur" may be financially unfair to tenants.

One person suggests that a night-watchman is needed to patrol the grounds. This may relate to the lack of adequate lighting mentioned. It may also have some connection with the fact that clothing is sometimes stolen off the clothesline, as mentioned by another tenant. Two retired couples believe that "rowdies from outside" come into the Project to engage in vandalism and "petting parties." Certainly, the Project is considered as something "separate and apart" from the neighbourhood, and this may contribute to attitudes of groups of youths "outside." This is an aspect of community relations which could be improved by a community facility of the "neighbourhood house" variety. Even without such a facility, a social worker attached to the Project might help to lessen "distance" between the "Project" and the "outside." "Project" athletic teams meeting "outside" teams in league play at parks, community centres, or schools might help to break down the "segregation."
Chapter VI

HUMAN RESOURCES

The preceding chapter does not exhaust all the aspects of administration and social policy which arise when a public housing project is reviewed. Indeed, as is already evident from what has been set out in preceding chapters, it is hard to draw the line between "administration" and "welfare."

There is also another obligation in presenting the results of a survey--especially the first in a new project, such as this. This is the diversity rather than a simple consensus of views to be given consideration. What remains to be presented and discussed--further reactions and suggestions of the tenants, social and community needs, ways and means of meeting these--may well be regarded as matters of administration and social policy. They are presented under the present heading, however, partly because they are less unified, but particularly because they underline in conclusion the basic lesson of all good housing projects: that people are resources as well as tenants; and that public housing can be an element in community-building as well as a source of cost and expenditure (as, of course, all "public utilities" are).

Public housing is more than real estate operation, more than just renting houses. Apart, altogether, from the questions of community life referred to elsewhere, public housing management has to be more sensitive to tenants as people. This
is well reflected in a bulletin summarizing important British experience. This report says:

"Management must include far more than rent collection and the ordering of repairs, for unless some steps are taken so to educate the tenant as to secure his cooperation, the landlord striving to maintain his property, and the tenant destroying it by his neglect, will remain warring parties. Hence good management additionally postulates the application of skill in treating the person who is paying for the use of the commodity so that he, too, may do his share in preserving its value; it is in effect a form of social education and aims at teaching a new and inexperienced community to be "housing minded."\(^1\)

Reactions and Suggestions on Improvements

One of the ways to engage the tenants' interest is to invite him to talk about the Project, not only appreciatively but also critically if the latter can be encouraged. It is hardly surprising that many tenants were reluctant to express any adverse views at all, or that many required help or suggestion of specifics before they could enter into discussion of "what else might be done."

For a proper perspective on complaints and suggestions, it is only fair to record that the great majority of tenants in Little Mountain are pleased with the housing project. Some of them are overjoyed with it. It represents, for most, an overwhelming improvement in living conditions. Such suggestions, as came in response to careful questioning, deserve consideration at least for possible future projects (on which Vancouver is

already embarked). They may be useful, also, as guides to where present administration and social policy can be steered.

A majority of the people questioned say that the "appearance" of the Project is satisfactory. "Appearance," however, is a rather inclusive term and is made up of factors like building design, landscaping, care of grounds, etc. Building design has been mentioned, particularly the non-conforming appearance of the row houses and their intrinsic ugliness. By such answers many of the "satisfied" majority show they are not really satisfied. The landscaping considerably cut from the original rather lavish plan, was, nevertheless, "saved" by the Authority in minimum form, and put in at the time of construction. Young trees were planted and were protected by braces; some of these have been destroyed by thoughtless children. Here, too, the tenants show by their answers the nature of their concern with the "appearance." "It would be nice to have trees and places to sit, but what's the use? The kids would tear it up."

A few tenants who live along the unpaved lane adjacent to the private homes on Main Street say "the place (the lane) is a dust-bowl in summer and a mud-hole in winter." Many tenants have tried to improve their "own doorsteps" by planting a little grass and a few flowers. There has been no attempt to develop tenant responsibility for ground-keeping, except by the giving out of a few packets of flower seed. Probably some potential exists here, if the interviews are read with insight. Many tenants, when questioned, profess to believe that most people would cooperate and take pride in the appearance of the place
"if things were nicer." A tenant organization might, through group discussions, help improve the appearance of the Project by involving tenants in the care of the grounds. Better control of the children might also grow out of such tenant involvement.

That some proportion of tenants are motivated to "self-help" was shown by efforts at organization such as the co-operative kindergarten (no longer in operation), the Grouse Walk Library, involvement in P.T.A. at General Brock School and the flourishing Sunday School in one of the suites, already mentioned.

Could tenants be more involved in issues which come closer to management rather than social activities? There is a quid pro quo element here, which is not always perceived. In her basic articles on "Social Questions in Housing and Community Planning," written in 1951, Catherine Bauer sums up this issue in the following terms:

"... some degree of tenant maintenance is often desirable to keep rents down. But can tenants be persuaded to do such work, even in their own economic interest, if they are not given considerable freedom and overall responsibility at the same time? Just where is the fine line between regimentation and the kind of restriction on individual freedom that is unavoidable in any close-planned development? How can tenant participation and a normal democratic community life best be encouraged? Every kind of management policy is being tried out in our new big housing projects, public and private; and we should know more about the results."

---

There are indeed many different approaches to this issue, and experiments should not be beyond the capacity of the Little Mountain tenants. The need for a Tenant Association in the Regent Park slum-clearance project of Toronto has been voiced from several quarters as a means of better interpretation of the rent policy, already referred to; for the better expansion of recreational and social activities; for sheer "self-help" in morale—-the encouragement of feelings of independence and initiative.

Little Mountain does not have a Tenant Association; however, it could use one, and there are some signs of "self-help." Whether it could function without a club room is doubtful, but the idea deserves exploration. It would have difficulties to surmount at the start, and it might well need some skilled guidance. Experience in British and American projects has shown that the most valuable resource is a group worker who can help to encourage local leadership; the greatest danger is its distortion into a "pressure group"; and that the answer to this is to be sure that it has real and constructive "jobs to do" and the good will of the management if it wants to do them responsibly. A good tenant association could create a means of communication between management and tenants. The Authority already has a responsibility for one-way flow of communiques on various important policy matters at least. Flow in the opposite direction, from tenant to landlord, is difficult without the active encouragement of the Authority in setting up channels or demonstrating a willingness to listen. These
channels must be such as to encourage the contribution of even the most timid. Through a Tenant Association, tenants can gain a certain anonymity which emboldens them to make suggestions.

Newcomers to the Project

Project dwellers have all moved, and so require some time to become settled in their new surroundings. As tenants represent different socio-economic groupings coming from all over the city, they have additional adjustment in respect to neighbour relationships, customs, and attitudes. Welfare problems of various kinds clearly do exist or may arise. Such matters as child care or school relationships could be better handled with professional help. The importance of opportunities for group "get-togethers" and discussions, the uses to which a hall or building could be put--it is more than a "place where people can meet"--need hardly be stressed. All these, and similar considerations, point to the desirability of a social worker as a member of the Authority staff.

"Welcoming the tenant to the Project" and "teaching him to respect the property and conserve it" are phrases which recur in a number of writings about public housing management. They are not so easy to apply as they sound. Connotations for these phrases may include images of the genial manager meeting the tenant at the open door of the new suite and ushering him in with bows; smiling white-aproned home economists demonstrating recipes and housekeeping shortcuts. In practice, however, the
annual budget may be a constant condensor focusing these vague but pleasant images into a few reasonable economical procedures. The necessity for holding down costs limits the sort of welcoming the landlord can give his tenant. The Authority's first chance to give tenants a helpful orientation to the Project and public housing is the application. Thoughtful wording of the application and an introductory paragraph on its purpose might help the applicant to understand the reasons for the questions and the values of public housing. On the other hand, the applicant has plenty of initial motivation, a desire to get out of his present housing and into the Project. Nothing in the way of a "sales pitch" is needed. Perhaps all that is necessary is a minimum of fact-eliciting questions in a minimum of words. The tenant's excitement may prevent him from absorbing anything more. The Vancouver Housing Authority follows the lead of Central Mortgage and Housing in a simple and business-like application form.

The second opportunity is the occasion of the inspection of the applicant's existing housing (before he became a V.H.A. tenant). Many authorities believe it is important that the person who makes the inspection be the same person who will see the applicant about any social problems after he enters the Project. This is to take advantage of the earliest possible opportunity for furthering a helpful relationship. The secretary-manager of the Vancouver Housing Authority has, in the past, made some inspections of the housing of applicants; however, with subsequent additions to his duties and the inclusion of a second housing project under his management, he no longer
does these inspections.

The third orientation opportunity is the tenant's arrival at the Project on moving-in day. The tenant goes to the Authority's office, signs the lease, receives his keys, and a "Tenant's Handbook." To be sure, this approach protects the tenant's independence and individuality. He is not smothered with regulations and tied with strings of dependency to the apron of management. However, this approach does not take into account differences in background nor the possibility of lack of experience with the modern facilities for living. If some tenants "bring their slums with them" as it is still frequently alleged, it may be because they were never helped to "leave the slum behind." The "Tenant's Handbook" gives some help with suggestions for the techniques of adequate housekeeping. The printed word, however, fails to get across to some people. This is well recognized by educators and it has come to be increasingly recognized by some public housing experts. But how is it to be implemented? By the same token, what should be done for "the difficult tenant"? It is not sufficient to warn tenants that unless housekeeping standards improve, he may be asked to leave. True, the tenant's housekeeping may improve on this basis, but the proper relationship between landlord and tenant has not been furthered. Can constructive help be given? There is little doubt that it can be only if (a) there is some person-to-person relationship between a tenant (preferably his family) and the representative of the Authority; or (b) if some kind of group or cooperative education is developed. This is part of the
argument for employing social workers as part of a public housing staff.

The welfare aspects of Little Mountain call for some challenging thinking on another point, because this "pilot project," as it was widely referred to at the beginning, differs fundamentally from traditional slum clearance on the matter of location.

Little Mountain Project was not directly associated with demolition of slums. Little Mountain tenants are not people who were moved en masse to strange new housing in the same old neighbourhood when their old houses were destroyed. Even so, they are people who have moved, who have left behind associations and friends, housing and stores, etc., which, though often inadequate, were nevertheless familiar. There is the alternative possibility that they have never experienced a defined, helpful "neighbourhood" at all—that an isolated pocket of decrepit housing, a room, a basement suite, has been their only "urban" experience! Their first impression of the new life is the Project rather than a new neighbourhood.¹ For the mother of small children, the wide-open spaces of Little

¹ The lack of defined and planned neighbourhoods can hardly be blamed on the Vancouver Housing Authority. It is all too characteristic of Vancouver generally; it happens to be particularly true of the section near Main Street in which the Project is located. The jumble of streets around Cartier Park and west of Mountain View Cemetery is almost typical of the "higgledy-piggledy" way Vancouver has grown. On the other hand the improvements arising from the development of an old quarry into Queen Elizabeth Park are a tribute to the new approach to city amenities and a real asset for the Project.
Mountain, the bewildering similarity of the buildings, the disruption of normal "blocks and streets" pattern might be threatening as she tried to keep track of a wandering two-year old. In the old neighbourhood, filled as it might have been with junkyards, industrial hazards, or busy streets, the dangers were at least familiar. The absence in the Project of fences or boundaries of any sort, the presence of hordes of children of all ages, and the impossibility of sequestering one's own children, are all facts that are experienced by the newly arrived mother as a shock. She cannot send other children away, nor can she limit her own to "their own backyard," when no distinguishable backyard exists.

With new tenants coming from a variety of low-grade rentals, there may be many welfare problems. The families may not have any furniture. (This was a problem for many of the tenants, revealed frequently in the survey.) What furniture there is may be infested with vermin; the children may have inadequate clothing; health problems may have been ignored because of the pressures of living in substandard dwellings. Having moved into larger, brighter, unfurnished housing in the midst of other people now well adjusted to it, may bring many of the family's problems into sudden sharp, painful focus. For many of the families interviewed, rent was higher in the Project than it was where they had lived before. True, it was better housing, but it cost more, and this was made even more apparent by the sudden need for new equipment occasioned by the move. If one has no windows, one needs no curtains. Merely rehousing these
people does not solve all problems.¹

For older families, too, the move meant disruption of familiar patterns of living. Much has been said, in various writings about housing, about the desirability of a heterogeneous project population; a mixed or balanced community, it might better be termed. Old people, it is claimed, need younger people and want to be amongst them. The gay sound of children's voices, the vitality of 'teen-agers, the vigor and purpose of young married couples are said to help the old to retain an interest in living, an identification with a vital, productive world in a way which adds "years to their lives, and life to their years." At Little Mountain, almost all the retired couples were grouped together in several blocks of one-bedroom apartments. Despite this grouping, retired families who were questioned said the children's normal noise was a constant bother, some children "deliberately annoyed them" at times, and some pulled up the flowers in the flower boxes.

"Difficult" Families

A very great deal depends upon how tenants are treated, or at least on what assumptions are made about them. If they are treated as "riff-raff" (that is, as "inferior" or "insensitive")

¹ Aronvici, Carol, Houses for the Masses, J. Wiley and Sons; New York; 1939; p. 243. "The poor live in slums, but slums alone do not make the poor. Low-income is caused by other conditions. These same people moved to palaces or the most expensive elevator apartments in any city, would still remain poor and without the means of caring for their sick, without the proper means for educational development or recreational facilities. They would still have to be supplied with the many services for which they could not pay."
they may respond in that way. Most serious writing about public housing management has realized that uneducable or "undesirable" tenants make up a very small percentage of the population, even in projects which are part of direct slum-clearance programmes.\(^1\) The mere removal of families from deficient housing into adequate housing frequently produces a great improvement in living practices and housekeeping standards, given a little time for "settling down." For some housewives the very possibility of being able to keep the house clean is sufficient encouragement to do so. But it is not enough for some. For them, the example of neighbours who are careful housekeepers may not suffice to teach them what a desirable level of housekeeping is. That is not to say that they are deliberately dirty or destructive; but they are not sufficiently conscious of other standards of social pressure to raise their own.\(^2\) With these families, someone must take time and patience and have a knowledge of human behaviour to help them to develop living

---

1 Bauer, Catherine, *A Citizen's Guide to Public Housing.* Vassar College; Poughkeepsie, N.-Y.; 1940; p. 54. "In European countries with long housing experience, the proportion of "uneducable" tenants who eventually have to be moved out of housing projects is never quoted at higher than five per cent, and this only in special cases. Certainly, one must expect to find a small proportion of shiftless families with no instinct for decent housekeeping in all income groups."

2 Mackintosh, James Macalister, *Housing and the Family.* Cassell; London; 1952; p. 26. "When all is said and done, a great many of these tenants have not had a chance. They are ignorant, and no one takes the trouble to teach them: they are dumped into council houses which are all strange and new, and no one explains to them how the houses and their fittings work." This is not necessarily true of Little Mountain, but the wisdom bears repetition.
habits which will make them acceptable neighbours and tenants.

The techniques of being a good neighbour are not instinctive equipment and are not always easily learned. A large part of the families in the sample surveyed showed that relationships between the family's children and neighbours' children were a very sensitive area. Furthermore, the mothers were frequently drawn into conflicts which had started between children. The behaviour of the children is most often a critical issue in the inter-family relations in a housing project. In this matter, the attitude of management toward the children and parents is important. If children were regarded by management as "poorly brought up," and in need of sharp rebuke and critical correction, communication between manager and parent could become impossible, and neighbourhood morale would deteriorate further. How to deal with the situation constructively, however, is not simple, nor are there any overnight miracles.

In the Little Mountain project, there are a certain number of "problem" or "difficult" families and children. Their extent is not too great: seemingly less than five per cent of the population presenting temporary problems at any one time but more than two per cent with more permanent types of problems. Though concern with "problem families" is often far out of proportion to their numbers, it is certain that they do have an effect on Project living. The problems these families have are not just such things as noisy parties, poor housekeeping or
failure to abide by Project regulations although these can irritate badly; but rather involve a more serious and ramifying type of family problem. Alcoholism of one or both parents, desertion of a breadwinner and mental illness are examples. All of these have further effects on the children in the family.

These problems are inevitably directed to the attention of the manager. When rent is not paid, he must look into the situation. He may be drawn in by a call from the school principal about one of the Project's children. He may hear complaints from neighbours or from people in the areas around the Project. To handle these problems, he needs not only a knowledge of the welfare services available in a community and the procedures of referral to them, but must continually judge whether he, himself, can be of service and the appropriate extent of this service.

It is well known that children often reflect problems that exist in their homes. This may be through withdrawal or through aggression. The quiet, withdrawn child may never come to attention the way the aggressive one often does in the Project; moreover, ideally, services should be available to help these children, but this is not always possible. The aggressive child, lacking a responsible parent or being under great tension and needing attention himself, may often become uncontrolled in his play and cause much property damage. While young children may react in this manner, the adolescent may gravitate to a gang with the potential for more serious types of delinquency. Children
before the courts are not unknown in the Project, and "near-
delinquency" is certain to come to the manager's attention from
time to time. Public housing experience has developed solutions
to these multiple problems by employing social workers--both
caseworkers and group workers--as part of the managerial staff.
A good manager, perhaps, will always be "part social worker,"
but he must primarily be the business manager. What is needed
is assistance to cope efficiently with the load. It is the
critical matter of intra-family attitudes and inter-family
relationships which is the special skill of the social worker.
Housing management may require so much time that the manager is
unable to function in a socially corrective way. However, the
manager needs some orientation in social problems as he is
always bound to receive some of them.¹

A social worker could perform many very important
services in connection with Little Mountain, ranging all the way
from referrals (schools, hospitals, social assistance, etc.) in
serious cases, to providing outlets for tenants who "just want
to talk things over." Some needed functions it must be
remembered--in recreation and education, for example--have been

¹ American practice favours social work staff as professional
persons in their own right while Britain has developed two schools
of thought. In Britain, the Society of Housing Managers (the
Octavia Hill "school") believes that social work and business can
be and should be combined; that rent collection is a social work
job when the head of the house is out of work. The Institute of
Housing believes that business and social service should be
separated and that social service should be entrusted solely to
social workers where the size of the housing operation makes this
possible. Other courses of study, having considerable content
with social problems, have been developed for housing managers.
left unfilled. It is clear that a business-like approach is essential and that use of a business approach helps to prevent some little problems from developing into big ones. Nevertheless, in public housing there are some problems which demand the attention of professional skills. There are also many very "normal" activities which can flourish with the little guidance that can only come because a helper is "always there."

Policies change in public housing, as in other fields. Some of these policy changes can be communicated directly and will not produce much resistance. Other changes will require some interpretation and some chance for "blow-back," opportunity for emotional reaction. Some of the policies which have provoked much emotional response were the wider entrance eligibility requirements which permitted lower income people to enter; requiring the surviving partner of the childless couple to move out after the death of the spouse; and inclusion of Family Allowance in income-rent computations. A social worker can learn from tenants which of these things really rankle; and by letting the tenant express resentment, the social worker can help prepare the tenant to accept the correct interpretation. Some complaints, when related to malfunctions of the physical equipment of housing, may produce no emotional reaction; others, when they relate to the "family next door" or "those little brats over on the other walk" may be highly charged. Poor "housekeeping" is a sensitive area, and slovenly or careless housekeepers may be entrenched and confirmed in careless ways by an unskilled approach.
The social worker—if he is not swamped by too much work!—can act as an enabler of community organization, to help tenants bring about some self-government or "association" efforts with a constructive orientation to management, and not only to the Project but to the neighbourhood and wider community. Given a chance to "feel its feet," such an "association" might be able to handle matters such as volunteer staffing of a children's play-room, educational discussions of "how to bring up a 'teen-ager," or better cooking and furnishing. It could welcome "visitors" to help integrate the Project into the larger community. This is perhaps expecting too much from one social worker and perhaps two would be necessary—one for family welfare and one for group and community work.

Implications for the Future

Little Mountain is the first public housing project of the Vancouver Housing Authority; already Orchard Park is a functioning reality; Strathcona redevelopment has been approved; projects will, doubtless, be planned for Vancouver in the future. Can we learn enough from experience? There is a challenge here—to accept what has been abundantly evidenced here, that public housing is a vital element in social welfare if we are willing to work to make it so.
Appendix A

The "Progressive" (Adjusted Proportional) Rent-Scale

Extract from Rents for Regent Park: A Rent-Scale System for a Public Housing Project, by Humphrey Carver and Alison Hopwood (published by Civic Advisory Council, City of Toronto, 1948), pp. 38-41.

''... there are two basic principles on which a range of rents can be established. Either the rents of the dwelling units themselves can be graded to give rents at all levels (the English "standard" rent system) or else rents can be based on each household's ability to pay. The former system does not seem to be applicable within a single project (such as Regent Park) because the differences in the quality of accommodation of the same size are not sufficient to justify the fixed differences in rent, nor does such a system provide for sufficient flexibility. It seems inevitable, therefore, that the rent of each dwelling will have to be adjusted to the occupants' ability to pay. This is the English "differential" rent system and the American "proportional" rent system. Our particular problem is to devise an application of this principle which has the merits of simplicity, justice and intelligibility. To achieve these merits some compromises are necessary; a system which sought to obtain the very finest adjustments in the interest of justice might become so complicated that it would be beyond the comprehension of the tenants and the public in general and would become a nuisance to the management of a project. To obtain the greatest co-operation between tenants and management, each tenant must understand the basis on which he and his neighbours are assessed. Furthermore the rent system must be explicable in brief and simple forms to the taxpayers who support the project and to the members of the City Council, to whom the Housing Authority reports...

... After a study of rent systems in other countries and with all the foregoing considerations in mind, a rent scale has been devised which incorporates the following features:

(1) Adjustment to family size and income, in conformity with the aims of English and Australian rent rebates and American proportional rents.

(2) The recognition of a minimum standard of living, comparable with the "subsistence minimum" used by some English authorities and the "basic wage" in Australia.
(3) The progressive application of subsidies so that a greater degree of rent relief may be granted in the lower ranges of income, in accordance with a system used by the National Capital Housing Authority (Washington, D. C.).

In drawing up the rent scale it has been necessary to establish some starting point. This has been provided by the Toronto Welfare Council's minimum family budget as published for May, 1947. This budget for a family of five (parents and three children) totals $172.48 and allows $33 for rent; it is designed for a family with children of stated ages, and adjusted to the current living costs. For the purposes of a rental scale no such exactitude is possible or desirable. It is sufficiently accurate to say that a family of five, with an income of $175 a month, can afford to pay $35 for rent. This is exactly one-fifth of the family income. Comparable figures referred to as "budget incomes" and "budget rents" have been set for families of other sizes as follows:

Monthly Income Required to Meet Minimum Standard of Living of the Toronto Welfare Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family of</th>
<th>Budget Income</th>
<th>Budget Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Persons</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Persons</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Persons</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Persons</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Persons</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Persons</td>
<td>$225</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is accepted that below these income levels families cannot pay 20 per cent of their income for rent and also meet the costs of a decent standard of living. Therefore the families with incomes inadequate to meet the prescribed standard of living are not required to pay as much as 20 per cent of their income for rent. The proportions of their income to be paid in rent is decreasingly smaller, reaching a point at which the rent charged by the public housing authority should be merely nominal. It is proposed that this should be achieved by

(1) subtracting $1 from the budget rent for each $5 decrease of income,
(2) subtracting an additional $1 for each $25 decrease of income.

It will be observed that the first of these two adjustments alone would maintain a 20 per cent ratio between rent and income, while the second adjustment makes the ratio of rent and income increasingly smaller as incomes fall further below the "budget income" levels.

While it is generally contended that at any economic
level a family should not have to pay more than 20 per cent of income for rent, it is proposed here that the progressive feature of the rent scale should operate both above and below the "budget income" levels. In other words it is suggested that higher income families in the housing project should pay an increasingly larger proportion of their income for rent. This is intended to meet certain requirements of public housing in general and of the Regent Park project in particular. It must be continually emphasized that public housing, with rents reduced by subsidy, is intended to benefit families which cannot pay the commercial rents of decent accommodation. On that account the rent system of a public housing project should incorporate some feature which will exclude families who can afford commercial rents, or at least exclude them from the benefit of subsidies. In the United States this has been done by the imposition of an income "ceiling"; by this means families with more than a specified income are not admitted as tenants or have to leave the project if their income rises above the ceiling level . . . while no definite income ceiling can be imposed it is thought that the rents of the higher income families re-housed should approximate more and more closely with commercial rents. It is also considered desirable to encourage these families to seek private housing and leave the public housing project for the occupation of families which are particularly in need of low-rental housing. It is thought that the progressive feature of the rent scale would introduce a kind of "soft" ceiling by means of which higher income families would not be excluded by an arbitrary regulation but would feel economic pressures persuading them to move out of a public housing project."
Appendix B: The Questionnaire

LITTLE MOUNTAIN SURVEY

Please be assured that all information is confidential and nobody will be quoted by name.

This study is being conducted by Social Work students from the University, and is not an official study of the Vancouver Housing Authority, or of the Central Mortgage.

(a) LIVING ACCOMMODATION (YOUR SUITE)

First of all, we want to know what you think about your new place, and how it compares with what you were living in before you came here.

1. More space than before? ........... Enough for everybody? ................

2. What things do you like best about it? (e.g., cleanliness, colour, light, well-heated, space, etc.) .........

3. What took the most "getting used to"?

4. Are there still some things you find strange?

5. How did things work out about furniture? 

   Also curtains, kitchen equipment etc.? ..............

6. Special Points about: (Compared with other place)

   (1) Cooking (stove etc.) ............

   (2) Food storage (and refrig.) ............

   (3) Meal preparation ................

   (4) Eating space ................

   (5) Hot water (washing, bathing) ....

   (6) Bathroom, toilet etc. ............

   (7) Bedrooms ................

   (8) House cleaning ................

   (9) Storage ................

   (10) Other ................

Do you feel you can really take pride in the place? ..............
(b) FAMILY LIVING

(a) Recreation, Hobbies, Entertaining, etc. (In your Apartment, or Within the Project)

1. Any special hobbies or sports in your family?
   (a) Adults ........................................... (b) Youngsters ...........................................

2. Can they be carried on here easily or not? ........ Better than before? ........
   ........ (a) Adults ........................................... (b) Youngsters ...........................................

3. Do your friends or family visit you at your new place?
   (a) Adults ........................................... (b) Youngsters (yours? ....... other people's .......)

4. Much radio? ........ record player ........ T.V. ........

5. Do neighbour's noises bother you? ............................ How soundproof are the units? ........

6. Do you have more privacy here than in the previous place(s)? ........
   ........ Do you like it, or do you feel a bit "cut off"?

(b) Social Activities Outside the House

1. What recreations do you most do together (parents and children)
   Weekdays ........................................... weekends ........................................
   summer ........................................... (N.B.: other than T.V.)

2. Do you belong to any clubs, groups etc.:
   (a) Mother ........................................... (b) Father ...........................................
   (c) youngsters ...........................................

3. Do you get much of your social contacts through these clubs
   or Church ........................................... or other (old friends; work, etc.) .......

4. Could you do with a workshop or hobby centre, etc., .... Where? (in the
   basement, or a separate unit?) ........................................

5. Is there a need for a community centre or club room or a hall, here?
   .... Any particular groups? .........................
   Need for a P.T.A.? ......................... Would you like to join?

6. Would you like to know your fellow-tenants better (e.g., other mothers, working
   wives) ........................................... (Are there things you ought to get together about?)
(c) The Children

1. Do they spend more time at home than at the former place(s)..............
   or less. 

2. Do they get more attention from mother .... father ......................
   Comments? 

3. Any differences in school? .... Like it better? .... less ........
   Different school mates? .... Other comments .........................

4. Any differences in homework? ........ ........................................

5. Young children: how do you manage when shopping, etc. ................
   Any "baby sitting" problems? ..............................................

6. Is there enough play space for young children? ....................
   Where do they play? ....................................................
   Problems? 

7. Do the school-age children get enough sports etc., through school, Scouts, etc.? 

8. Would an organized playground (e.g. with sandbox, "jungle gym", etc.) be well
   used here? 

9. What about a volunteers' cooperative play-group, or day-care group? ....

(c) NEIGHBOURHOOD AND DISTRICT

Present Facilities

1. Are the schools convenient? Elementary .... High ....
   Nursery, kindergarten? .........................

2. Whereabouts do you do most of your grocery shopping? ........
   Is it far? .... Convenient? ........

3. Other kinds of shopping? .........................

4. How do you get on for church? ........

5. Any transportation problems? Father: work ...... other ....
   Mother? ...... Children? .........................

Comparisons

a. Which districts did you live in (Vancouver) before coming here? ....

b. Did you live in apt., rooms, house, other ..........

1. Are there things you miss in this (L.M.) district? ........

2. What things were you glad to leave in the old district (if any)? ....

3. Do you go back to the old district much? ........

4. Did you have many friends there? ...... if so, do they visit you here?
   often? ........

5. Do the children like this district? ........ or have any complaints?

6. Would you say you feel part of a new neighbourhood here?
   Or that you belong mostly to the project? ........
   (Would you call it a "community"?) .......
Family and Earnings:
(a) Size of your family ..........................................
(b) Any earners besides (yourself) (husband) ...................
(c) Occupation of breadwinner(s) ............................... (full time, part-time, or irregular) ......................
(d) Like better employment, if feasible? ......................
(e) Unemployment or non-wage-earner (SA) etc. ..............

Budget Situation:
1. Is your rent higher or lower than you paid before? .......
2. Does it make it harder or easier to balance the budget (make both ends meet) ......................................
3. What would you say is your biggest or most difficult budget item (apart from rent)? .........................
4. Did you have special problems with furniture, credit purchase etc. (or have now) which makes your budget situation a bad one? ........................................

Rent and Income
1. Do you consider the rent scale here (so far as you understand it) fair ..........................
   or not? (how) ..................................................
2. Do you think your rent should be higher if your income goes up? ..........................
3. Do you understand why the income check-up for tenants is necessary? ...........
   Do you feel it is conducted reasonably? ..........................
4. Have you ever been able to consider buying a house? .........................
   Could you have managed a down payment (say at least $500)?
   Monthly payments (how much would be a maximum for you?) ..................
5. Any reasons against home purchase in your case? (E.g., apartment more convenient? Not able to cope with maintenance. Work not always in one place? Previous adverse experience?)

6. Do you think it is true that tenants are harder on properties than owners? What is your experience with maintenance, repairs, etc. here?

GENERAL

1. What things would you most like to see improved in this project?

2. Have you any suggestions which you would like to make for any new project similar to Little Mountain, in the future?

3. Would you like to see more grass, trees, sheltered walks, or hedges etc.? gardens places to sit in the open (in summer)? or do you think everything is fine as it is?

4. Are you satisfied with the general appearance of the project? Could it be more pleasant? tidier? More sheltered or protected? Do you think everybody would cooperate and take a pride in the place?

5. Do you think a "Little Mountain Social Club" would be a good idea? Perhaps with a bulletin board, club room, coffee bar, "do-it-yourself" newspaper? Or do you like the idea of a Community Centre serving the entire district, not just Little Mountain tenants?

6. Do you think the public knows enough about housing projects of this kind?

7. Do you think there should be more such projects as Little Mountain? (Do you think they should be distributed around the city, perhaps even in the suburbs? Or in the oldest districts to replace some of the slums?)
Appendix C

Vancouver Revised Rent-Scale

The rent-scale in use in the Vancouver Authority's properties is derived from the Carver-Hopwood scale (appendix A) but differs slightly from that scale as set out in Rents for Regent Park and in the Administration manual. The differences are in the setting of new minimum incomes for eligibility and the use of new service charge computations for lower income brackets. The lower minima were mostly to permit entrance of old age pensioners, both couples and singles. Service charge is, perhaps, somewhat confusing: it applies to the charge levied against the apartment-block dweller for his share of heat, hot water, and refrigerator costs. It does not apply to the occupant of a row house.

A very significant item is the "surcharge" which is grafted onto the top of the standard rent-scale. Designed to provide for families whose income rises above the maximum after they have been admitted as residents, it has become important in recent years. The maximum entrance income varies from $290 per month for a two-person family to $325 per month for a seven-person family. If the income of a tenant-family increases beyond the maximum, they can continue to live in the Project, but must pay an additional thirty per cent of the amount by which income exceeds the maximum. This method is less abrupt and harsh than would be the requirement that the family leave when income reached the maximum or within six months after. The surcharge provides a slight prod for the "high-income" family to encourage it to move out into other housing. It is based on the assumption that the family with over-maximum income is able to afford commercial accommodation or perhaps home purchase. This assumption may well be questioned as many circumstances might make it desirable for a family to continue to rent even when its income goes up. But there is no alternative if projects are to have a "ceiling" at all.

1 Carver, Humphrey, and Hopwood, Alison, Rents for Regent Park. Civic Advisory Council of Toronto; Toronto; 1948.

## RENT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>Rent by Number of Persons in Family</th>
<th>Service Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$315</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$310</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$305</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$295</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$290</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$285</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$280</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$275</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$270</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$265</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$260</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$255</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$245</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$240</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$235</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$230</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$225</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$220</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$215</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$210</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$205</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$195</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$190</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$185</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$180</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$175</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$170</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$165</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$160</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$155</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$145</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$140</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$135</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$130</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$115</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$105</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum income with social or old age pension assistance only.
Appendix D: THE VANCOUVER HOUSING AUTHORITY

INSPECTION REPORT

Complete one copy and attach to application.
When a re-check is made complete a new form and mark prior report cancelled.

PRESENT HOUSING

Name of Applicant..........................................................
Address.................................................................Phone..................................................
Number of persons in household........................................

SUITABILITY AS A TENANT: (See paragraph 4.1 of the Administration manual)
Comments are to be recorded on the reverse side of this page.

DEFECTS OF PRESENT HOUSING (bad conditions get high marks, see over)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MAX. POINTS</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Overcrowding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Disrepair resulting in hazards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kitchen facilities inadequate or lack of private kitchen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Bathroom facilities inadequate or not private; laundry overtaxed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Heating facilities inadequate or unsafe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Inadequate natural light or ventilation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Lack of safe children's play space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Location far from employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Other unsatisfactory conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 33

Rooms in Dwelling:

for this family only?............
Kitchen shared with others?............

Bathroom for this family only?............
shared with others?............
Living Room?.........................
Dining Room (Separate)?................ ...

Bedrooms?
0 1 2 3 4 5 6
(circle for correct number of bedrooms)
(a) **Suitability:** (evidence of unsuitability such as unreliability in payment of debts, or instability as reflected in intemperence and family trouble, will disqualify the applicant).

(b) **Present Conditions:** (including impressions of housekeeping, health of family, ownership of furniture, or any other special features).

**PRESENT HOUSING: SCORING PROCEDURE**

It is suggested that the Inspector make notes in the description column during each inspection but not try to mark the score in all respects until he has completed several or all inspections, and can sort the applicants into groups on each factor according to the relative severity of the defects observed. The most severe shall be given the maximum points in the table.

The following will serve as a guide to scoring certain of the factors:

1. Overcrowding occurs unless there is a bedroom for each two persons in the household, plus enough bedrooms so that no dependents of opposite sexes over 10 years old must share a room.

2. Score if heating equipment is unable to maintain comfortable temperatures or liable to fire hazard if over-taxed.

3. Do not give full marks if conditions are easy to rectify; include inspection of basement or attic if any.

4. Score if there is neither a back yard nor play lot that is easy and safe to go to.

5. Score if journey to place of employment by public transit takes more than 30 minutes, or costs a zone fare plus the standard fare for the system.

6. Score for unsatisfactory conditions, such as harmful surroundings, special atmospheric and noise hazards, etc.
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