1

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

***THE CULTURE OF PUBLIC HOUSING IN TWENTIETH CENTURY
CANADA: ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN AND CULTURAL MEANING
IN THREE PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS, 1918-1990***

L. Jill Delaney, B.I.S.

*A thesis submitted to the Faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
in Canadian Studies*

**Carleton University
OTTAWA, Ontario**

c. 1991, L. Jill Delaney

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-70969-3

Canada

Carleton University

Ottawa, Canada K1S 5B6

Thesis contains black & white
photographs &/or explanatory tables
which when microfilmed may lose their
significance. The hardcopy of the
thesis is available upon request from
Carleton University Library.

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis:

"The Culture of Public Housing in Twentieth Century
Canada: Architectural Design and Cultural Meaning,
in Three Public Housing Projects, 1918-1990"

submitted by Leslie Jill Delaney, B.I.S.,
in partial fulfilment of the requirement, for
the degree of Master of Arts

.....
Thesis Co-Supervisor

.....
Thesis Co-Supervisor

.....
Director
Institute of Canadian Studies

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

September 1991

Abstract

This thesis is a critical analysis of the architecture of three public housing projects in Canada: the garden suburb of Lindenlea (1918-1924); the urban clearance and renewal project of Alexandra Park (1964-1966); and the urban intensification, infill, Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition (1990). The design and production of the three projects is analysed in relation to their typological foundations and the architectural and planning theories and practices which influenced their form. This analysis is contextualized through discussion of the projects' spatial and temporal location within modern culture, and the possibility of the existence of a culture of public housing in twentieth century Canada. This culture may be characterized by the attempt to provide an environment through which access to the predominant culture is gained, and raises the issues of institutionalization in modern culture, and the design of community as it relates to the social and spatial notions of public and private.

30. Klein and Sears. Don Valley Woods, Toronto. Site Plan.
Typical site planning by this architectural firm on the
1960s. "Don Valley Woods," The Canadian Architect (August
1964):4-46, p. 45.
31. Site Plan. Alexandra Park, Toronto. Webb Zerafa and
Menkes; Jerome Markson; Klein and Sears. "Urban Renewal:
Alexandra Park, Toronto," The Canadian Architect
(September 1969): 54-66, p. 58.
32. Unit plans. Alexandra Park. "Redevelopment: Alexandra
Park, Toronto," The Canadian Architect 11 (July 1966):48-
50, p. 50.
33. "Area before Redevelopment," showing Alexandra Park site
in black. "Urban Renewal: Alexandra Park, Toronto," p.
56.
34. "Alexandra Park - Centennial Award Winner," illustrating
oriel window used throughout the project. "First housing
project to win CHDC Award," Urban Renewal and Public
Housing in Canada (1st quarter, 1967):4.
35. Typical housing form extant in Alexandra Park before
clearance and renewal. Photo by author, 1990.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Illustrations	vii
 INTRODUCTION	 1
 CHAPTER ONE: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICAL APPROACH AND THE THREE PROJECTS	
 Introduction	 6
Architecture and Culture	8
Architecture as a Cultural Object	10
The Chronotope and Motifs of Modernity	12
The Three Projects: Lindenlea, Alexandra Park, The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition	16
Architectural Typology	22
Conclusion	25
 CHAPTER TWO: THE GARDEN SUBURB OF LINDENLEA, OTTAWA (1918-1924)	
 Introduction	 26
Urban Historical/Ideological Setting	28

Political Setting	39
The Garden Suburb of Lindenlea	43
Conclusion	58

CHAPTER THREE: ALEXANDRA PARK, TORONTO (1964-1966)

Introduction	64
Urban Historical Setting	66
Political Setting	70
Ideological Setting	73
Design Setting: The Row House	79
Alexandra Park	84
Conclusion	100

CHAPTER FOUR: THE HOUSING ON TORONTO'S MAIN STREETS

IDEAS COMPETITION

Introduction	104
Urban Historical Setting	106
The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets	
Ideas Competition	112
Political Setting	115
Design Setting	123
The Grand Prize Entry	133
Conclusion	141

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION**145**

**Normalisation, Hegemony and the Institution
of Public Housing**

151

The Design of Community

162

Possibilities for Future Study

164**ILLUSTRATIONS****BIBLIOGRAPHY****168**

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

1. Ebenezer Howard. Diagrams illustrating principles of the Garden City Concept. Howard, Ebenezer. Garden Cities of Tomorrow (ed.) F.J. Osborn (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965):52-53.
2. Plan of the Garden City of Letchworth, England. Howard, Garden Cities of Tomorrow :105.
3. Plan of the Garden City of Welwyn, England. Howard, Garden Cities of Tomorrow :129.
4. Plan of Lindenlea. Journal of the Town Planning Institute of Canada (April, 1921), p. 5.
5. "Housing Suggestions by the Housing Committee of the Cabinet, Canada," Journal of the AIA, (August, 1919).
6. "Housing Sugaestions by the Housing Committee of the Cabinet, Canada," The Builder (July, 1919).
7. Two types of detached houses recommended in, Ontario. Report of the Ontario Housing Committee Including Standards for Inexpensive Houses Adopted for Ontario and Typical Plans. (Ontario: A.T. Wilgress, 1919).

8. Elevation. House for C.A. Menard, Lindenlea. City of Ottawa Archives, Papers of the Ottawa Housing Commission, RG1\6.
9. Plan. House for C.A. Menard, Lindenlea. City of Ottawa Archives, Papers of the Ottawa Housing Commission, RG1\6.
10. Plan. House for C.A. Menard, Lindenlea. City of Ottawa Archives, Papers of the Ottawa Housing Commission, RG1\6.
11. Elevations. House for M.M. Reid, Lindenlea. City of Ottawa Archives, Papers of the Ottawa Housing Commission, RG1\6.
12. Plans. House for M.M. Reid, Lindenlea. City of Ottawa Archives, Papers of the Ottawa Housing Commission, RG1\6.
13. Elevation. House for J.A.C. Roy, Lindenlea. City of Ottawa Archives, Papers of the Ottawa Housing Commission, RG1\6.
14. View down Rockcliffe Way to children's playground, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.
15. Gambrel roof houses off Maple Avenue, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.
16. House, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.

17. House, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.
18. House, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.
19. Houses on Rock Avenue, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.
20. House, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.
21. House, Lindenlea. Photo by author, 1990.
22. Clarence Stein and Henry Wright, 1929. Neighbourhood Unit, Radburn, New Jersey. Schaffer, Daniel. Garden Cities for America: The Radburn Experience (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982):143.
23. Review and analysis of Radburn New Jersey. "Preview Issue," Architectural Review vol. 129 no. 767 (Jan. 1961): 323.
24. "Suggested Re-housing Scheme no. 3," Ontario. Report of the Lieutenant-Governor's Committee on Housing Conditions in Toronto. (The Bruce Report) (Toronto: Ontario, 1934):99.

25. J.E. Hoare Jr. Bird's eye view of Regent Park North, Toronto. Rose, Albert. Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance (Toronto: U. of T. Press, 1958): figure 1.
26. Page and Steele. Regent Park South, Toronto. Site Plan, showing placement of apartment slabs irregularly to the existing street pattern. "Apartments: Regent Park South, Toronto, " The Canadian Architect IV, 9 (September 1959):62-73, p. 68.
27. Page and Steele. Regent Park South, Toronto. Section through building. "Apartments: Regent Park South, Toronto," p. 66.
28. Peter Batchelor. "Landsdown Crescent, Bath, England. The intimacy and repose of Georgian streets and spaces rose from the simple repetition of an elegant and highly refined basic housing unit." "Horizontal Multiple Housing: A Study of Low Rise Multiple Housing Developments in Western Europe and Scandinavia," Journal of the RAIC (February, 1965):22-38, p. 25.
29. Peter Batrhelor. "Malt Mill Lane, Alcester, England. Streets of Charmless Time." "Horizontal Multiple Housing," p. 25.

30. Klein and Sears. Don Valley Woods, Toronto. Site Plan.
Typical site planning by this architectural firm on the
1960s. "Don Valley Woods," The Canadian Architect (August
1964):4-46, p. 45.
31. Site Plan. Alexandra Park, Toronto. Webb Zerafa and
Menkes; Jerome Markson; Klein and Sears. "Urban Renewal:
Alexandra Park, Toronto," The Canadian Architect
(September 1969): 54-66, p. 58.
32. Unit plans. Alexandra Park. "Redevelopment: Alexandra
Park, Toronto," The Canadian Architect 11 (July 1966):48-
50, p. 50.
33. "Area before Redevelopment," showing Alexandra Park site
in black. "Urban Renewal: Alexandra Park, Toronto," p.
56.
34. "Alexandra Park - Centennial Award Winner," illustrating
oriel window used throughout the project. "First housing
project to win CHDC Award," Urban Renewal and Public
Housing in Canada (1st quarter, 1967):4.
35. Typical housing form extant in Alexandra Park before
clearance and renewal. Photo by author, 1990.

-
36. View from Alexandra Park off Vanauley Walk. Photo by author, 1990.
37. Entrance to Alexandra Park off Vanauley Street. Photo by author, 1990.
38. Pedestrian walk, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
39. Row houses, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
40. Row houses, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
41. Row houses, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
42. Row houses, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
43. Row houses, Alexandra Park, illustrating 'Georgian' repetitiveness. Photo by author, 1990.
44. Rear of row house units, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
45. Enclosed green space, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
46. Pedestrian walk, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.

47. Rear of two and three storey units, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
48. Rear gardens, Alexandra Park. Photo by author, 1990.
49. "Lord Simcoe's 1793 Plan for Toronto drawn by Aitken," City of Toronto. Housing on Toronto's Mains Streets: A Design Competition. Conditions and Programme. (Toronto, January, 1990):11.
50. "The Inner City, Early Developments," Conditions and Programme, p. 12.
51. Current pattern of narrow lot subdivision on Queen Street West from at least 1890, Conditions and Programme, p. 20.
52. "1880's Main Streets building," Conditions and Programmes, p. 27.
53. "Late 19th Century Main Street building," Conditions and Programme, p. 28.
54. "Early 20th Century Main Street building," Conditions and Programme, p. 29.

55. "Typical 1930's Main Streets Building," Conditions and Programme, p. 30.
56. "1960's Main Streets Building," Conditions and Programme, p. 31.
57. "Competition Sites," Conditions and Programme, p. 51.
58. Diamond and Myers. Sherbourne Lanes, Toronto, 1977. Sectional Perspective. George Baird, "Theory\Vacant Lots in Toronto," Design Quarterly no. 8 (1978): 16-41, p. 36.
59. Roof Plan. "Theory\Vacant Lots in Toronto," p. 37.
60. Denyse Gauthier, Alain Carle and Nicholas Roquet. Grand Prize Entry. Strategic Drawing. "Topography, Main Street, Ravine and Lake." "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," Places 7:2 (Winter 1991): 48-79, p. 56.
61. Grand Prize Entry. Axonometric\Grove. Large Site C-3. 1220-1221-1230 Dundas Street West, "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," p. 49.

62. Grand Prize Entry. Axonometric\Lane Way. Large Site C-3. 1220-1221-1230 Dundas Street West, "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," p. 56.
63. Grand Prize Entry. The Territory; and Typology: A Fragment of the Street. Large Site C-3. 1220-1221-1230 Dundas Street West, "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," p. 58.
64. Grand Prize Entry. Clockwise from top left: a) Axonometric\Lakeview b) Front elevation\Lakeview c) Ground Floor Plans d) Exploded Axonometric. Large Site C-3. 1220-1221-1230 Dundas street West, "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," p. 59.
65. Grand Prize Entry. Plans. Corner Site A-1. Drawings courtesy Denyse Gauthier, Alain Carle and Nicholas Roquet.
66. Grand Prize Entry. Plans. Mid-block site B-3. 685 Danforth Avenue. Drawings courtesy Denyse Gauthier, Alain Carle and Nicholas Roquet.
67. First Award Entry. Paul Walker Clarke, Alexandria Va. "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," p. 61.

68. Honourable Mention Award Entry. Brown and Storey Architects, Toronto. "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," p. 67.
69. Honourable Mention Award Entry. James Colizza, Jacques Belleau and Jacques Hamel, Ottawa. "Housing on Toronto's Main Streets," p. 71.
70. Grow Home. Avi Friedman and Witold Rybzyński. Pamela Young, "Redefining a Dream," Maclean's (July 16, 1990): 46-47, p. 46.

INTRODUCTION

The design and production of public housing in Canada has been a matter of popular and professional criticism, on one basis or another, since the construction of the first projects in the early twentieth century. While there have been countless user satisfaction studies completed since the 1960s, very little has taken place in the area of a more formal architectural critique of this form of housing. One of the primary motives of this study, therefore, is to add to this literature, and to provide a possible critical basis for further study. The thesis will focus on an analysis of three public housing projects (from the period 1918-1990) and their typological foundations in order to explore the possibility of the existence of a 'culture of public housing' in twentieth century Canada, and the architectural outgrowth of such a culture.

The first chapter of the thesis will develop the critical apparatus to be used in the analysis, and introduce the three projects to be examined. This apparatus will build on the notion of a culture of housing, by embedding the working definition of architecture in a cultural context. Architecture will be defined, following Giddens, as a 'cultural object' which can be read for its transmission of cultural values,

customs and norms.¹ In order to elucidate the connections between the architectural design of public housing and the culture in which it is located, the theoretical framework uses Bakhtin's spatiotemporal concepts of chronotope and motif as a means of defining categories of analysis.² The use of these concepts helps in the identification of the three projects as representative of architectural types which can be culturally located.

The following three chapters will contain the critical analysis of the architectural design and production of the projects, in chronological order. The analyses include discussions of the urban historical, ideological, political and design contexts, as well as specific critical analyses of the projects. The first project is the garden suburb of Lindenlea, Ottawa (1918-1924). Lindenlea was designed and built under the guidance of Thomas Adams, a British planner closely linked to the Garden City Movement in that country. The suburb was meant to serve as a model project for the Federal Housing Scheme, the first major initiative of the Canadian federal government in subsidized housing. The garden suburb type was strongly promoted by members of the Urban

¹ Anthony Giddens, "Structuralism, post-structuralism and the production of culture," Social Theory and Modern Sociology (Cambridge: Polity Press 1987):73-108, p. 101.

² M.M. Bakhtin. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. (ed. Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981):87

Reform Movement in Canada, who sought to solve the housing problems in the cities through a program of normalization of lower-income Canadians and immigrants. This program was characterized in large part by the promotion of the middle class family life as the appropriate social model for all Canadians.

The second type to be analysed is represented by the public housing project of Alexandra Park, Toronto, designed in the mid-1960s by architects Webb Zerafa, Klein and Sears, and Jerome Markson. Alexandra Park represents the urban clearance and renewal, low-rise row housing type popular in the 1960s. As an urban clearance and renewal scheme, the project was partly concerned with the restructuring of the urban core according to the Modernist system of rationalized zoning. However, architects of the 1960s were also beginning to question much of the Modernist orthodoxy, especially that which produced such projects as Regent Park North and South in Toronto. This questioning led to an attempt at Alexandra Park to address the problem of creating community through a design which emphasized the separation of the project from the neighbourhood, creating a residential enclave with interior pedestrian streets and green spaces. Finally, Alexandra Park represents a mature example of the fully institutionalized housing project which was the common form of public housing from the late-1940s until the 1970s.

The final project to be analysed is the 1990 Housing on Toronto's Main Street Ideas Competition, and its Grand Prize Entry by Alain Carle, Denyse Gauthier and Nicholas Roquet. The Competition and winning entry represent the recent emergence of the infill housing type as a possible solution to affordable and amenable public housing in the core area. Infill housing is one method of intensification and densification of the urban environment, providing for mixed use and diversity, and promoting an essentially romanticized view of the traditional urban neighbourhood. The Competition was a 'search for ideas', to provide mixed residential-commercial building along the main arterial streets of Toronto, with the plan for development by public, private and non-profit interests. The winning entry offers a 'strategic' proposal - a typological design proposal which addresses the issues of living on Main Street, and changing needs and attitudes towards the residential environment and its relation to the public realm.

The concluding chapter will provide a summary of this analysis, in light of the original intentions of identifying a culture of housing in Canada. The issue of architectural, historical, political and cultural continuity between the projects will be closely considered in this final analysis. Brief comments will be made on possible topics of future study related to the architectural design and production of public

housing, and on the use of a cultural model of analysis in such studies.

CHAPTER ONE: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICAL APPROACH AND THE THREE PROJECTS.

Introduction

The critical analysis of this thesis is focussed on the architectural design and production of three projects, chosen to represent three of the most important and influential public housing typologies in the period between 1918 and 1990. These types will be defined by an analysis of the merging of temporally and spatially specific social practices and cultural motifs, and the use and manipulation of these cultural motifs in the design and production of public housing. In so doing, I hope to work toward the identification of a 'culture of housing' in twentieth century Canada.³ This culture of housing may be thought of as a sub-culture, and broadly defined as consisting of a common set of values, customs and ideas which influence and are influenced by the design and production of public housing.⁴ By hypothesizing

³ The term 'culture of housing' is here used as a shorthand for the more descriptive but awkward culture of public housing. It should be noted however that while I am specifically interested in publicly-subsidized housing, this form shares many of its cultural characteristics with private market housing as well.

⁴ Knesl, p. 15. The author defines culture as "the production, distribution, consumption and reproduction of ideas and values held about the world, others and self."

that such a culture informs and is informed by the three types of housing under analysis in this thesis, it is possible to begin to critically evaluate the historical development, changes and consistencies in the architecture of public housing in Canada.

Before proceeding further, it will be necessary to set out a definition of what is meant by the term 'public housing'. In this thesis, 'public housing' will refer to publicly-subsidized housing built to be affordable to those who could not normally enter the private housing market. The definition of what constitutes public housing has itself shifted and changed in the period under discussion, and the choice of projects in this thesis reflects that ideological repositioning. Nonetheless, the choice of the term public housing deliberately emphasizes the institutional, state control of this sector of the housing market. The varying manner in which the state involves itself in the production of the three projects can be considered an important aspect in understanding the meaning of the design and production process. The form of public subsidization in housing is reflexively related to the architectural form of the housing through this ideological link.

Architecture and Culture

One of the most important roles of architecture is its ability to validate the ideas and values we hold about ourselves and our place in the world.⁵ Following J.A. Knesl, culture is a social practice,

the formal interpretation of praxis, (in choosing to present or not; in choosing how to present; in explaining and legitimizing; in exhorting or stifling conceptions and valuations) culture forms ideas, values and interests, and it prefigures the form and structure of experience itself.⁶

Social activity takes place across time and space;⁷ it is a measurable practice which has a concrete effect on its temporal and spatial location. However, the recursive nature of social action must also be acknowledged through the understanding that "social life is produced and reproduced by the temporal and spatial structures of society."⁸ Within this definition, architecture can be understood as a temporal and spatial concretization of social praxis:

⁵ J.A. Knesl, "The powers of architecture," Environment and Planning D: Society and Space (Vol. 2 1984):3-22, p. 16.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Anthony Giddens, Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory (London: Macmillan Press, 1982):8.

⁸ N. Gregson, "Structuration theory: some thoughts on the possibilities for empirical research," Environment and Planning D: Society and Space (Vol. 5 1987):73-91, p. 76.

Buildings - whether schools, mental asylums, prisons, libraries, museums - as socially constructed institutions - reproduce in their very conception, as well as their internal spatial order - both the ideologies and social and cultural categories of groups in power: buildings are classifying devices which map the world of dominant groups. Beyond the building, the different spaces of the city, the street, the park, the ghetto, the suburb, not only represent a given social order but, in their physical, spatial and symbolic forms, actually participate in the construction of social and cultural existence. They are part of the discourse on society, which is, to a large extent, constituted both in and through the buildings and spaces it creates.⁹

But we must also be careful to acknowledge the direct influence that our society's institutions may exert on architectural design and production.

Architectural praxis is subject to a host of laws, regulations, and increasingly codified procedures regulating design, realization, and use of space. These regulating mechanisms arguably serve purposes that reflect the powers and interests prevalent in the current politico-economic sphere.¹⁰

An analysis of design and production issues in architecture must therefore account for the multiplicity of 'voices' involved in the creation of a building. In the instance of the three projects being considered, the most direct users of the

⁹ Anthony King, "Cultural Hegemony and Capital Cities," Capital Cities: How to ensure their effectiveness and harmonious development (Ottawa: National Capital Commission, December 6-8, 1990): 16.

¹⁰ Knesl, "The Powers of Architecture," p. 9.

architecture - the inhabitants - were rarely involved in this process. Those most closely involved were the architects and the institutional client (in these cases different government authorities). One must consider not only the contracted architect, but also those involved in the government, other architects, planners, politicians, as well as social agencies, private interest groups, and critics. Without the inclusion of these actors in such an analysis, there exists a false division between the design and production aspects of architecture, and their reflexive relationship is not adequately addressed.

Architecture as a cultural object

The production and design of architecture is both a part of the recursive social practice that is culture, and a product of it. Architecture is not the actual spatial structure of society, but is a product of the imprinting actions of social practices upon that structure. In his theory of structuration, Anthony Giddens defines 'structure' as "the rules and resources instantiated in social systems, but having only a 'virtual existence'."¹¹ These rules and resources become 'actual' in the intersection between social practice and time and space, and are concretized, given permanence and legitimation, by what Giddens refers to as 'cultural objects',

¹¹ Giddens Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory, p.9.

and defines as:

a durable medium of transmission across contexts, [in which the] 'medium' should be taken to refer both to the physical substance of the cultural object and to the means of its dissemination across different contexts.¹²

Cultural objects and hence architecture can be considered as artifacts, but ones which "incorporate 'extended' forms of signification."¹³ The 'medium' of architecture is therefore not only the constructed building but the means by which its design transmits cultural knowledge and experience.

The function of transmission involves a two-stepped process of encoding and retrieval. For Giddens, encoding involves the production of meaning through difference.¹⁴ A building is recognized for its specific use, the meaning of its existence, through its differences from other buildings. These differences are encoded both through its design elements and through its function in social practices.

¹² Giddens, "Structuralism, post-structuralism and the production of culture," p. 101.

¹³ Ibid., p. 100.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 101.

The chronotope and motifs of modernity

The three projects chosen for analysis cover the production of public housing in Canada from the period in which the three levels of government (federal, provincial and municipal) began to show a serious interest in the housing problem, to the present time (1918-1990). Although the projects were designed and constructed within the seemingly short time frame of eighty years, the social and cultural climates surrounding each can be seen to have significant differences. These differences can be set within the phenomenon of the rapid changes in modern Western and in this case Canadian culture and society, especially in the period following the Second World War. Modern Western culture has often been characterized by the rapidity of developments in both the hard and social sciences, in technology and in both high and popular cultural production. In architectural design and production, the twentieth century has been marked by the introduction and evolution of a variety of 'movements' and 'styles', and by a seemingly constant shifting or overlapping in theoretical positions regarding the formalistic, functional and cultural meaning of the form. The three projects reflect this diversity in their adoption of three distinct architectural typologies. But these typologies must be understood to derive not from any rigid positionality, but from a complex interaction of

constantly evolving social practices and cultural traditions.

One of the problems inherent in the project of this thesis therefore, is how to adequately represent the diverse forces acting on and within the three projects in a coherent manner. Through a process of critical analysis I will work to place the architectural design and production of the three projects within their cultural milieu, the culture of modernity. A broad but critical review of prevalent issues of the period under review (1918-1990) has lead to the definition of a set of 'motifs' which are commonly derived from their modern location, but which also express the developments in modern culture and in the culture of housing of the specific temporal and spatial locations of the three projects. These 'motifs' can be defined as cultural elements, broad themes which have informed the production and reproduction of modern culture in twentieth century Canada.¹⁵

The concept of the motif comes from the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin's analysis of cultural production and text. Bakhtin promoted the interrelatedness of sociocultural praxis and its temporal and spatial location. The definition of the time-space configuration in which sociocultural praxis is situated was essential to an understanding of the meaning of such praxis and its concretization in cultural objects. He

¹⁵ Bakhtin, 87.

referred to this time-space configuration as a 'chronotope'. The chronotope becomes the basic 'unit of analysis' of cultural activity for Bakhtin, because it is only through these chronotopes that we become aware of the meaning of both the social practices and the objects.¹⁶ Holquist defines the chronotope as, "an optic for reading texts as x-rays of the forces at work in the cultural system from which they spring."¹⁷

However, within his analysis Bakhtin also acknowledges that art (and here I include architecture) involves semantic elements which, as Folch-Serra states "are not subject to temporal and spatial determinations."

...we manage to endow all phenomena with meaning, that is, we incorporate them not only into the sphere of spatial and temporal existence but also into a semantic sphere....whatever these meanings turn out to be, in order to enter our social experience they must take on the form of a sign that is audible and visible for us.¹⁸

Chronotopes concretize meaning for us by embedding it within specific time-space experiences. In a manner similar to the transmission of meaning which occurs in Giddens' cultural

¹⁶ M. Folch-Serra, "Place, voice, space: Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogical landscape," Environment and Planning D: Society and Space (Vol. 8 1990):255-274, p. 264.

¹⁷ Bakhtin, p. 425.

¹⁸ Folch-Serra, p. 264.

objects therefore, the culture of housing is expressed through the chronotopic characteristics of the architecture of the three projects.

Motifs are in part, defined by their chronotopic location, that is by the values, experience and knowledge of that chronotope. In this thesis, I have defined their shared chronotope as modernity. Dominant ideological influences on the configuration of this chronotope include (beginning in the 18th century), the rise of liberal capitalism and industrialism, of science and its derived technology, and of the middle class to political and sociocultural predominance, as primary defining elements of both productive and everyday life. Modern life can be differentiated from previous practices through such developments as its division and organization of labour and production processes leading to mass production and specialization, new modes of consumption, the rise of institutionalized forms of governments, and not least of all its unprecedented urbanization. These new forms of sociocultural praxis are dialogically reflective of profound changes to our spatial-temporal understanding and expression of meaning. All of these elements were to have a significant effect on the design and production of architecture, not least of which was the new inclusion of the design of mass produced residential developments for the middle and working classes.

It is through these 'spatial-temporal understandings and expressions' (motifs), particularly those pertaining to the definition of a culture of housing, that the architectural design and production of the three projects will be critically analysed. They are, in a non-hierarchical listing: standardization; functionalism and rationalization; moral, physical and social health; the public versus private dichotomy and its effect on the notion of community; the urban/suburban dichotomy (including social, planic and scenographic elements); social milieu (specifically the view of the inhabitants); and finally, precedents and sources. Definition and importance of these motifs to the design and production of the three projects changes over the period under discussion, and so will be discussed more specifically in relation to each project.

The Three Projects: Lindenlea, Alexandra Park, The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition.

For Bakhtin chronotopes have a dialogic relationship to each other, they are constantly informed by one another and therefore co-exist in a mutually inclusive manner.¹⁹ Thus the chronotope of modernity defined above is not a static or autonomous notion, but is defined in part by its relationship to and difference from other chronotopes. For the purposes of

¹⁹ Bakhtin, p. 252.

analysis in this thesis, I have thus defined three other chronotopes which are interwoven into the chronotope of modernity: early modernism, late modernism and post modernism, and which relate directly to the three projects being analysed.

Lindenlea and the early modern chronotope

The first project under discussion is the garden suburb of Lindenlea, designed and constructed in Ottawa between 1918 and 1924. Lindenlea represents the design and production of public housing in the early modern chronotope, and reveals an almost proto-modern character in relation to what is commonly identified in architectural literature as the Modern Movement. The early modern chronotope was characterized by strong and largely patriarchal concerns for and approaches toward moral and physical health. This motif was prevalent in conjunction with the motif of the private realm, which was viewed as morally superior socially, politically and economically to the notion of the public. The result was a program of normalization, based upon the model of the family life as ideally constituted by the suburban middle class. The suburb was designed and built under many of the principles of the Garden City Movement founded in England in the late nineteenth century, and the later Urban Reform Movement in Canada.

Lindenlea is of crucial importance in understanding the typological development of public housing architecture in Canada, because to a high degree it represents the beginning of federal public housing policy in Canada. The suburb was designed and built to serve as a model for other communities across Canada which were becoming involved in the development of publicly-subsidized housing under the new Federal Housing Scheme. As a model and prototypical project for the federal government, Lindenlea's transmission of the ideal values and norms held by the reformers about the place and form of public housing, and of the contrasting realities of such an ambitious project, is very strong. It thus stands as an excellent subject with which to begin the study, for it represents the early national agenda for the provision of publicly subsidized housing, as well as the form that was felt to be most appropriate for such a development; the privately owned, detached single family home.

Alexandra Park and the late modern chronotope

The public housing project of Alexandra Park in Toronto (1966) will serve as the representative of the second type of housing under examination, which can be situated within the late modern chronotope.²⁰ The discourse of the period can be

²⁰ The high modern chronotope, situated temporally in Canada from the late 1930s through the 1950s, and represented by such housing projects as Regent Park North and South will

characterized by a fully developed modern institutionalization, and a social and cultural attitude which tempered the motif of high modern functionalism with a questioning position of 'humanism', placing strong value in the notion of community. The post-World War Two period was to see the rise of the welfare state in Canada, as well as increasing government intervention in the growth and planning of cities. All levels of government enthusiastically sponsored programmes of slum clearance and urban renewal as a means of modernizing Canadian cities and allowing redevelopment to occur at a large scale. While the mood of social reform was carried over into the post-World War Two period with the adoption of the modernist agenda of large scale rational and efficient redevelopment, by the 1960s these concerns were being challenged by new concerns for the development of the social community, and the location of the individual and family within this community. As a mature example of its type, Alexandra Park represents a growing realization that the grand, often utopian schemes for urban renewal and housing redevelopment were further alienating the various sections of the urban population rather than uniting them. The project is thus located between two fundamentally different and often contradictory attitudes about the appropriate approach to and form of, public housing in Canada, which nonetheless strongly

not be addressed in detail in this thesis because it has been substantially documented and discussed elsewhere.

influenced the production of large numbers of public housing developments in the three decades following the War.

Alexandra Park was chosen as a representative of its type because it was generally well received by the architects and social planners of the period, being the first public housing project to win an award from the Canadian Housing Design Council. As well, the design architects of the project, the firms of Klein and Sears and Jerome Markson, were part of a community of architects in Toronto who designed a large proportion of the innovative private and public housing developments in Toronto and Central Canada during the period.

The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition and the post-modern chronotope

The final type of architectural design and production of public housing in Canada is represented by the Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition (1990). The competition and Grand Prize entry are representative of a developing housing typology - infill housing - characteristic of the post-modern chronotope. This chronotope promotes the motif of public over private, and emphasizes the notions of multiplicity and specificity in a dialogic understanding of society, culture and community. The competition was developed to generate design ideas and prototypes for the intensification of

affordable residential living space (as private, public and joint developments) on the main arterial streets of Toronto's core. The sponsors of the competition, the Ontario government, Metro Toronto and the City of Toronto felt that an intensification process which paid heed to the traditional forms of Toronto's streets and their activities (ie. medium height buildings of mixed use on streets with ready access to public transport and other amenities) would be one way of dealing with the continuing housing crisis in the city. The concept of the reintegration of affordable housing into the core through infill and intensification techniques represents a major shift in architectural type from Alexandra Park, but the development of the concept can be clearly traced from many of the questions being asked at the time of that project. The work of Jane Jacobs is of particular note here, in its reassertion of the importance of the street as a positive public space. Jacobs' work appeared in the early 1960s and had some influence in that decade, but its full impact would not be felt until the 1980s. The analysis will focus on the Grand Prize winning design, by the Universite de Montreal architectural students Denyse Gauthier, Alain Carle and Nicholas Roquet. Their entry was a truly prototypical, conceptual scheme which addressed all three of the types of sites made available to the competitors by the organizers. The purpose behind the entry was to present a conceptual process, a way of thinking about designing and building infill housing

which would take advantage of the historical urban morphology of Toronto's main streets, as well as the current social and cultural needs of people living, working and doing business on these streets. The theory and methodology behind the entry owes much to the Italian neo-Rationalist movement in this approach.²¹

The competition and the winning entry are important indicators of the growing interest in this type of architectural approach for the provision of affordable housing in Canada and abroad. Discussion of the use of infill as a general urban design approach began in the 1970s in Toronto and other major Canadian centres, and infill has been used as one means of providing public housing in urban areas since that period. The competition and the other related initiatives undertaken by the City of Toronto seem to indicate a policy decision to more seriously pursue this typology in the area of housing production.

Architectural Typology

The situating of each of the projects within these chronotopes recognizes "treatments of time and space in diverse guises and

²¹ For information on the neo-Rationalist movement see Dennis Sharp (ed.) The Rationalists: Theory and Design in the Modern Movement (London: Architectural Press, 1978), and Rossi, Aldo The Architecture of the City (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982).

different discourses," which allows for a typologizing of their architectural design and production.²² The three projects can be categorized within their distinctive types (related to their function as public housing) through the particular intersection of social practices and motifs, and their architects' (and clients') adoption and manipulation of these motifs in the design and production process. The motifs thus help to define the functional, aesthetic and symbolic elements of each architectural type.

In his essay, "Modern Architecture and Historicity," architectural theorist and critic Alan Colquhoun defines architectural typology in a manner which is sympathetic to Giddens' concept of 'extended signification', in which the cultural object is an artifact, but also transmits cultural knowledge and experience.²³ For Colquhoun, the architectural type sits conceptually between the two modern interpretations of history: the normative view, in which

history is the repository of permanent values transmitted from one generation to the next in the forms of myths and apodictic truths,²⁴

²² Folch-Serra, p. 262.

²³ Alan Colquhoun, "Introduction: Modern Architecture and Historicity," in Essays in Architectural Criticism: Modern Architecture and Historical Change (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981): 11-19.

²⁴ Ibid.

and the relativist view, in which

history is a process of evolution in which systems of cultural value only possess a relative truth.²⁵

Within the normative understanding of history, architecture is assumed to have 'genetic' links to 'cultural memory'. Cultural memory implies coherence, homogeneity and historical continuity, and the architectural type acts as an instrument of this cultural memory.²⁶ Within the relativist view, architecture becomes a positivist or behavioral 'science', in which only the most immediate social actions and practices have meaning.²⁷ Colquhoun's typology mediates between these two extremes, accepting the ideological continuity of architecture, but also acknowledging the transformative nature of social action on architecture's design, production and use. These two interpretations of history can be compared with Bakhtin's definition of motifs and chronotopically specific values and practices.

Architectural types can be defined and recognized through their specific and unique constitution, use and expression of cultural motifs. The projects of Lindenlea and Alexandra Park may share many of the same motifs (standardization, privacy,

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 15.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 19.

and rationalization for instance), but may be considered as different architectural types by the manner in which these motifs are interpreted and expressed in the architectural medium itself. Thus Lindenlea represents the privately-owned, detached, single family type, Alexandra Park the publicly operated single family row house type, and the Housing Competition the multiple-option, contextualized infill type. In this sense type is understood to be reflexively related to its specific chronotopic location and to the architectural modes of expression of meaning within that chronotope.

Conclusion

Through a critical analysis of the three projects using the theoretical framework posited above, I hope to reveal and further define the existence of a culture of housing in modern Canada. Use of the projects to represent three important typologies of housing in this chronotope will lead to a broader discussion of the dynamics of the architectural design and production of public housing in twentieth century Canada as a sociocultural practice. This discussion is meant to help contextualize the architectural types, and to further our understanding of the process and meaning behind these projects as important indicators of a more general set of meanings we attach to the design and inhabitation of the urban environment.

CHAPTER TWO: THE GARDEN SUBURB OF LINDENLEA, OTTAWA (1918-1924)

Introduction

The garden suburb of Lindenlea today stands between the communities of New Edinburgh and Vanier, in Ottawa, as an example of housing and planning theories prevalent in Canada following World War I. It was the first low-income housing development built under the aegis of the Federal Housing Scheme (1918), which was itself the first major federal intervention in the area of housing in Canadian history. The creation of Lindenlea and the Federal Housing Scheme are closely linked by a common ideological base, consisting of the principles of the Urban Reform Movement of Canada and the Garden City Movement, originating in England.

Built under the auspices of the Ottawa Housing Commission, Lindenlea's principle design features and standards were largely the creation of Thomas Adams, the Town Planning Advisor to the Commission of Conservation and to the Housing Committee of the Federal Cabinet. Adams played a key role in the development of the Federal Housing Scheme legislation, and then chose Lindenlea to serve as a model design for other Canadian municipalities participating in the Scheme. This

makes the suburb an excellent example for an analysis and understanding of the prevalent and official standards and ideas for appropriate housing types in Canada, during this important early period in the development of the state as social regulator.

For the purposes of analysis the garden suburb of Lindenlea can be located within the 'early modern' chronotope. This chronotope is in many senses protomodernist in its spatiotemporal configuration of many of the issues which characterize the twentieth century. Concerns expressed through the design and production of Lindenlea reflect a growing recognition of the implications and possibilities of 'modern life': the standardization and rationalization of modes of living and modes of accommodation through the manipulation of science, technology and industry. This was combined with an idealism that these could also solve the problems created by industrialism such as mass urbanization and the housing crisis, by allowing a better standard of living that was radically separated from the production aspects of the industrial society. The early modern chronotopic location of Lindenlea thus serves as a useful introduction to the encompassing modern chronotope of the thesis, for it represents the spatial and temporal effects of the modernization of Canada as initially confronted.

Urban Historical/Ideological Setting

From the late nineteenth century through the early decades of the twentieth, Canada was to undergo profound structural changes as a result of increasing urbanization and industrialization. This overall growth was the result of a number of factors, not the least of which was the implementation of P.M. John A. Macdonald's National Policy. The 'colonialization' of the West and the protective tariffs of the Policy were to facilitate greatly the establishment of Central Canadian industries, and the urban centres in which these were located. Immigrants and rural Canadians flowed into the cities, with the result that the population growth of the urban centres far outstripped that of the overall growth of the nation. By the 1920s Canada had become an urban nation, with just over half its total population residing in urban centres.²⁸ While the National Policy had managed to set in motion this dramatic change from an agrarian to urban society, the government was not prepared to deal with many of the resulting structural problems, including the growing housing crisis. The problems associated with rapid urban growth soon overwhelmed the municipal governments. The poor living

²⁸ Paul Rutherford, "Tomorrow's Metropolis: The Urban Reform Movement in Canada, 1880-1920," in (eds.) Gilbert Stelter and Alan Artibise. The Canadian City: Essays in Urban and Social History. (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1984):435-455, p. 435.

conditions of the slum areas of major centres were already in place before the rise in industrialization, but the rapid influx of people in the first decade of the twentieth century created a much more visible crisis.

At the same time, middle and upper income Canadians were moving out of the urban core areas into the suburbs, which were felt to provide a more morally, physically and spiritually appropriate environment for family living than the polluted and crowded conditions downtown. But this flight from the city could not erase the situation of the urban poor from the minds of many of the middle class, who promoted and became active in the Canadian Urban Reform Movement in the late nineteenth century. Herbert Ames' 1897 study of poverty in Montreal, The City Below the Hill, was a shocking documentation of the appalling living conditions of the working class districts in that city, and helped to spur social activism not only in Montreal but in other Canadian cities as well.²⁹

The First World War served to heighten both the problems in urban areas and concern about these problems. Housing construction came to a virtual halt during the War, as construction materials and labour were redirected to the war

²⁹ The study found one area with a population density of 300 person per acre. John English, Borden: His Life and World (Toronto: Hill Ryerson Ltd., 1977): 35.

effort. The return of soldiers needing housing, the post-War recession of 1918-1920, and the continuing pressure of urban and housing reformers forced the reluctant federal government to take action in this area by introducing the Federal Housing Scheme in 1918. The Scheme was created under the Emergency War Measures Act, making it in effect a temporary measure, and after a lacklustre performance was dismantled by the government in 1924 during a period of national economic prosperity.

The Urban Reform Movement began to gain momentum in the late nineteenth century, corresponding to similar movements in the United States and Great Britain. The movement began largely as a philanthropic endeavour with strong paternalistic overtones, with the reformers tending to be middle class males more often than not. Concern over the living conditions in the slums was popularized through reform oriented newspapers such as the Ottawa Journal, the Montreal Star, and the Toronto Telegram. By 1900 however, the cause was effectively in the hands of 'specialists' who focussed on various issues of the urban crisis.³⁰ The reformers in Canada concentrated on improving the sanitation, overcrowding and poor construction of slum dwellings, and battled exploitive rents and real estate speculation, all of which were felt to contribute to disease

³⁰ Paul Rutherford, Saving the Canadian City: The First Phase 1880-1920 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974): x.

and moral decay. The fundamental social influence of the growth of the applied sciences, especially the obsession for rationalization of the later nineteenth century, should be considered of prime importance in understanding this movement. In their rhetoric, the Progressives in Canada and the United States relied heavily on the ideas of 'scientific management' of the home, and a rational approach to life in general. Standards became an essential part of their programme, and were based on the ideas of efficiency, modernization and the advantages of mass production and industrialization. The changes were approached universally, from urban and regional planning, through domestic architecture, to interior decorating and consumer products for the home. It is this discourse of the all-encompassing benefits of rationalism and science combined with a strong Victorian preoccupation with morality which predominantly influenced the early modern chronotope.

The ideological links between the reform movements in Canada and Great Britain were to be strengthened in 1915 with the arrival in Canada of Thomas Adams, who was to advise the federal government's Commission of Conservation on issues of town planning. Adams was an advocate of the Garden City Movement in Britain, originated by Ebenezer Howard. Howard had been part of the radical reform movement begun in the late nineteenth century known as Fabianism, which sought a

nonviolent means of effecting real social change in Britain. The Garden City model, developed between 1889 and 1892 by Howard, presented a possible solution. The Garden City was to be a highly organized community that would be situated in the centre of an agricultural greenbelt (1). The principle of access to open space was declared to be one of the fundamental rights of mankind by the reformers of the period. This belief co-existed in Howard's theories with a strong antipathy to land speculation, which he regarded as the root of the problems of the capitalist economic system. If the ability to make money through land was removed through state regulation, the capitalist system could once again become balanced.³¹ Howard's ideas and their translation into physical design by architects such as Parker and Unwin, were to have an impact in modern city planning and design, especially in North America, which is difficult to underestimate. The Garden City concept spawned a moderate number of Garden City communities, but also helped to propagate the countless suburbs of contemporary cities, with their hierarchical divisions of winding roads, parks and decentralized service nodes (2,3).

The physical and social formation of the houses built at Lindenlea came to be a mechanism by which the Canadian reformers attempted to regain control of the urban

³¹ Robert Fishman, Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1982):40-48.

environment, and return it to a state of 'normalcy.' The creation of the Federal Housing Scheme in 1918 provided an opportunity for these reformers to translate their ideas into built form in garden suburbs such as Lindenlea, but the suburb's manifestation should be seen as also reflecting broader cultural precepts of the period. Adams' strong functionalist streak made him appealing to middle class Canadians. While maintaining his reformist position regarding the need to provide better living conditions for the workers, he could appeal to the business community by emphasizing the economic basis of the city, as well as his primary concern that the town plan should facilitate and improve the conditions of the business and industrial environment. Thus Adams was able to incorporate the interests of business, the reformers and the government. The house as constructed at Lindenlea can thus be viewed as an attempt to realize the Canadian bourgeois myth, to create a homogeneous environment in which a homogeneous society would exist. The middle class concerns for the individual character of 'man', the privacy of the family, the standardization, rationalization and moralization of social behaviour, and the home environment in which these are located are all configurations of the motifs prevalent in the early modern chronotope.

The idea of home that was present in Canada in the early twentieth century was based in the liberal value system which

forms the cornerstone of Western political, social and economic practices, and therefore the reformers' platform. The association between the idea of 'home' and the liberal value system lies in the latter's all-encompassing respect for the right of property, as gained by individual labour. This right was felt to benefit not only the individual, but the collective society as well, and so private homeownership became a key principle of early urban reform.³² The house was to become the major economic and symbolic element in Canadian middle class life, but the symbolic character of the privately owned home was equally intense for the working class. The private home was a place of haven from the vagaries of the outside world, from the instability of rented accommodation, and possibly an escape from the bounds of their social class to the 'normal' life of the middle class.³³ As an item of personal gain and private consumption, the home long stood as an important signifier of personal expression in Canadian culture.³⁴ However, with the middle class in Canada as the largest group of home owners in this period, the effect was a normalization of this signficatory aspect, in which

³² Kamal Sayegh, Housing: A Canadian Perspective Ottawa: Academy Books, (1987): 118.

³³ Deryk W. Holdsworth, "House and Home in Vancouver: Images of West Coast Urbanism, 1886-1929," in eds. Gilbert A. Stelter and Alan F. J. Artibise The Canadian City: Essays in Urban and Social History (Ottawa: Carleton University Press): 187-209, p. 192.

³⁴ Sayegh, p. 119.

private home ownership and identification became a necessary condition of participating in a broader homogenized society. In Lindenlea, this paradoxical notion was evinced in both the stylistic form of the houses and in the forms of social action which were hoped to take place within this formal environment.

The image of women and their place in the home in the early modern chronotope was also to have a major impact on the conception of appropriate house form. The image was based upon anglo-middle class attitudes, in which the home was viewed as a place of retreat from the incivilities of the outside world, as a place in which the moral content of life could be controlled and the wife/mother and children could be kept safe and content. The rapid urbanization and industrialization of the period, as well as the disruptive character of World War One, served to heighten this idealized image in the minds of the urban reformers. The growth of industry as a significant employer of the urban working class was largely blamed for the disruption of the 'traditional' family, as the work environment for women and children shifted increasingly from home to factory.³⁵ The war only exacerbated this situation, and it was during this period that large numbers of middle class women began to enter the work force. This situation

³⁵ Suzanne Mackenzie, "Building Women, Building Cities: Toward Gender Sensitive Theory in the Environmental Disciplines, " in eds. Caroline Andrews and Beth Moore Milroy, Life Spaces: Gender, Household, Employment (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press 1988): 13-30, p. 19.

continued to be accepted after the end of the war, but only under specific conditions. The working woman of the middle class was overwhelmingly single, and her employment was usually considered temporary, a stop-gap measure until marriage, when she would begin her real career at home.³⁶ It was in this sense that the conjuncture between the realities of the social condition of women and the image of women in the minds of the reformers became an important aspect in the development of housing form. A temporary foray into the working world was even considered to be a positive step by the 1920s, for,

a few years of business experience.... serve to make [a woman] a more efficient home-maker, a more companionable wife, and a better balanced mother.³⁷

In this manner, the traditional home environment could ultimately be maintained, while perhaps incorporating some of the rational concepts of the modern capitalist business world.

The rise of home economics and domestic science as a part of the formal education process for women at this time was no

³⁶ Mary Vipond, "The Image of Women in Canadian Mass Circulation Magazines in the 1920s," Modernist Studies: Literature and Culture 1920-1940 vol. 1 no. 3 (1974-75): 5-14. See also Veronica Strong-Boag, The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939 (Toronto: Penguin, 1988): Chapter Two, "Working for Pay".

³⁷ Ibid., 5-14.

coincidence. The rationalization of the architecture of the home and its keeper were closely integrated. The move to make the home-maker more efficient through work experience went hand in hand with the reformers program of making her into a 'scientific manager' as well, often through home economics classes and university programs.³⁸ The position of housewife was portrayed as a career which required training and dedication. The efficient and morally upright home could not be properly maintained by an amateur, while the 'professional' homemaker should not have had to expect anything less than a professionally designed environment in which to do her work. This environment tended to be prescriptive, demanding a standardized set of actions from the housewife and leaving her little room to maintain an independent mode of living. Domestic science classes and literature set out clear guidelines for the provision of a 'normal' home environment, which every housewife could be measured against. The programmes were thus patriarchal in nature, implying that a woman needed to be taught how to be a proper housewife who would meet the professional standards her husband had come to expect in the rest of his life.

The urban reformers, largely members of the middle class, and male more often than not, seemed to sense a threat to their

³⁸ Ibid., 5-14.

traditional social environment in the urbanization and industrialization of Canada, and sought ways to remedy this situation.³⁹ Their attempt to revitalize the institution of the middle class family was facilitated in part by their acceptance of the temporary work life of the young single woman. But as Suzanne Mackenzie points out, the bourgeois also fought against any further articulation of these working class forms by creating an even greater separation between work and home, both physically and socially, than that created by the industrial revolution.⁴⁰ The creation of the suburbs was in some sense a reactionary heightening of the myth of the ideal home, and of the myth of the woman and the family, in an effort to retain the preferred traditional practices. Both were isolated from the uncontrolled progress of urbanization, resulting in an intermixing and interchange of the values applied to each. The home was a place of "restfulness, privacy, non-work" and sentimentalization, and these values came to be ascribed to the women as well, thus naturalizing her role as home-maker.⁴¹ Just as the home became an item of personal expression for the male owner, the woman, and her success in her roles as home-maker, wife, and mother became

³⁹ Paul Rutherford, "Tomorrow's Metropolis: The Urban Reform Movement in Canada, 1880-1920," in (eds.) Gilbert Stelter and Alan Artibise, The Canadian City: Essays in Urban and Social History. (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1984):435-455, p. 447; Mackenzie, p. 20.

⁴⁰ Mackenzie, p. 20.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 21.

part of this expression as well.⁴²

Political Setting

In 1909 the formation of the Commission of Conservation provided an important conduit between the reform movement and the federal government, and served to institutionalize the middle class programme of normalization. The Commission was an autonomous federal-provincial advisory body, concerned with the efficient and economical use of the nation's resources, including human life. The Commission adopted progressive doctrines and pushed the notion of 'scientific management' in its publication, the Conservation of Life.⁴³ Clifford Sifton, head of the Commission, preached the 'new gospel' of public health under the guidance of "the light of science and modern sanitary methods," as being "at the root of all happiness."⁴⁴ Sifton had formerly held the position of Minister of the Interior in the Laurier government, during the beginnings of Western colonialization. His position with regard to the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe who settled in the West was, like most of his colleagues,

⁴² Vipond.

⁴³ Michael Simpson, Thomas Adams and the Modern Planning Movement: Britain, Canada and the United States, 1900-1940 (London and New York: Alexandrine Press Book, Mansell, 1985): 3.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

assimilationist. This attitude was to continue in his work for the Commission of Conservation. Many urban reformers were of the opinion that slum conditions were at least partially the result of the large immigrant and ethnic communities which inhabited them. It was felt these people had brought 'old world' habits with them to Canada, and the reformers sought to 'modernize' these immigrants to Canadian models of living. Conservation of Life was to become the leading government voice regarding urban reform and housing, always with a strong emphasis on public and moral health. Sifton's positions as Minister of the Interior and later head of the Commission of Conservation can also be linked to the government's ideological position regarding the nation's development. Sifton's efforts at colonizing the West and in promoting the efficient use of the nation's resources - including human resources - are both progressive development policies, aimed at increasing the economic well-being of the nation.

By 1918, the demand for the federal government to do something about the housing situation was becoming both too loud and too justified to be ignored. The costs of building had increased beyond the war time inflation, causing a virtual standstill in house construction during this period.⁴⁵ As well, the expectation of having somewhere to house the returning

⁴⁵ "The Housing Problem and Production," Conservation of Life Vol. IV no. 3 (July 1918): 49-57, p.53.

soldiers, many with new families, in their own homes, was seen to be the least the country could do to reward their efforts overseas. Adams and the Commission of Conservation pressed for government involvement in the housing problem, recommending the building of new communities for soldiers along the Garden City principles. The towns of Lens, Saskatchewan was the sole result of this suggestion. Most other suggestions were not as radical, nor as expensive. Various schemes were presented by members of the government as the war appeared to be winding down in 1918. They were based largely on short term programmes that would offer low-interest loans to individual buyers or builders. The thought of subsidized public housing on a national scale was not considered for numerous reasons, including of course, the possible cost involved to the federal government.⁴⁶ If the federal government was to become involved in the actual home-building process, it could be only at the emergency or model level. Canada was to remain a 'property-owning democracy', for this enhanced social stability and the desire to work.⁴⁷

The government requested that Thomas Adams, as Planning

⁴⁶ The rebuilding of Halifax homes destroyed by the explosion was subsidized by the federal government, and may be considered an important exception to federal policy. See John C. Weaver, "Reconstruction of the Richmond District in Halifax: A Canadian Episode in Public Housing and Town Planning, 1918-1921," Plan Canada Vol. 16 (March 1976): 36-47.

⁴⁷ Simpson, p. 95.

Advisor to the Commission of Conservation, prepare a report for review. From this initiative came the Federal Housing Scheme. There were two essential aims of the Scheme. It was intended to serve the advancement of the nation by the provision of a better living environment for the soldiers and the poorly housed working class, improving their moral and physical well being, to standards acceptable to the middle class (although not necessarily to middle class standards). It was also to provide a boost to the construction industry, through the provision of low interest loans by the Federal government (through the Provinces) to the municipalities or individuals, with which to build low cost private homes.⁴⁸ The legislation was pushed through under the War Measures Act, in effect labelling it as a temporary, emergency scheme. No doubt the increasing labour unrest in Canada, combined with the perceived threat of Bolshevism, helped make this and other social policy legislation of the period seem timely. The Russian Revolution was perceived to be a real threat to the middle class way of life in Canada, and the normalization of the working class citizens was seen to be one of the most effective ways of combatting this danger. Under the provisions of the legislation, each province was required to provide more

⁴⁸ Andrew Eric Jones, Beginnings of Federal Government Housing Policy, 1918-1924 (Centre for Social Welfare Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa) Occasional Paper no. 1/78 (1978): 12. The cost limit set by the Ontario Housing Act was four thousand dollars. Letter from J.A. Ellis, Director, Housing Branch, Bureau of Municipal Affairs, Ontario, to the Ottawa Housing Commission, June 30, 1922. City of Ottawa Archives, RG 20/3, 144.

detailed legislation of its own, with regulations for the construction of houses to be funded through the Scheme. These provincial regulations were probably fairly uniform in nature, as each required the approval of the Housing Committee of the Federal Government before funding would be provided. Through this approval provision the Housing Committee thus established the concept of a basic living standard for all Canadians, a standard which held fixed notions regarding what could be considered the acceptable design of housing.

The Garden Suburb of Lindenlea

When the City of Ottawa declared its intentions to develop the site of Lindenlea, Thomas Adams became directly involved in the project and decided to make it into a model which could be emulated by other Canadian municipalities. Because of this direct involvement at the federal level, it would seem that the Ontario government had only nominal involvement in the initial design of the project. The decision by Adams to involve himself directly in the design of a low-income housing development reveals an understanding that the success of such a reform project could not consist solely of economic aid and general directive policies. The type and form of the house and the site were at least as important as the opportunity for purchase. Lindenlea was built as a suburb for lower income

Canadians, but was carefully modelled after the current middle class preferences. In a chronotope characterized by a concern for homogeneity and normalization, the development of a model project which would demonstrate the correct form of housing design is peculiarly appropriate.

The site planning of Lindenlea is in many ways as important to our understanding of the informing discourse of the period as the designs of the houses themselves. Because this project was to serve as a model of the Federal Housing Committee, Thomas Adams personally designed the layout of the suburb. He followed closely the design principles of the Garden City Movement, creating a small and intimate community that has withstood absorption by Ottawa to this day (4). The design fundamentals of the Garden City Movement in Great Britain were the product of Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker. Both architects had been strongly influenced by the tenets of the Arts and Crafts Movement, and sought to achieve "organic unity" in their site plans. As with other aspects of Arts and Crafts design, the medieval village acted as a romantic ideal to be emulated by the two architects, because it had "the appearance of being an organic whole, the home of a community," and because the village was seen to honestly express its purpose.⁴⁹ As Fishman states,

⁴⁹ Raymond Unwin, "Co-operation in building," in Parker and Unwin The Art of Building a Home, p. 92, as quoted in Robert Fishman, Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard,

Unwin's aesthetic glorification of the traditional village was also a glorification of the stable social relations he imagined existed there, and an implicit critique of the modern quest for change.⁵⁰

Thus the garden city, or suburb in the case of Lindenlea, was seen as a place which could be designed specifically for retreat from the chaos and flux of city life, a place where 'traditional' values could be rediscovered and reestablished by the working class inhabitants.⁵¹

In his site design for Lindenlea, Adams followed the Garden City fondness for curving street, cul de sacs, and tree lined boulevards, if on a necessarily smaller scale. The plan also provided for the setting aside of ten percent of the land for parks and recreational sites, such as tennis courts and bowling greens (14). Rockcliffe Way was planned as the main traffic artery, cutting diagonally through the site, but

Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier (Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1982):69-70.

⁵⁰ Fishman, p. 69.

⁵¹ It is interesting to note however, that some of Unwin's ideas were quite radical, deriving from the romanticized view of medieval life held by followers of the Arts and Crafts movement. One of the original schemes presented by Unwin for the first Garden City was a cooperative quadrangle, which would include a common dining room, nursery and recreation room. The plan was only realized in one small quadrangle called Homesgarth. Fishman, pp.70-71.

effort was made to keep through traffic to a minimum.⁵² While the desired effect of such garden city planning was a picturesque community, the theory was influenced strongly by the proto-modernist tendencies of the Arts and Crafts movement, in its combination of utility and nature, and the beauty found therein. Of course the garden suburb was also a popular middle class environment, and was therefore most appropriate for the reformist intentions of Adams and the Commission of Conservation.

Lindenlea was divided into 168 lots, all roughly the same size, but of varying shapes according to their location. Adams and his assistants were quite concerned about the placement of the houses on these individual lots.⁵³ An article in the April, 1921 issue of the Journal of the Town Planning Institute of Canada regarding the plan of Lindenlea, expressed concern about the need for "proper discrimination shown in the types of buildings erected, particularly in the design of those occupying strategic points and vistas at the ends of streets."⁵⁴ The same article criticizes many of the houses

⁵² Thomas Adams, "Report on the Planning and Redevelopment of the Lindenlea Estate, Ottawa," to the Ottawa Housing Commission, July 25, 1919. City of Ottawa Archives, RG22.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ "Proposed or completed Developments: Site Planning at Lindenlea, Ottawa," Journal of the Town Planning Institute of Canada (April 1921): 4-5. It should be noted here that Thomas Adams was the founder and first president of the Institute, and that a close associate of his was the editor of the Journal. The town

thus far built at Lindenlea as unattractive, and unsuited for their particular lots. Adams was to totally disassociate himself from the project in 1920 because of conflicts with the Ottawa Housing Commission regarding just this issue.

The Ottawa Housing Commission went to some lengths to give the project flexibility. Thus, after selecting their lots, home owners could choose from five or six different house plans (16-21). Some owners even brought in their own plans, although this was not encouraged. The commission's flexibility reflects a general acknowledgement of the desire and even need for individual expression through house form, if the program of incorporation of the working class into mainstream Canadian society was to be successful. It certainly would have been less expensive to build totally standardized units, as the Europeans were doing at the time. However, while the designers of Lindenlea adopted certain modernist tenets of building technology and standards, the aspects of individual identity and a picturesque setting remained a more important principle. Thomas Adams laid out clear provisions regarding the standards to be used in the design of Lindenlea. These standards appear in an article in the Journal of the American Institute of Architects of June 1919.

planning community of Canada, such as it was, was very tight, and most professionals were in complete agreement with Adams' plans and designs.

Provision should be made for securing ample garden - and air - space surrounding the dwellings to be erected. In cities and towns, each dwelling should occupy a lot comprising at least 1800 square feet Not less than 50 feet of clear open space in depth should be provided at the rear of dwellings, and the buildings should not occupy more than 50 per cent of the lot...⁵⁵

Considering these 'recommendations', it would be very difficult to build anything other than a suburban style development. The standards were in keeping with the reformers' attitudes regarding the health and moral needs of the working classes. Education was of course a major part of their program, but without the proper living environment, all this effort would be for nought. Physical health and morality were closely linked by the reformers and the public health officials, both influenced by current theories dominated by scientific and rational thinking. Charles Hodgetts, the medical advisor to the Commission of Conservation declared that, "light, air and water are the birthright of every man, woman and child in Canada." He also tied poor housing conditions to national concerns by blaming those conditions for,

[the] decreased efficiency of the people to the point where one in three men are unfit ... to fight the battle for freedom and honour... unfit to efficiently assist to build this nation in its

⁵⁵ "Housing Activities Around the World: Housing in Canada; notes from the Government Statement," Journal of the American Institute of Architects Vol. VII no. 6 (June, 1919): 271-274, p. 271.

struggle for supremacy in the markets of the world.⁵⁶

The reformers were thus not purely philanthropic in their concerns, but were fighting a battle against the threat of the deterioration of their middle class and nationalistic values, ideals and goals.

In the summer of 1919 the Journal of the American Institute of Architects and the British journal Builder both published drawings of the model designs produced by the architect working under Adams, W.D. Cromarty. The JAIA labelled these plans as "Housing Suggestions by the Housing Committee of the Cabinet, Canada," but neither journal provided additional commentary or information on the plans (5,6)⁵⁷. Part of Adams' suggestions always had included the provision of grouped houses on the Letchworth model, as well as detached, but Lindenlea was developed and built strictly as a suburb of single detached houses. However, the grouped or rowhouse was not a common or popular type for middle class Canadians, and therefore would probably not be seen as an appropriate or

⁵⁶ In his article, "Housing and Health," Charles Hodgetts quoted Sir John Simon, Medical Health Officer of the Privy Council in England, who in 1866 stated, "When overcrowding exists in a sanitary sense, it almost always exists even more promiscuously in certain moral senses..." Canadian Municipal Journal (March, 1920): 86-87, 93, p. 87.

⁵⁷ "Housing Activities Around the World: Housing in Canada; notes from the Government Statement," Journal of the American Institute of Architects Vol. VII no. 6 (June, 1919):271-274.

popular type for model working class housing either.

Diversity of materials in exterior finishings was allowed for by both the federal and provincial housing authorities, and the housing at Lindenlea reflects this. Once again, the influence of the Garden City movement and its ties to the Arts and Crafts movement is evident. At Letchworth, the designs of Unwin and Parker reflected the Arts and Crafts preference for "cleanliness, simplicity, and the honest use of materials."⁵⁸ The ideology of 'cooperative' and community life were expressed through a reinterpretation of medieval vernacular architecture, including the use of brick and stucco.⁵⁹

In the house designs for Lindenlea brick and stucco were the most popular materials, often in combination. Although the preferences of the federal government are not known, the Ontario guidelines recommended brick, hollow tile, stone or concrete, with stucco, shingles or clapboard acceptable as well (7).⁶⁰ Almost all of the houses were two storey, and all provided a front or side verandah or porch. Many had second storey balconies or sleeping porches. This was in keeping with the current theories on hygiene, which encouraged

⁵⁸ Fishman, p. 69.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Ontario. Report of the Ontario Housing Committee: Including Standards for Inexpensive Houses Adopted for Ontario and Typical Plans (Toronto: A.T. Wilgress, 1919): 22.

as much fresh air in the house as possible. Of course this recommendation had two corollary effects. Housekeeping books recommended daily airing of rooms and bed linens, while the open windows increased dust in the house. Thus the conscientious housewife could add two more chores to her daily list.

This emphasis on fresh air, in combination with the push for sunlight in every room, also led to changes in house design, especially in low income shelter. One of the major complaints of urban reformers regarding tenements was the lack of ventilation and light in the units. The standards provided by both the federal and provincial governments included strict regulations about combatting these perceived evils. Minimum space requirements between buildings were set out, generally following suburban standards. Within the design of the house itself, the federal government demanded that,

every habitable room should have at least one window opening to the outer air. Each room should have a window space of at least one-tenth the floor area, and cross ventilation should be provided where practicable.⁶¹

This predilection for windows is apparent in the designs of the houses for Lindenlea. Every design includes a large,

⁶¹ JAIA, "Housing Activities Around the World: Housing in Canada; note from the government statement," p. 271.

usually tripartite window in the living room or parlour. Many have basement windows, although basements were strictly forbidden for habitation. Very few of the plans are more than two rooms deep, providing the opportunity for windows on two sides of the room, and thus better cross ventilation (9,10).

But there were other more socially motivated reasons for the provision of more window space and sunlight in the homes of low-income families. The Ontario guideline book provides the following inspiring tale.

Family consisting of father, mother and six children. House had been neglected so long by landlord that walls and paint were in very dirty condition, front steps broken, windows out and altogether house presented a very dilapidated condition. Woman had apparently lost all interest in children and home. Children usually dirty and only half clothed. House filthy. About two months ago the whole family with the exception of the father were taken ill with diphtheria and sent to Isolation hospital. Our Division, through efforts of the Division of Housing, succeeded in bringing force to bear on the landlord with the result that he had the house renovated, papered, painted and repaired before the woman and children were discharged from the hospital. Now the woman takes very good care of the home and children, who for the first time are clean, and go to school quite regularly.⁶²

Through the provision of a 'normal' environment then, these families had learned to participate in their society in the correct manner, by getting jobs, going to school, and

⁶² Report of the Ontario Housing Committee, p.52.

especially by keeping the house up to middle class standards.

Besides the change in appearance of houses through such things as additional windows, aesthetic changes were made as well. These changes were also based on theories promoting rationalization, efficiency and economy in all aspects of life. The decorative excesses of 1890s domestic Canadian architecture are nowhere apparent in the architecture of the post-War era. The Modernist aesthetic would not fully appear in Canadian architecture until the 1930s, but the influences of mass production, standardization and the Arts and Crafts predilection for simplicity of line were felt in Canadian architecture nonetheless. The massing of the houses in Lindenlea is generally quite simple, often a foursquare plan with a front porch, to minimize exterior wall space, and thus reduce costs. Decorative woodwork around eaves, doors and windows is gone, as is any overt decorative brickwork, particularly voussoirs, polychrome or three-dimensional banding, or chimney work. Porches and verandas have either square or simple Doric posts, and small undecorated pediments, if there is one at all. Window sills are usually concrete, and very few windows have shutters. The most common decorative element seems to be minimal half timbering on houses finished in stucco (8,11). The overall appearance of the houses is of a subdued Arts and Crafts style, which matches well with its English Garden City prototypes. A letter from Thomas Adams to

the Ottawa Housing Commission's architect F.E. Belfry confirms the desire for simplicity in the exterior design, "The bands on stucco work should not be included, but plain scheme of brick and rough cast stucco preferable."⁶³

One of the most common housing types found at Lindenlea was the front gambrel roof type (13,15). This style was popular in Ontario from at least the late 19th century. It was probably one of the more economic styles to build, since its low roof line and square plan would reduce the costs of exterior cladding. However, its inclusion as an approved and much used style of housing for the model suburb also indicates the desire of the designers to maintain a link with traditional, middle class housing forms and therefore reinforce the link between the two.

Adams tried to exercise a general aesthetic control over the designs for Lindenlea in the beginning although he was not an architect, nor did he have any designated power to do so. He comments in the same letter about the 'balance of the windows' in some designs, suggesting that "a flat canopy is much more in keeping with the elevation" and to "get door more nearly under centre of window" on another type submitted for his approval. Much of the correspondence between Adams and Belfry suggests that Adams was very concerned with the overall

⁶³ Thomas Adams, letter, June 27, 1919.

appearance of the suburb. In particular he refers to the need to design and build the houses so that the roof lines were at the same level throughout and that the suitability of a house design and its intended lot be carefully considered. The rationalization of architecture that was taking place in this period had stripped the form of most of the ornament which had been used as a mode of expression in the 19th century. Thus the placement of windows and the continuity of rooflines became an important aesthetic concern. The importance of an overall consistency to the 'look' of the suburb is reflective of the modernist penchant for comprehensive planning and design in order to achieve a homogeneous environment. Adams' concern over such aesthetic details cannot be trivialized, for recognition of these architectural values helps to locate the project within the early modern chronotope.

The rationalization program that had its effect in the stripping down of the exterior was to play an equally important role in influencing the design of the interior. Especially in the low cost homes, any vestiges of the eccentricity of the Victorian plan was eradicated. Most of the homes built at Lindenlea were square in plan, and this immediately lessened the opportunity for an imaginative play with spatial effects. The typical plan was quartered on both levels (12). The downstairs consisted of an entrance hall with stairway quarter, and relatively equally sized living room,

dining room and kitchen. The upstairs consisted of two large bedrooms, and two smaller ones, which shared their quarters with a bathroom and the staircase. Most plans opted for a side hall entrance, which allowed better isolation of the living room, and more direct access to the kitchen at the rear of the house.

One of the most revolutionary features of these working class homes was the required inclusion of built-in closets. While built-in closets had become more prevalent in middle and upper class homes in the early years of the twentieth century, they were not a frequent feature of tenement houses.⁶⁴ Once again, closets were deemed necessary to maintain a clean and efficient home and person. All plans were required to have closets in each bedroom, and most had hall closets as well. Bathrooms were also undergoing major changes. All plans available for Lindenlea show a consolidated bathroom, with a built-in tub, sink and toilet in a single room. This was a shift from older houses, or the European model, which often had a separate water closet.

Built-in cupboards were not to be found in the kitchens of Lindenlea. More expensive houses of the period did include this recent innovation, but the cost was probably prohibitive

⁶⁴ Gwendolyn Wright, Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980): 245.

for Lindenlea. The boom in domestic sciences and education of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries played a major part in the changing role of the kitchen, as well as new expectations of the housewife. The kitchen was no longer the central activity space of the middle class home. In the minds of the reformers, it became a 'laboratory' for the specific use of preparing healthy and hygienic food for the family.⁶⁵ Feminist scholars have pointed to this shift as a further isolation of the wife from the family, and from the social realm in general. The housewife was the 'master of the kitchen', helped supposedly by her new electric appliances. The design approach at Lindenlea is an interesting contrast to the earlier houses of Letchworth Garden City in England, and reflects the influence of the Canadian and American reform movements on domestic architecture. Rather than trying to provide the ideal middle class plan by miniaturizing it for affordable housing, Parker and Unwin recognized the importance of the kitchen as the central social space of the working class home. In their cottages, the kitchen is combined with the living room in a modern open-plan design.⁶⁶

The size of the kitchen in the later designs was often reduced as well, due once again to its specific use, and to aid in the

⁶⁵ Gwendolyn Wright, "Sweet and Clean: The Domestic Landscape in the Progressive Era," Landscape Vol. 20 no.1 (October 1975): 38-43, p. 41.

⁶⁶ Fishman, p. 74.

efficiency of housework. The kitchens of Lindenlea were still primitive in their minimality by our modern standards. The only built-in feature was the sink. There were no cupboards, and no counter space, and certainly no appliances included in any of the drawings. The pantry also diminished in size or completely disappeared, leaving one to wonder where the homemaker was expected to keep her food. All the kitchens did have at least one window, plus a door letting on to a back stoop or directly to the garden.⁶⁷

Conclusion

The garden suburb of Lindenlea was designed and built to serve as a model for the building of economical yet appropriate low-cost housing in Canadian municipalities. In the end the dual aims were incompatible, and the suburb was largely occupied by civil servants. The use of the model format was typical in many ways of the early modern ideology - model homes at fairs, settlement houses, and instructional books on the appropriate home environment were popular aids for the reformers of the period. The use of the model reflects the aim of these reformers, including Adams and the Commission of Conservation, to incorporate the poor into their middle class culture

⁶⁷ For an informative description of the typical middle class and working class home environments in the 1920s see Veronica Strong-Boag, The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939.

through the production of a normalized and homogeneous environment.

The techniques and philosophy of modern science and industry came to the aid of this programme, providing clear examples of the advantages of standardization, efficiency and modern technology. However, while these ideals provided a means, the true aims of the Canadian reformers found their source in nineteenth century values of morality. The configuration of the early modern chronotope is thus informed by beliefs in the direct link between moral and physical health, in the inappropriateness of the city as a family environment, in the sanctity of the family and the place of the women in the home, and in the value of private home ownership.

The approach was patriarchal, ethnocentric and deterministic: if the poor could be shown the proper way, and placed in the proper environment, they would naturally begin to behave in a 'normal' manner. At the same time the municipalities across Canada had to be shown and taught how to provide and create the correct environment. The model format was thus an appropriate one: it would set a single basic standard of housing design across the country and across the population.

These ideals were clearly transmitted in the design of Lindenlea. It was a suburban project, separated from the

dirtiness of the industrial and amoral city, while providing the scientifically specified amount of fresh air, light and green space required for proper physical and moral health. The houses were detached, single family homes of traditional, middle class styles to be privately owned, which promoted individual pride and care. At the same time, these houses were designed under a definite set of standards regarding both functional and aesthetic issues.

The location of Lindenlea as an ideal type of public housing within the early modern chronotope thus helps to explain some of the design decisions made. The choice of the detached, two-storey type over the more economical and modern 'cottage flat' row house type built by the Toronto Housing Company a few years before and proposed by both Adams and the Ontario government, reflects this idealistic positioning.⁶⁸ The Ottawa Housing Commission was in fact censured by the Housing Branch of the Ontario Bureau of Municipal Affairs for its seeming lack of concern about the cost overruns of its houses.

The three or four styles which predominate at Lindenlea are essentially stripped down and smaller versions of popular Canadian domestic architecture of the time. Rationalization and the theories of scientific management and hygiene did play

⁶⁸ Craick, W.A., "Cottage Flats in Toronto," Architectural Record (December 1914): 540-544.

a major role in the development of the housing forms of this period, and of Lindenlea as a result. In Canada, however, this did not result in a rejection, parallel to that of Europe's, of the traditional in favour of the Modern, but rather in a rejuvenation of the traditional forms and ideals, to serve the modern theories. The reformers were willing to embrace the new theories on hygiene and health, which were essentially the same as those influential on the Modernist architects of Europe. But the early modern social and moral ideology in Canada was in part characterized by a conservative belief in traditional values. By keeping traditional exterior house forms rather than adopting the radical, Modernist machine aesthetic, the designers produced the most appropriate housing type for their programme. And while the major influence on Lindenlea and other housing reform projects of the period came from the Garden City Movement in Great Britain, Lindenlea is not a miniature Letchworth or Port Sunlight. The contrast between the exterior and interior designs of the houses at Lindenlea is most informative in this regard. The houses of Lindenlea follow the modern interior planning concepts of Adam's designs for the Federal Housing Committee, as presented in the JAIA and The Builder, but revert to a reinterpretation of more traditional Canadian stylizations (such as the gambrel roof) on the exterior.

However, the sole use of the double-storey, detached house at

Lindenlea also reflects a more problematic result than aesthetic and social homogeneity. The reformers, while intent on providing a middle class environment for their clients, effectively excluded low-income earners from participation. A large percentage of the houses at Lindenlea were bought or built by civil servants, who certainly could not be considered to come from the low-income stratus. The houses at Lindenlea were priced between three thousand and forty-five hundred dollars, and this was well beyond the price range of the most needy. The majority of those desperate for decent housing would not have been able to afford even the down payment required (only veterans were exempt from this requirement).⁶⁹

This was perhaps the major failing of Lindenlea, and of the housing type it represents. The development was to become the subject of various controversies and scandals during its building, but none of these really concerned the basic flaw of unattainability by those it sought (in the official rhetoric) to help. Although it would have been possible to develop and build housing in which the lower income citizens of Ottawa could afford to live (if not own), this would have meant a drastic compromise in the standards, aesthetic and otherwise, set by the federal government and the reformers. The original purpose of Lindenlea, to provide decent, low-cost housing to

⁶⁹ Cassie Doyle, Municipal Initiatives in Housing 1900-1970: The City of Ottawa. (City of Ottawa, 1982).

those in need, had become obscured by a complex combination of aesthetic and social preconceptions. The rationalization and scientific management which was hailed by the reformers as the solution to Canada's urban social and moral woes ultimately became submerged under a style of new traditionalism.

CHAPTER THREE: ALEXANDRA PARK, TORONTO (1964-1966)

Introduction

In the previous chapter it was shown that the ideology of the housing reformers of the early modern chronotope was strongly influenced by a belief in the standardized and efficient methods of science and industry as a model for everyday life. In the post-World War Two period however, it was the discipline of sociology which gained influence over the producers of public housing, becoming an established source of knowledge by the 1960s and the design of Alexandra Park. This intellectual shift is a key factor in the manner in which the inhabitants of 1960s housing were socially and spatially located by the professions. The ideology of the early modern reformers focussed on the moral and physical health of the individual within the family unit. The late modern chronotope however, is configured through an assertion of the issues of the family and the community in the areas of health, social milieu and the urban/suburban dichotomy. Thus while the family continued to be the social unit of both greatest concern and ideological approval, planners, architects and sociologists came to be increasingly interested in the design and production of community environments. One of the mature results of this chronotopic shift was the emergence of the row house urban renewal project type as represented by Alexandra

Park.

The public housing project of Alexandra Park occupies eighteen acres of an originally designated seventy two acre improvement area in downtown Toronto, known as The Alexandra Park Redevelopment Area. The project is bounded on the north by Dundas Street, on the west by Augusta Avenue and Denison Avenue, and on the east by Cameron Street. It is set back some distance from Queen Street to the south. The housing consists of a total of 429 units, with 267 row houses, 143 apartments, 13 rehabilitated houses and 6 rehabilitated apartments.⁷⁰ The layout of the site plan was essentially derived through a desire to maintain the existing throughways of the area, by the creation of pedestrian walkways which follow the same general pattern as the previously existing streets. The architecture of the project is predominantly low-rise row or terrace housing at a high density, and Modernist in a tough, practical and economical manner. Each row house unit has both a front entrance onto the pedestrian street, and a back entrance onto a small private garden, leading usually to a semi-public green space. The discussion in this chapter will focus on the row house element of the project, as this constitutes the major typological and ideological presence of

⁷⁰ Webb, Zerafa and Menkes; Jerome Markson; Klein and Sears, The Alexandra Park Redevelopment Area Proposed Public Housing Project: A Report by the Architects for Alexandra Park, unpublished, June 24, 1960

the design.

Urban Historical Setting

Alexandra Park (1966) was one of many initiatives in the area of slum clearance and urban renewal undertaken by the City of Toronto in the 1950s and 1960s. The initial impetus for this new approach seems to have come largely from the 1934 Report of the Lieutenant-Governor's Committee on Housing Conditions in Toronto (The Bruce Report). The Report was comprehensive in its review and condemnation of existing housing conditions in Toronto, and in suggesting new solutions to the problem. Although the primary concerns of planners and politicians would shift in emphasis over the next thirty years, the Report helps to reveal the ideological origins of slum clearance and urban renewal. The solutions recommended by the committee were largely based on the principles of decentralization and suburbanization following the work of Garden City movement advocates although at a much more comprehensive scale than at Lindenlea, including a redesign and rebuilding of the city core following the same basic principles. The Report includes a speech in which the Lieutenant-Governor outlined his resolution to the problem.

It seems to me that the only availing remedy in Toronto is a planned decentralization which will take the outmoded factory away from our congested central areas and substitute for it in the

outskirts a new modern building that would permit workers to establish their homes convenient to their work in surroundings where their children would learn by experience that grass is a green, living and loving carpet, and that there are really and truly other and lovelier flowers than those of the lithographed calendar that hangs on the cracked, crumbling and soiled wall of a murky room into which the sun's rays have never penetrated. It seems to me also, that as we evacuate those factories and hovels, we must raze them and bury the distressing memory of them in fine central parks and recreational centres.⁷¹

The Report made two major recommendations. First that the City establish a Planning Commission, and then that it undertake an 'extensive' slum clearance program and the building of low-cost rental housing, in cooperation with the federal and provincial governments (24).⁷² Much of the ideology and rhetoric in the report follows the tradition of the urban reformers from the pre-World War One period, including references to the moral degradation which is determined by the physical conditions of the core area 'slums'. However, the emphasis on clearance, and the suggestion that new housing could be built in place of the old (and by the government) is new. The Report moves the design and production of public housing in Canada one step closer toward the grand projects and sometimes totalizing visions of the Modern Movement in its suggestions for a bold and institutionalized approach of

⁷¹ Ontario. Report of the Lieutenant-Governor's Committee on Housing Conditions in Toronto (Bruce Report). (Toronto, 1934), p. 5.

⁷² Graham Fraser. Fighting Back: Urban Renewal in Trefann Court. (Toronto: Hakkert, 1972): 56.

clearance and renewal. The first concrete results of the Report can be seen in the Regent Park North project, started in the late 1940s as the first public housing project in Canada.

It was during the post-World War Two period that the City of Toronto began to develop planning guidelines and bylaws that would significantly alter the morphology of the city's fabric. George Baird has pinpointed 1954 as a crucial year in the urban development of Toronto. This year saw the formation of the metropolitan system of government, the opening of the subway system, and a new zoning bylaw which "was designed to foster downtown redevelopment, both commercial and residential."⁷³ The new regulations allowed, partly through provisions for land assembly, the development of the Central Business District into an area of skyscrapers, while high-rise apartment buildings began to appear in the older residential districts as well.⁷⁴

The programme of slum clearance and urban renewal had by that point been taken up enthusiastically by the City of Toronto Planning Board. In their annual report of 1944, the Board estimated that over 50 percent of Toronto's residential area,

⁷³ George Baird, "Theory/Vacant Lots in Toronto," Design Quarterly no. 108 (1978):16-31, p. 17.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 18.

as well as almost all the neighbourhoods lying south of the CPR North Toronto line, were "declining," implying that these were areas to be considered for eventual clearance and renewal.⁷⁵ As with the standards set for Lindenlea, the criteria for determining 'scund' housing by the Board seemed to be based upon the suburban model. However, it was no longer thought practical to replace the existing housing with publicly subsidized garden city housing. A conceptual plan commissioned by the City for its 1956 Urban Renewal: A Study of Toronto imagined a massive clearance plan in the core area, replaced by "superblocks" of row housing, three or four storey walk-ups and maisonettes, and some high-rise development.⁷⁶ Le Corbusier's Radiant City had finally made its way to Toronto. The scheme was never carried out, although its influence can be seen in the design of Regent Park South (26,27).

The 1956 plan for the superblock redevelopment of the core area of Toronto holds all the major characteristics of the typical slum clearance and urban renewal programme. In the post-World War Two period clearance and renewal were seen to be the best way to modernize the Canadian city and provide the infrastructure, services and commercial and residential accommodation necessary for rational and efficient development

⁷⁵ Fraser, p. 57.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 60.

and growth. It was a modernist project requiring large scale planning and projects, including the separation of activities (ie. residential, industrial, commercial) through zoning and relocation. Although zoning and relocation were also projects from the post-World War One period, by the late 1940s they were being carried out at a much larger and broader scale, and included redevelopment of the core area as a primary goal. Land assembly by private and public developers was seen as a positive activity, and was encouraged by all levels of government in order to facilitate redevelopment.

Political Setting

The federal government encouraged the shift to larger-scale community oriented projects through funding provided by the 1944 National Housing Act, and through policies developed by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.⁷⁷ Federal housing policy between 1935 and 1938 followed the same general philosophy as that set out by the Federal Housing Scheme, with the emphasis on low interest rate loans for the building of privately owned housing.⁷⁸ The National Housing Act introduced in 1938 was the first to provide funds to improve

⁷⁷ The Corporation was created in 1946.

⁷⁸ There was no federal government housing policy between 1924 and 1935.

the availability and quality of low-rental housing.⁷⁹ Lack of interest on the part of the provinces, and the interruption of World War Two helped make the Act a failure. The federal government directed most of its energies into Wartime Housing Limited, which built 25,000 small houses across Canada during the War.⁸⁰

The 1944 National Housing Act reintroduced the provision of funds for rental housing, and promoted the use of slum clearance as a major aspect of creating adequate housing for low-income households. In 1946 the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was created and assumed responsibility for the Act. As the major source of funding to municipalities and private developers, the NHA under CMHC was to become very influential in the types of solutions chosen. CMHC actively encouraged slum clearance and urban renewal in the post-war period.⁸¹ The 1954 National Housing Act included a separate section (Part III) dealing with Housing Redevelopment. This Part authorized "grants to municipalities for acquiring, clearing and planning blighted areas suitable for low- or

⁷⁹ The Act provided both tax incentives and a total of thirty million dollars in loans to municipal authorities for the provision of low-rental units, along with the low-interest loans of the DHA.

⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 125-126; and Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Ontario Housing Corporation. Ontario Housing Corporation, 1964-1984 (Ministry, 1984):6.

⁸¹ CMHC published a journal, Urban Renewal and Public Housing in Canada from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s.

moderate-cost rental projects or any public purpose."⁸²

The development of housing construction standards in this period by the federal government through CMHC reflects the interest in recreating in total the residential urban environment. The standards were therefore not confined to building technology or such things as room size, but included the question of social and community standards as well. This concern is one of the prime motivators for CMHC's interest in urban renewal. In the 1966 CMHC pamphlet on urban renewal and public housing, the following list comprises their justification for such undertakings: overcrowding; lack of community facilities including schools, parks, playgrounds, and community halls; unsatisfactory relationship between uses; physical deterioration of buildings; inadequacy or lack of services; inadequacy of traffic patterns; a use no longer reasonable within the context of economic or social pressures.⁸³ It is interesting to note that over half of the problems are either community or separation (zoning or traffic) related.

⁸² Ontario Housing Corporation 1964-1984, p. 131.

⁸³ Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Some Basic Questions and Answers on the Urban Renewal and Public Housing Provision of the NHA (Ottawa: CMHC, 1966), pamphlet.

Ideological Setting

The 1956 report identified two areas in Toronto as being a priority for urban renewal; Alexandra Park and Moss Park. The Planning Board recommended clearance of 10.7 acres, and the subsequent construction of public housing for 1450 people. The scheme was approved by the City of Toronto, but rejected by the metropolitan government, with the result that the plans were stalled until 1962. Metro Toronto felt that Toronto's principal problem of overcrowding would not be solved through the clearance of the existing housing in Alexandra Park, which it declared needed only rehabilitation rather than demolition. Metro advocated the building of new housing on vacant rather than cleared land, on the grounds that it would be cheaper and would provide more accommodation.⁸⁴

By the time that urban renewal once again became an option in Alexandra Park the approach was beginning to be subject to criticism from both social activists and citizens groups. Regent Park South, a clearance and renewal project which combined high-rise apartment buildings with a few low-rise townhouses had, by the early sixties, begun to reveal itself as a highly problematic building form for public housing that accommodated families. The process of urban renewal was also beginning to come under attack, with its expropriation of

⁸⁴ Fraser, p. 67.

property and relocation which often took little account of the upheaval and long term effect it was having on existing residents. Planners still believed that they were doing the best for all parties involved, but residents who owned homes in the designated areas saw only the loss of these homes and of their sometimes fragile sense of stability.

The origins of the definition of community adopted by architects, planners and sociologists in the 1960s can be seen to come from two overlapping ideological motifs. The first was an essentially romantic view of community which drew on a rising interest in the history of urban development, and especially in small European towns or villages. These villages were increasingly seen as the ideal social and architectural type for housing developments, in contrast to the huge and monolithic developments of modernism. In the field of sociology, this ideal was theorized as the 'natural community', beginning with Park and Burgess in the 1920s.⁸⁵ As Gerald Suttles defines it,

...the natural community was not seen as primarily an intentional or instrumental collectivity ... explanations of its solidarity were heavily weighted toward the development of sentimental ties among coresidents.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ Gerald D. Suttles. The Social Construction of Communities (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972): 11.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

This model emphasized "shared social characteristics as a basis for shared feelings and values."⁸⁷ The result of this naturalizing perspective was a view of the existence of the village community as an ontological reality, but a reality which could only exist within the specific environment of the village or small town. The city produced social anomie and alienation, and thus spelled the death of community.

While shifts were occurring in the social location of residents, the deterministic belief in their surrounding environment remained strong. The ideology of the early modern social and housing reformers sought improvements to household environments in order to set the individual on the path to moral and physical well being. While these concerns had not completely disappeared by the 1960s, the overriding interest seemed to be in housing and urban design that would allow 'better' social behaviour. In the preface to his book on Regent Park North for instance, Albert Rose poses the following as the work's fundamental question,

When a group of people are removed from living conditions considered among the most seriously inadequate in the community and placed in new housing and a new environment, adequate both in the physical and social sense, do their health, welfare, social relationships and personal

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 12.

behaviour or standards change positively?⁸⁸

One can see the influence of the two motifs of separation and community, as well as the continuing belief in the deterministic effect of the environment in the design and production of Alexandra Park. The architects and social planners of the project tried to create an autonomous community within a redeveloped urban precinct through the use of specific design features in the site plan and buildings. The precedent for these features was the European village, with its narrow streets, high density and shared public spaces.

Thus while the early modernist motif of the individual becomes somewhat submerged by the rising late modernist motif of community, many of the other motifs present in Lindenlea continue, carried forward in part by this belief in the powers of environment: issues of rationalization, functionalism, standardization and health all continue to exert substantial pressure on design and production ideology in the 1960s, if in somewhat reconfigured ways.

The continuing influence of these motifs is apparent in the adaptation rather than rejection of the modernist views on

⁸⁸ Albert Rose, Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958): vii.

technology and science during the late 1950s and 1960s. On a broad cultural level, science and technology were no longer viewed as unproblematic tools for the improvement of humans and human behaviour. Following the Second World War a more wary and ironic view of technology prevails, and the desire to produce a 'rational man' was tempered in most intellectual and reform circles with a more humanistic and populist approach. In the April 1960 issue of The Architectural Review Ian Nairn would cynically declare that,

[the choice is] man as any kind of civilized social animal, or man as a tiresomely inefficient cog in the society set up by his mindless masters.⁸⁹

Nairn's article constitutes a diatribe against human reliance on the car, an issue of paramount importance in any discussion of the post-WWII North American and British cities. But while the technological products of modern science, such as the automobile and the atomic bomb were viewed with increasing distrust in some circles, the essential modernist principles of rationalization and functionalism held firm. Planners and architects of the 1960s, for example, expended much of their creative energy on the separation of cars and people, through the building of expressways, the pedestrianisation of streets,

⁸⁹ Ian Nairn, "The Mindless Master," The Architectural Review (Vol. 127 no. 758, April 1960): 229-231, p. 230.

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

squares and campuses, and the creation of shopping malls.⁹⁰

It is important to understand that while all these car-related projects derive from the common motif of separation, they ultimately express two radically different yet equally influential perspectives about the appropriate form of the urban environment. It is these two themes of separation and community which in many ways define the late modern chronotopic location of Alexandra Park.

The expressway was conceived in the name of modern efficiency, to aid in the rapid and safe movement of cars between the various zones of the city. It is both an expression and servant of rationality and of technology, rejecting and often destroying the traditional neighbourhoods and their sense of community and compact vitality.⁹¹ The pedestrian precinct, on the other hand, was designed for human leisure, pleasure, safety and communality. It is a place for children to play, for adults to be both flaneur and consumer, an essentially romantic reinterpretation of the premodern European town squares and winding streets (29). Both of these motifs, that

⁹⁰ Robert Moses is perhaps the most influential figure in the creation of expressways in North America, through his transformation of New York; Clarence Stein, the designer of Radburn, N.J. is generally viewed as the originator of the idea of the separation of pedestrian and car traffic in residential areas.

⁹¹ See Marshall Berman, "Robert Moses: The Expressway World," All That is Solid Melts into Air, The Experience of Modernity, (New York: Penguin Books, 1982): 290-311.

of efficiency through separation, and of community through separation, gain common ground in the Alexandra Park programme of urban clearance and renewal.

Design Setting: The Row House

It was not until the mid- 1950s that the housing community in Canada began to look to low-rise row housing as a viable solution to many of the problems presented by the affordable housing shortage. Housing policy in the 1950s and 1960s was still very much directed toward providing accommodation for low-income families, and the form of even low-rise apartment blocks such as built in Regent Park North was seen increasingly as inappropriate for this group (25). In contrast, row housing was seen to hold all the most important features of the detached single family dwelling, but at a much more affordable and compact scale. It was especially the house-to-ground relationship which architects of the period stressed as making row housing a valid form of family accommodation.

[Row housing is a] single family house joined to other single family houses ... each having individual identity both to a front door and to an identifiable ground space.⁹²

⁹² Jack Klein, The Row House - its place in the urban community (Ottawa: Canadian Housing Design Council, n.d.): 1.

The work of Clarence Stein on Radburn Garden City in New Jersey was particularly influential in the site planning of these row housing schemes (22,23). Stein's reworking of the traditional relationship between house and street, in order to create a separation between pedestrian and automobile traffic was enthusiastically adopted by Central Canadian architects in the early 1960s as a fundamental motif for the design of multiple housing developments. The adoption of the ideal of separation, however, did not mean the wholesale acceptance of Stein's garden suburb planning. The critique of the suburbs was popular sport among architects of the 1960s.

Here alone is the amazing paradox of the suburb: A dichotomy of feeling is plainly expressed by the individual house which tries by its very nature to stand apart, and yet which rarely displays any genuine personal expression.⁹³

Architects also deplored the characteristic sprawl which lacked spatial definition, ate up rural lands, was becoming increasingly expensive, and necessitated ever expanding complex road systems for car dependent commuters. Moreover, not only were the suburbs themselves tedious, but they were seen as adversely affecting the city core's urban vitality.⁹⁴

⁹³ Peter Batchelor, "Horizontal Multiple Housing: A study of low-rise multiple housing developments in Western Europe and Scandinavia," Journal of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (February, 1965): 22-38, p. 22.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p.22.

This yearning for a return to the diversity and density of the urban core was most clearly and forcefully presented by Jane Jacobs in her 1961 book, The Death and Life of Great American Cities.

While Jacob's book became a great popular success, and continues to influence architects today, the response by the housing culture of which the Alexandra Park architects were a part, was tempered by their modernist notions of rationalization and functionalism. In particular, Jacobs' unabashed adoration of the qualities of the street were seen by some as idealistic, particularly in ignoring the dangers of mixing cars and children.⁹⁵ The limited acceptance of Jacobs' ideas by the architects of the period will be more fully examined in relation to her reaction to Alexandra Park. It can be stated here however, that this reaction to her work epitomizes the paradoxical conjuncture between the period ideologies of separation and community.

Row housing was seen as an ideal typology for developing a more urbanistic housing development which would still allow for the suburban characteristics of safe and green recreational space and house identity. In his essay on row housing for the Canadian Housing Design Council, Jack Klein

⁹⁵ Ivor de Wolfe, "The Death and Life of the Great American Citizen," The Architectural Review (Vol. 133 no. 792, February 1963): 91-93, p.92.

wrote that

Such housing can be developed in any urban location used for residential purposes and is suitable for all families regardless of family formation or income. While there is a tendency for large new developments to occur in the suburbs where land is more readily available, row housing is equally useful in established parts of the city. Here the development may take the form of clearance and replacement of out-dated housing.⁹⁶

Row housing is thus presented as a typology that is one of the most flexible forms available. Two major ideological forces seem to be at play in Klein's essay, one established and one just emerging in the 1960s. The first is the use of housing as a normalizing object - row housing is presented as being appropriate not just for affordable housing, but for all classes and in all locations. The second is the emerging recognition that detached single family housing, and the more recent high-rise apartment block housing, may not meet the needs of all of society, and that alternative forms need to be made available.

The idea of row housing seems to have come to Canadian housing designers from England (in particular through the work of the London County Council). In England such housing was a continuation of the traditional terrace housing that developed in the 18th century industrial and urban boom, and which crossed all class boundaries from the prestigious Crescent in

⁹⁶ Klein, The Row House, p.5.

Bath to the industrial workers' terrace housing in Manchester (28). The London County Council began to build this type as affordable housing immediately following the Second World War, and Canadian architects such as Jerome Markson, Jack Klein and Henry Sears were made aware of it through work and travel there in the 1950s, and through the British journal The Architectural Review.⁹⁷ An informal community including Irving Grossman, Henry Fleiss, James Murray (editor of The Canadian Architect for a time), and the architects of Alexandra Park promoted this type of compact, pedestrian related row housing in Toronto and Canada, beginning in the early 1960s (30).⁹⁸

The compact form of row housing was seen by these architects as an important way to combat the evil sprawling and social dispersion of the suburbs. Functionalism was still of paramount importance in the expression and discussion of built form, but the humanist possibilities of housing became more forcefully asserted within this architectural subculture.⁹⁹ In particular, the reacceptance of past models of urbanization, particularly with regard to a desire to

⁹⁷ Jerome Markson and Jack Klein, interview, Toronto, February 18, 1991.

⁹⁸ Jack Klein, for instance, gave a cross country lecture tour on public housing as Chairman of the Canadian Housing Design Council.

⁹⁹ See Batchelor, for instance.

increased density, human scale and variety in new building, was clearly a turn away from the heroic modernism of Le Corbusier's Ville Radieuse, or Frank Lloyd Wright's Broadacre City. This new combination of sensibilities can be more clearly explored in an analysis of Alexandra Park.

Alexandra Park

The initial area of study for improvement in Alexandra Park was bounded by Spadina, Queen, Bathurst and Dundas Streets, situated in the heart of downtown Toronto, just south of Kensington Market (Chinatown was not significantly developed in the 1950s and 1960s) (33). The arterial streets housed largely commercial and office space, and there were some industrial uses scattered throughout the area. The majority of development in the area however, was residential (35). Most of these buildings were originally single family residences, at a very high density, with a scattering of low rise apartment blocks. There was little vacant land, although the corner of Bathurst and Dundas held a seven acre public park (Alexandra Park).¹⁰⁰ While the amount of industrial use was relatively low, and largely of the 'light' variety (shirt manufacturing and bakeries, but also a tire retreading plant), the mixing with residential use was seen as highly unfavourable in a

¹⁰⁰ Advisory Committee on Alexandra Park Improvement, Report on the Improvement of Alexandra Park Area (Toronto, 1962): 'Alexandra Park Existing Land Use Map'.

period which promoted the separation of use through zoning. A study of the condition of residential buildings done in April, 1961 found only 8.4 percent in "good" condition, 47.9 percent in "fair" condition and 43.7 percent in "poor" condition. Owner-occupied and owner and tenant occupied buildings accounted for a remarkable sixty-nine percent of the residential stock in the Park.¹⁰¹

The issues of community and neighbourhood dominated the design and production of Alexandra Park from the beginning. While the family unit was still considered to be the ideal social group, there was a growing realization by the 1960s that this unit could not function wholly on its own, especially when confronted with the economic and social problems faced by those of low-income. As Jack Klein put it, "Up to that time [the mid-1960s], public housing had been notoriously insensitive to how it packaged people."¹⁰² Thus projects like Alexandra Park sought to provide an environment that would produce a positive grouping of families, while also including the elderly or single. The primacy of the idea of

¹⁰¹ "Good buildings are those in sound structural condition, which, with maintenance, will serve a useful purpose for many years. Fair are those buildings which, with maintenance and some necessary repairs, could have a useful life for many years. Poor are those that have lived their useful life and should be demolished because decay is too far advanced for repairs to be feasible." Advisory Committee on Alexandra Park Improvement, Report on the Improvement of Alexandra Park Area (Toronto, 1962): 3.

¹⁰² Interview, February 18, 1991.

grouping in the design process became apparent in interviews with the architects of the project. All three interviews were dominated by discussion of the site plan, even when questions were directed toward issues of unit plan.¹⁰³

The decision to create the project as a pedestrian precinct was to have a profound impact on the overall character and integration of the project into its surroundings. The bulk of building on the site is two to three storey row house units which line the pedestrian streets, and create enclosed green spaces to the rear. There is a definite 'hierarchy of spaces' which acts as an elemental ordering concept for the design of the project. A small number of the units face onto existing streets. Parking lots are located on the perimeter of the site, off all surrounding streets. Dundas Street is lined with a fence and a medium height brick wall (36). There is a small 'community core' located off Augusta Avenue; a sitting out area surrounded by a few shops, a day care centre, and an administrative office located on the ground floors of the apartment blocks. The overall effect of the project design is a sense of enclosure, of separateness and difference from the surrounding area.

This is quite different from what the 1962 Report recommends

¹⁰³ Jack Klein and Jerome Markson, interview, Toronto, February 19, 1991; Henry Sears, interview, Toronto, April 12, 1991.

and what the architects later described as their intent. The 1962 report by the Advisory Committee included the recommendations that the "project fit in with the surrounding area," and that it "recognize directions of movement from the houses to schools, shops, transportation, etc."¹⁰⁴ In a similar vein, the June 1966 report of the architects states,

The public housing project is designed to become an integral part of the neighbourhood. It will be compatible in scale and character with the good housing in the area and will provide amenities which should serve the neighbourhood in general. The small community core which consists of a few neighbourhood shops, a nursery and a sitting-out area, is at the geographic centre of the neighbourhood. The main pedestrian promenade recognizes existing walking patterns through the area. It is hoped that the new project would complement the existing neighbourhood and contribute to the revitalization of the area as a whole.¹⁰⁵

This concern with compatibility appears in most of the writings on Alexandra Park, from its initial conception to the journal reviews upon its completion. We must be careful however, to understand this concept within the late modern discourse of the 1960s, rather than our own perhaps extreme sense of aesthetic contextualization and tradition. It is useful in this regard to consider the Advisory Committee's distinction between "anonymous" and "institutional" or "self-conscious" treatments in its recommendations for the design

¹⁰⁴ Report on the Improvement of the Alexandra Park Area, p.20.

¹⁰⁵ Report by the Architects for Alexandra Park.

of the project.¹⁰⁶ The project was considered compatible because it was in some sense a modern reinterpretation of the existing building forms in the neighbourhood. For both the Advisory Committee and the architects, compatibility existed more in a programmatic sense than a physical or formal sense. Thus in some ways, the architects did not view the removal of automobile traffic from the internal street network as a major interruption to the character of the neighbourhood. Rather it was viewed as an enhancement, creating a pedestrian precinct that would provide a safe and 'pleasant' place for children to play.

The public housing site has been designed to separate out clearly pedestrian and vehicular movements and to provide a pleasant environment for people to walk or children to play.¹⁰⁷

Street traffic was seen by both the architects and the Advisory Committee to be a major problem in the Alexandra Park area. There was a shortage of parking for both the residential and commercial users of the community, and the use of the streets by industrial trucks was viewed as particularly undesirable.¹⁰⁸ The desire to make this an environment in which the family could interact with the community made the

¹⁰⁶ Report on the Improvement of the Alexandra Park Area, p.20.

¹⁰⁷ Report by the Architects for Alexandra Park.

¹⁰⁸ Report on the Improvement of the Alexandra Park Area, p. 5.

design of a pedestrian precinct a logical decision.

The technical difficulty of this decision was eased by the low level of car ownership expected among the projected population of the project. Because there was an expected ownership rate of only one to two cars for every three persons, parking lots of reasonable size could be located at the perimeter of the site. While the architects designed the lots to be relatively unobtrusive, the Advisory Committee viewed them as buffer zones between the housing and the commercial uses around the project.¹⁰⁹ The 'small community core', situated off Augusta Avenue, was seen as serving not only the project but the whole community. Once again this was a feature that was more sophisticated in terms of programme than finished design. It contains a rather barren sitting out area, a set of shops and a day care centre. The inclusion of these services in a public housing project was fairly radical for the period, acting against the conventional notion of separation of uses, as well as of private and institutional interests. Finally, a brick wall and metal fence run the length of the project along Dundas Street.

In formal terms, the creation of the pedestrian precinct and the placement of the parking lots seem to act as physical

¹⁰⁹ Report on the Improvement of the Alexandra Park Area, p.

barriers to the site, unintentionally working against the programmatic connections. The change of environment and sensibility upon entering the project effectively separates it from its surroundings. While the pedestrian streets follow existing patterns, they narrow appreciably from the existing streets, helping to create a sense of difference and of inside/outside. Furthermore, the architects have created a clear and formal entry way in at least three of the access routes into the project. The entrance from the south off Vanauley Street is bridged by the second storey bedrooms of two adjoining units (37); the entrance from Augusta is radically constricted by the two apartment blocks on either side and overhead; and the Dundas Street entrance is announced through a break in the brick wall which runs along the street edge.

Jerome Markson and Jack Klein have both expressed dissatisfaction with this wall along Dundas Street, although without providing specific reasons for its existence.¹¹⁰ It is in many ways one of the most telling elements of the project. By its very nature, a wall is about inclusion and exclusion, about expressing the difference between the two spaces it divides. This wall, however divides not only the project from Dundas Street, but the architects and their Radburn principles from that absolute embodiment of community,

¹¹⁰ Interviews, February 18, 1991.

Jane Jacobs.

Jacobs abhorred this wall, according to Jack Klein. In fact, she did not care for the project as a whole, but the wall particularly irked her.¹¹ It is not difficult to understand why. Jacobs' philosophy of community is based on the notion of the revival of the urban street. The street was seen as the main theatre of social activity, and more importantly, was seen to provide all the essentials for a happy, healthy and safe community. More specifically, the dense, mixed configuration of the urban street was a space that was constantly being viewed by the community which it served, and was therefore a safe public space.

The wall along Dundas Street effectively negates this opportunity, by dividing the project from the street. In this wall the late modernist motif of community so strongly and convincingly forwarded by Jacobs and others lost its battle with the modernist motif of separation in Alexandra Park. In concrete terms, the issue of traffic safety prevailed over street vitality in the design of Alexandra Park and in many other similar planning projects of the period.

The overlay of these two spatializing motifs is neatly summarized in an article in the February 1963 issue of The

¹¹ Interview, February 18, 1991.

Architectural Review. The author provides a generally laudatory review of Jacobs' work, except on the issue of mixed car-pedestrian use. The car is depicted as perhaps one of the most evil inventions of modern science and technology, and one which will probably become obsolete in the not too distant future. In the meantime however, everything should be done to minimize the possible deadly damage caused by the relationship of "child vs. tank."¹¹² This sentiment influenced not only the design of public and private housing developments, but the revitalization or creation of urban centres, and is closely related to the development of shopping malls in the same period. The pedestrianisation of Sparks Street Mall in Ottawa is one of the more famous examples of this trend in Canada.

Although the architects admit to the problematic nature of the wall on Dundas Street, they continue to defend this separation of children from automobiles. The spatial concept of separation runs throughout the design of the project. There is a "hierarchy of spaces" in the project, that allow for the existence of both family and community within the single precinct.¹¹³ Viewed in these terms the project most closely resembles a very compact suburb. The writings of the architects involved in this project, as well as those of others appearing in The Canadian Architect and The

¹¹² de Wolfe, p. 92.

¹¹³ Jack Klein, interview, February 18, 1991.

Architectural Review, do not challenge the ideological foundations of the suburb so much as its dispersion over space and time. The notions of private space for families, and the separation of residential from commercial and industrial uses are only nominally challenged.¹¹⁴

Thus the design of Alexandra Park includes small private back gardens for each of the family row house units, usually but not always backing onto a semi-public park space (44-48). The contrast between these green spaces and the paved front of the row house units is extreme to the point of architectural schizophrenia. The architects had originally specified brick paving and plantings for these streets, in order to make an amenable environment. However the client, Ontario Housing Corporation, decided that it could save money by replacing the brick with asphalt, and this decision prevailed despite protests from the architects that the project would remain within budget even with the original paving material (38-43).

As Henry Sears stated,

... [the asphalt] changed the whole character ... it looked like leftover space ... the finish was wrong, and it was a very strong statement and a wrong statement at the time.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ As with Lindenlea, the low-income inhabitants of this period continued to view the detached single family home as the ideal residential environment. See Oscar Newman, Defensible Space (New York: Collier Books, 1973):106.

¹¹⁵ Henry Sears, interview, April 12 1991, Toronto.

There are no 'front yards' on the houses, rather the pavement meets their facades, in much the same manner as the densely packed streets of old European cities. These are clearly public spaces, with none of the suburban ambiguity of front lawns as spaces for public viewing but not public occupancy. The space of these streets is strongly defined by the buildings on either side. The width of the streets varies as they wind their way through the site, widening at nodal connecting points, and becoming quite narrow at others. The housing thus becomes the main defining element of the project, carving out both the public streets and the green spaces behind, literally following the dictum that "housing is the building block of the community."¹¹⁶

The exterior architecture of the row housing is, as Jack Klein stated "vigorously modern."¹¹⁷ There are two storey and three storey units, with different exterior articulation. The front facades of both these types are composed of very planar surfaces of dark brown brick, with crisp squares cut out for doors and windows. 'Boxy overhangs', originally of wood, now replaced with aluminum siding, define the roofline as modernist cornices. Thin horizontal strip windows are inset immediately below the cornices, separating it from the lower part of the facade. In the two storey units, the front

¹¹⁶ Jerome Markson, interview, February 18, 1991.

¹¹⁷ Jack Klein, interview, February 18, 1991.

entrance is set back from the main facade, and this two-storey interruption of plane serves to visually separate and distinguish the units. Doorways are at pavement level, with no stairs. Strip windows identical to the ones below the cornice define the first storey. The three storey units are defined by two storey white triangular oriels which project from their cutout (34). The front doors are set back into a small alcove, and the cornice line is broken between units.

The influence of Georgian row housing is clear in the overall treatment of the Alexandra Park units. Visual separation of the units is achieved through a clearly expressed use of defining symbols (door, window, cornice line, setback) on a repetitive basis (43). In a truly modernist fashion, these symbolic elements of 'house' have been reduced to a minimal aesthetic. The oriel or 'bay' windows are probably the most striking individual feature of the design, but even they express an interest in straightforward pragmatic design for achieving maximum light in the interior rooms. For Jack Klein the architecture of Alexandra Park speaks of "good proportions, honest material, good shapes, beauty."¹¹⁸ Beauty comes from a full understanding and manipulation of the former most basic design elements, rather than any more elaborate detailing.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

The affect of these facades is that they define the streets in a bold and austere manner. Jerome Markson saw the row house type as an opportunity to 'make space' in the urban environment.¹¹⁹ While the units are clearly defined, there is little opportunity for individual expression at the front of the units, thus further defining this as a public (and institutional) space. The strip windows are small, and rather highly placed, allowing for views out, but a great deal of privacy within.

The backs of the units are treated in a more open manner, with large plate glass windows and doors opening onto the back garden. The three storey units have a pitched roof, with Modernist dormers as defining elements. The hierarchy of spaces is carried out from front to back: the street is clearly public; the house is clearly private at the front, but becomes more open at the back; the back yard is private (divided from the neighbours by a concrete screen wall) yet opens onto a semipublic garden with path. Considering the contemporaneous professional disdain for the suburbs, it is a curious echoing of the suburban design formula: the public street (this time without cars), the private house, and the semipublic back yard, where leisure activities with other members of the neighbourhood take place.

¹¹⁹ Jerome Markson, interview, February 18, 1991.

The interiors of the units were designed, according to Henry Sears, with the needs of the low-income inhabitants in mind (32). The specific concern was that these people would have little money to spend on furniture, and that the interior layout should accommodate this problem. It was therefore decided that most of the units should have distinctly separate and small living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens, rather than a more open plan that "would have been done for middle class people."¹²⁰ Division of living room and dining room in one of the two-storey, three-bedroom units is through a change in floor level and a half wall presenting a more open space. In most of the plans however, the kitchen separates the dining and living rooms, although this creates the problem of having no window in the kitchen. The kitchens are small and efficient, but with minimal counter and cupboard space. The size of the kitchens varies little depending on the number of inhabitants, and is actually slightly smaller in the four and five bedroom units. Thoughts of family shared cooking, or of keeping an eye on small children while in the kitchen were seemingly not often considered by the architects.

The size of the family unit was considered in regard to bathrooms however, with the four and five bedroom units receiving a washroom as well as a bathroom. The living room is invariably at the back of the unit, with direct access to the

¹²⁰ Interview, Henry Sears, April 12, 1991.

private garden, and large window space. The smallest (three bedrooms) of the units has the largest living room, with a five bedroom family expected to share a main living space of just under thirteen feet square. The dining room of this largest unit is somewhat more spacious than the others, but the space doubles as a main circulation area for the floor.

The architects did have the opportunity to test their designs on a limited basis. The OHC was anxious to get some units built as quickly as possible, and therefore adopted a fast track approach to the development of the project. Forty-seven units in the northwest corner of the site were built while the architects completed the working drawings for the remainder of the project. Henry Sears took the opportunity to meet with the inhabitants of these units to ask about their design. While the process was informal rather than systematic, apparently only minor complaints were voiced, largely over finishes, and over the poor maintenance of the project by OHC.¹²¹

The most problematic design is probably that of the five-bedroom unit, with an odd, bent footprint derived from site planning needs rather than individual unit needs. Henry Sears explained the design choice as coming from the need "... to make the corner work."¹²² As a result, the unit is only two

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid.

storeys, with one bedroom on the ground floor. This bedroom and the washroom are both accessed directly from the dining room, the galley type kitchen has no windows and is the second smallest of all the unit types. It was thought that the bedroom on the ground floor could be inhabited by an older child, who might need more privacy and freedom than the other children.¹²³ Nonetheless the bent footprint creates a vague and uneconomical entry downstairs, and a very large hallway upstairs.

It is difficult to decide however, if the three bedroom unit which contains a bedroom with only a high window that allows no view out, is even more problematic than the five-bedroom unit. Unit widths had to be kept as narrow as possible in order for the project to be cost effective, and this particular design configuration allowed a three bedroom unit within a standard width, two-storey format. Even Henry Sears admitted that he would find living in a bedroom with no view out "a problem," but that none of the tenants of the initially completed block complained, even when asked specifically about this room.¹²⁴ The best design is one of the three bedroom units, with a semi-open plan (a half wall divides living room and dining room), and the kitchen at the front of the unit. This would allow the parents clear views of front and back

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

from all downstairs rooms, while allowing natural light in as well.

Conclusion

Through a critical reading, both the flaws and merits of the design of Alexandra Park reveal its location within the late modern housing culture of Canada. The most obvious flaw, from our current perspective, is the institutional ghettoization of the inhabitants. The divergence between the architects' stated intent and the achieved results are most apparent here, and lead to a questioning of the design premises, of how this project came to be designed as it was. Once again, we must return to the two primary themes of separation and community. It would seem that there are two levels of separation, intentional and unintentional, on the part of the architects. The intentional separation may be thought of as deriving from ideological design issues - the rationalization and functionalization of uses - the separation of residential from commercial and industrial, of cars from people, and the careful creation of a hierarchy of spaces and spatial practices. This programme carried unintended or perhaps unforeseen consequences however, with the social and physical form of the project effectively separating it from the surrounding neighbourhood. Community was created, but only within the confines of the project, largely excluding the

existing patterns of living around it. And the community that was created within Alexandra Park was not one that was considered desirable by the inhabitants, who do not want to be labelled as public housing tenants, or by the larger community, which labelled, feared, shunned and derided the project and its inhabitants.

From a critical historical perspective, Alexandra Park seems crucial in understanding the progression of housing design and production ideas and ideologies in twentieth century Canada. Its paradoxical character comes from its chronotopic location in late modernism. It occupies the chronotopic space between the garden suburb ideal of Lindenlea (unit identity, family, private gardens and public parks, separation of uses and classes) and the infill housing of Toronto's Housing on Main Streets Ideas Competition (dispersion, deregulation, deinstitutionalization, contextualization, intensification and urbanization). In such projects as Lindenlea architects and planners were ready to abandon the city to the evils of capital production in favour of an idyllic pastoral residential environment. In Alexandra Park, the belief in the pastoral has faded somewhat in favour of the new romance of the city, but still holds enough power to make positive comparisons between the design principles of Lindenlea and Alexandra Park credible.

The architectural design of the project also speaks of the interpenetration of functionalist Modernism and more populist and humanist influences. The exterior architectural membrane of the row houses is highly Modernist, in its minimalist concern with essential architectural elements of plane, proportion and functional honesty. By the 1960s however, these very preoccupations would draw architectural interests away from the monumental and to the vernacular in the design of housing developments. Robert Venturi's Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture was published in 1966, while Moshe Safdie's Habitat, an extreme example of the conflation of Modernism and vernacular, was finished by 1967.

Alexandra Park hints at the architectural design preoccupations of 'post-modernity' with its absorption in issues of site configuration, rather than individual unit design. In much the same manner as the Krier brothers give primacy to the space of the urban rather than the space of the interior in their designs, the architects of Alexandra Park designed the site first, and the units last. While Thomas Adams was concerned with site at Lindenlea, this site was seen as servant to the individual houses, and to the ideology of the insular, protective and natural family group.

At Alexandra Park, the preoccupation with site is closely linked to the late modern notion of community. The problem is

that this community was discrete and separate from the rest of the city both socially and physically. While normalization was still the key element of the agenda for the government, the process at Alexandra Park was characterized by a belief in the benefits of functional separation in the social retrofitting of the occupants. Thus the public housing project was the institutional stepping stone on the way toward the normal middle class life and environment. The individual need for public housing was seen as a temporary measure that would be supplanted by reentry into the private market in the near future. This official attitude helped to justify the direct government involvement in the provision of housing. Alexandra Park is a strong example of the institutionalization of public housing within the modern discourse. The acceptance of the responsibility and need of government to become directly involved in the provision of affordable housing through urban clearance and renewal is a clear physical manifestation of this political and social institutionalization. As will be seen in the next chapter the late modern chronotope and the design and production of Alexandra Park in many ways marked the height of this institutionalism, with the backlash against it as a major influence on the post-modern chronotope and its design and production values.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE HOUSING ON TORONTO'S MAIN STREETS IDEAS COMPETITION (1990)

Introduction

In November of 1989, the City of Toronto announced its intention to hold an international architectural competition to foster "creative approaches" to the idea of designing infill housing for the city's main streets. The competition was just one part of a larger and longer process of evaluating the provision of much needed housing in the core area, while "respecting [the] historical development pattern" of the city and its streets.¹²⁵ The 335 entries were judged in June 1990, with a Grand Prize being awarded to the architectural students Denyse Gauthier, Alain Carle and Nicholas Roquet of the Universite de Montreal. Their entry was truly prototypical in character - presenting an architectural strategy for the development and use of a typology of main street, mixed-use building, rather than the specific building design common to most other entries.

The competition and its Grand Prize winner are a useful example for the examination of recent architectural public

¹²⁵ City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Housing on Toronto's Main Streets: A Design Competition. Conditions and Programme. Toronto: City of Toronto, January 1990, p.3.

housing design and future possibilities in Canada. They serve to illuminate the maturation of a historical progression toward the growing acceptance of infill housing as a viable solution to our housing and urban planning problems by professionals, the general public, and the governing institutions, at least in Toronto. This historical progression began shortly after the completion of Alexandra Park in the late 1960s, and can be seen in part as a reaction against that type of late modernist 'project' approach.

This chapter will begin by tracing these changing attitudes about housing and urban design in Toronto as essential to understanding the motivations for the competition. The Grand Prize submission will act as a focal point and primary example for an analytic and critical discussion of infill housing as a possible public housing type. While there are continuities in the urban design philosophy from Alexandra Park to the Housing Competition, the reemergence of certain social and political attitudes prevalent at Lindenlea will also be noted. More specifically, I will discuss the return to the idea of integration through housing type, as it relates to normalization and middle class hegemony in the use of urban infill as a public housing form.

The strategy of infill is not limited, or even mostly used for the production of housing. However, all forms of infill have

certain basic precepts which will be assumed in the following discussion of infill housing. It is a form of design and building which promotes the intensification and 'densification' of streets or other urban configurations (courts, squares or back lanes, for example) by 'filling in' the gaps in the street wall or space. In the case of the Housing on Main Streets Competition, most of the proposed sites dealt with the problem of street wall, although one did extend back into the space behind two strips of houses. These gaps more commonly include empty lots or parking lots, or spaces above lower than average height buildings. The organizers of the Competition have calculated that the most beneficial height for buildings along Toronto's arterial streets is between four and five storeys, which currently leaves a large amount of underdeveloped space along these streets. While this concern is largely aesthetic, infill housing is advantageous to municipalities in that it provides additional accommodation where other existing soft and hard services already exist, thus saving the cost of new infrastructure.

Urban Historical Setting

An understanding of the historical development of the urban morphology of Toronto and its main streets is essential to the concept of infill housing, which by definition is closely

integrated with the surrounding urban fabric. Early plans of the city were laid out as a grid from the lakeshore outward, gradually expanding while ignoring the local topography of ravines and hills (49, 50).¹²⁶ This layout has remained the basic form giver to the City to the present time, with the original city blocks and large park lots slowly being subdivided and increasingly developed over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Overlaying this basic grid is a system of arterial roads, or main streets, which often originated as the main streets of villages annexed by the City of Toronto in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These main streets acted and continue to act as major service and retail centres for the neighbourhoods which surround them. The Toronto streetcar routes which linked the original villages (such as Eglinton and Leslieville) to the City also helped to create the long retail strips which exist today along such streets as Dundas, Yonge and Queen.¹²⁷

The common building typology of Toronto in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries took its form from two related conditions: an attitude toward buildings as the spatial and functional definers of the street, and the subdivision of lots

¹²⁶ City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Housing on Toronto's Main Streets: A Design Competition. Conditions and Programme. (Toronto: City of Toronto, January 1990): 9-10.

¹²⁷ City of Toronto. Planning and Development Board, et. al. Housing on Toronto's Main Streets: Proposals Report. Toronto: City of Toronto, July 1989, p. 13.

into narrow and long parcels that facilitated this attitude. Toronto's lots traditionally vary from between 20 to 50 feet wide and 100 and 150 feet deep (51). The buildings on these lots are long and narrow, between two and four storeys, with the front facing to the street, and service to the rear.¹²⁸ Buildings along the main commercial streets tended to be retail at grade, with residential in the upper storeys (52-56).

With a rather narrow storefront at grade and vertical building line continuing upwards, buildings were perceived as a series of narrow and separate vertical entities adding up to one larger building form.¹²⁹

Intensification of the main streets as commercial and residential areas was more or less continuous from the late nineteenth century until the Depression, remaining minimal until after the Second World War. As was discussed in relation to Alexandra Park, the period following World War Two saw a radical change in planning approach toward the City of Toronto, with an emphasis on both clearance and renewal and the separation of uses through zoning. However, the combination of threats to the core residential areas, the redevelopment of older neighbourhoods into high-rise apartments and office buildings, and the urban renewal housing

¹²⁸ George Baird, "Theory/Vacant Lots in Toronto," Design Quarterly no. 108 (1978):16-41, p. 24.

¹²⁹ Proposals Report, p. 14.

schemes of the municipal government began to provoke significant citizen reaction in the late 1960s. The citizens of Trefann Court began a protracted and ultimately successful battle against a housing urban renewal scheme in 1966, and the first 'reform' candidates were elected to City Council in 1968. In 1972 the citizens of Toronto elected their first reform Council, in coalition with liberal Mayor David Crombie. Land-use planning was the major focus of the campaign.¹³⁰

While the City was working to develop the core of the downtown into a specialized business district in the 1960s, the residential areas surrounding this core began to be subject to gentrification. Baird saw this dual process of redevelopment and renovation as part of a growing awareness and adoption by certain groups of the new "cosmopolitan sophistication" possibilities of urban Toronto.¹³¹ These older neighbourhoods were still occupied by a mix of lower, middle and upper income residents who had never joined the post-war flight to the suburbs. It has been the lower income tenants who suffered the most by the gentrification process, as inexpensive properties which provide affordable rental housing are bought up by the middle class, renovated and often

¹³⁰ Glenna Carolyn Pendleton, "An Exploratory Study of New Infill Housing in Toronto's Central City Planning Area," M.A. Thesis, School of Regional Planning and Resource Development, University of Waterloo, 1983, pp. 161-63.

¹³¹ Baird, p. 18.

deconverted into single family homes again.

In 1976 the City of Toronto Council reflected the changing attitude toward redevelopment in the core area by expressing concern over the effects on the businessmen, customers and residents of a decline of the retail strips.¹³² It was found that the nodal concept of development had not been very successful, and that the retail strips still functioned as the main service areas for local residents. A 1978 report concluded that

...retail strips are an integral component of the city's structure and are the traditional centres of activity for its neighbourhoods. Their redevelopment or major change in function could have a sizeable physical and social impact on the abutting residential neighbourhoods which should be considered in the development of policies for the strips.¹³³

But City policy was also beginning to consider how to encourage more residential development in the Central Area. The 1976 Central Area Plan designated main streets for Low Density Mixed Commercial-Residential development, in the hope of creating a "more livable inner city environment."¹³⁴ Current planning policy has followed from this new sympathy with both the traditional uses and current needs of the

¹³² Proposals Report, p. 20.

¹³³ Ibid., p. 21.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

Central Area urban environment, encouraging mixed-use development at a scale and character sympathetic to the existing fabric. The Main Streets Initiative and the Ideas Competition can be seen as the most recent step in this progression.

Living in downtown Toronto has become an increasingly popular choice among middle and upper income professionals in the 1970s and 1980s. The move back to city has complex motivations; the desire to live closer to work and entertainment in order to save time and energy, dissatisfaction with the homogeneity of suburban life and sprawl and a parallel rise in interest in the historic environment and buildings of the core, are just some of the reasons for the urban renaissance. Accommodation is now well beyond the price range of the lower income groups, and 'affordable' housing in the core is largely limited to public housing projects or co-ops. The value of land has limited the new development of housing to high end rental or condominiums by private developers. At the same time, the demographic makeup of Central Area residents is considerably different than that of the suburban metropolitan areas, and requires different accommodation than has been traditionally available.

The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Ideas Competition

The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Initiative, and its Competition of 1990, evolved from a curious combination of the need for pragmatic planning to promote the production of housing in the City, and the City's constant desire to achieve status as a 'world-class' city. The Initiative is in part a response to City of Toronto Councillor Richard Gilbert's "Proposal to Redevelop the Main Streets of Toronto." Gilbert's proposal specifically addresses the above problems: that the City is experiencing demographic changes which current housing production types are not meeting, and that "Toronto's main streets are underdeveloped and modest and do not reflect Toronto's image as a major urban centre."¹³⁵ While these are the two major architectural problems of the Initiative, there are underlying social concepts which also inform the project. Some of these can be considered to have their origins around the time of Alexandra Park, particularly the concepts of community and integration. It will be shown however, that these concepts have shifted in their meaning and application, and can now be situated within a 'post-modern' discourse. The desire to see Toronto's urban morphology as consisting of a series of linked neighbourhood/villages has not been

¹³⁵ City of Toronto. Housing on Toronto's Main Streets: Proposals Report. (Toronto: City of Toronto, 1989): 5.

limited to the Initiative; throughout the 1970s and 1980s the planning department has worked toward the identification of neighbourhoods based on ethnicity (Chinatown), use (the Fabric District) or redevelopment/gentrification projects based on location (Yorkville). These communities are seen as, and increasingly exploited to give 'cultural identity' to the city, often promoting its 'world class' diversity and vitality.¹³⁶

It is the new definition of community, which emphasizes character through specificity and multiplicity, rather than social class, which helps to place the Housing on Main Streets Initiative within a postmodern chronotope. The communities of the 1960s, while physically compared to European villages, were still largely defined in terms of social class, and public housing still tended to be ghettoized. However, the 'maturation' of the City of Toronto in the 1970s and 1980s, with large influxes of both the gentrifying anglo-middle class and ethnic populations, combined with a new federal emphasis on multiculturalism helped to change this definition. The gentrification of large parts of the core area and the need for the new inhabitants to be able to identify their neighbourhoods in terms that emphasized their cosmopolitan nature, and planning policies which worked specifically to encourage high-end retail development and use in the core area

¹³⁶ Conditions and Programmes, p.6.

combined to submerge the previous class-based definitions of community. Of course it was the middle class which was largely responsible for this redefinition based on an image of ethnicity, but as was discussed in relation to Lindenlea, one of the major characteristics of middle class hegemony is the disappearance of class as a legitimate social characterization.

This new definition of community is therefore closely tied to the concept of social integration. The understanding of this concept in relation to the Main Streets Initiative has much in common with the ideological model used at Lindenlea, although it has resulted in a fundamentally different physical form. This model is based on the normalization of all social groups to middle class ideology through their environmental integration. In the same manner that the urban reformers viewed the middle class garden suburb as the ideal environment in which to normalize the urban poor, infill housing is viewed as an opportunity by contemporary urban reformers to reintegrate our marginalized urban poor into the newly defined urban neighbourhoods of Toronto. However, contemporary ideas of integration are modified by the above notions of community, especially with regard to ethnicity, and reformers and city planners involved in infill are concerned with the maintenance of the existing social patterns of these groups.

The Competition document for example, specifically defines "innovative housing design to meet demographic trends," as one of the 'design challenges' of the competition.¹³⁷ While this awareness of the social and cultural heterogeneity of the city is laudable, programmes directed toward integration can, for certain groups, become programmes of dispersion, leading to the possibility of social and cultural disappearance. The privileging of ethnic or geographic-historical community identity can marginalize even further those who may not fit into these identities including the homeless or those who tend to move frequently, because inherent in the search for community identity is the notion of stability. It also, as stated above, submerges the issues of class under labels more palatable to the dominant liberal middle class.

Political Setting

The programme of integration has occurred at the political as well as the ideological level in the Main Streets Initiative. The 1964 amendments to the National Housing Act mark the beginning of a political desire to move toward deinstitutionalization through the return of the provision of low-income housing to the private market housing industry.

¹³⁷ Conditions and Programme, p. 6. "The number of single-person households grew by 5% between 1981 and 1986 to a total of 47% of the population. Of the family totals, 16.6% are single-parent families," and p. 2.

While the larger proportion of monies available from the federal government had always been directed to the subsidization of low interest rate mortgages and loans, the post-World War Two period was marked by direct federal involvement in the physical provision and operation of low-income housing. In 1964 the government began to encourage alternative forms of provision by recognizing non-profit housing corporations as eligible for federal loans. In the 1973 amendments, housing co-operatives were treated as non-profit corporations, and therefore also eligible for the low cost loans.¹³⁸ Along with other programs implemented in the 1970s, including the Multiple Unit Rental Building (MURB) scheme, and the Assisted Rental Program (ARP), these amendments helped to create a "third sector" in the housing market which has become increasingly important in providing affordable housing.¹³⁹

The Task Force on Housing and Urban Development of 1968 continued the government push toward more private sector involvement in the low-rent market. Although the Task Force recommended increased government direction in this area, the major thrust of this involvement was to be in the encouragement of the private market. In a manner that harkens

¹³⁸ John R. Miron. Housing in Postwar Canada: Demographic Change, Household Formation, and Housing Demand. (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988): 254.

¹³⁹ Ibid., p. 256.

back to pre-World War Two ideology the Task Force reported that public housing "runs counter to the general Canadian concept of social welfare and security."¹⁴⁰ After declaring its strong objections to the concept of the public housing 'project', the Task Force went on to recommend that 'subsidized rental' through the private market was a more appropriate form providing housing to the needy, as they would then gain access to the same type of housing as everybody else.¹⁴¹ It was essentially a call to return to the system of aid used before World War Two, in which the government would "provide the necessary regulatory framework" in order to encourage the private market production of affordable housing.¹⁴²

The building of public housing projects came to a virtual stop by the end of the 1970s, and the government increasingly relies on the third sector (including municipal non-profit corporations and co-operative housing) to carry out the construction of affordable accommodation (both the MURB and ARP schemes have been terminated).¹⁴³ This policy shift has had both positive and negative impacts in the provision of

¹⁴⁰ Canada. Task Force on Housing and Urban Development. Report (Ottawa: Canada, 1969): 52.

¹⁴¹ Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 23.

¹⁴³ Miron, pp. 252, 256.

low-income housing. It has ended the creation of large scale, public housing projects which tend to ghettoize the inhabitants. It has generally lead to the creation of third sector housing which is closer to the wants of the inhabitants, because of closer links between the developer and the future clients, especially in the case of co-operative housing. However, it has placed an ever increasing burden upon non-profit corporations to provide the significant portion of low-income housing, when these corporations were originally structured to be administered at a small scale. This devolving of responsibility also does not seem to have effected the quantity of low-income housing being built, as the new developers still have to compete for high-priced land on the open market. At the same time, some municipalities have shown a marked lack of interest in using their new responsibilities to provide amenable low-cost housing, in part because the needed funding did not seem to come with the new powers.

At a public forum held after the completion of the Housing on Main Streets Competition, views as to the political problems and possible solutions to the provision of affordable (or any type of) infill housing focussed on municipal zoning regulations. It was commonly held by most participants, from a broad political and professional spectrum, that the housing development market was overregulated to the extent that small private developers would not be able to profitably enter the

market, let alone provide affordable housing. While some of the points raised in this discussion were valid, the call from some of the more conservative participants for total deregulation, which would also in effect nullify current housing standards, was more questionable. It was also disappointing that no one thought to question the decreasing interest of the federal government in providing funding to small private developers or building owners, such as those common along the main streets of Toronto. There would seem to be a renewed rise in the ideologically conservative premise, on the part of the governments and professionals, that the private market, and specifically the small scale, 'traditional' business interests will be both willing and able to provide affordable and amenable housing for the low-income sector.¹⁴⁴

Finally, the use of the competition form in the production of ideas about infill housing must be discussed in relation to the political agenda of the City of Toronto, and the Planning and Development Department. The Competition can be viewed in the first instance as largely an exercise in publicity by the City, in order to increase the level of awareness of the Main Streets Initiative in Toronto. The design solutions sought and

¹⁴⁴ For an early discussion of the benefits of this type of approach see Roger Krohn et. al., The Other Economy: The Internal Logic of Local Rental Housing (Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977)

gained were easily available to the City planners and architects from local and international studies and examples found in architectural books or journals, and in the built form of Toronto itself. However, the public nature of the competition served to remove the issue from the planning department, which tended to be conservative and therefore lacking in flexibility regarding new planning and regulation approaches to dealing with the housing problem in the City.¹⁴⁵ The competition form also served to alert the small landowners and business people along the Main Streets that the City would be promoting housing intensification in those areas by private developers.

The use of the competition form has broader ideological implications as well. Because a competition is at least somewhat public in nature it gives the appearance of being democratic - prizes are awarded by an impartial jury, who are looking for the 'best' design, regardless of name or influence. This form of decision making is becoming increasingly popular in a political environment in which politicians and bureaucrats are uncomfortable with making outright decisions, and the public is largely cynical of those decisions. Of course the competition was not really democratic as entry was limited to architectural and planning professionals, but it was as 'grassroots' as possible in the

¹⁴⁵ Lorne Cappe, interview, Toronto, February 18, 1991.

given situation. Organizers of the competition did actually consider holding a completely open competition, but at least one member of the architectural community expressed serious concern about the possibility of a 'housewife' winning.¹⁴⁶ At a more fundamental level, the competition inherently lacks democratic character in that a pre-set, prescribed brief of conditions and programme negates the usual architect-client interaction which allows for design negotiation and understanding to take place. While this may seem a moot point with regard to an 'ideas' competition, it points to a problem inherent in all three projects: the lack of consultation between architect and user in public housing design. The opposition to the possibility of a housewife winning the design competition illustrates the continuing gap between the profession and the public, in which the realm of the specialist is clearly demarcated and protected. Nonetheless, the Initiative and Competition have been carefully structured to appear as democratic and public as possible. A City Councillor, Richard Gilbert, has been publicly credited with conceiving the idea of infill housing on Main Street, the Competition was held with much public fanfare, and a series of public forums and discussions have been held in the wake of its conclusion, all to enhance the perception of public participation in the decision-making process.

¹⁴⁶ Lorne Cappe, interview.

Mention must also be made of the international character of the Competition. This aspect dovetails with the continuing effort to define Toronto as an international city with 'world-class' problems requiring 'world-class' solutions. This leads to questions of the globalization of approach to architectural and planning problems, and how this affects the form of solutions presented. Juror Kees Christiaanse expressed his disappointment that so many of the designs submitted proposed European-based solutions rather than seriously considering the American city street grid form of Toronto in their designs (67-69).¹⁴⁷ The yearning on the part of many Canadian architects and other interest groups to turn our cities into imitations of dense European models is problematic not only aesthetically, but politically and culturally as well, as these cities were produced under considerably different systems than our own.

¹⁴⁷ Kees Christiaanse, "Urban Design for Architectural Diversity," Places (vol. 7, no. 2, Winter 1991):66-69, p.66.

Design Setting

As was shown in the previous chapter, the design of Alexandra Park was already showing the influence of a questioning of the values and design of Modern architecture and planning, which were nascent in Lindenlea but particularly strong in the 1940s and 1950s in Canada. These values, which, "gave a privileged position to reason, abstraction, science and technique," are even more openly questioned and rejected within the post-modern chronotope of the Housing Competition.¹⁴⁸ Within this chronotope, the motifs of standardization and functionalism are submerged by the rising motifs of public/private and scenographic concerns. While there are conceptual links between this view and that prevalent at Alexandra Park, it must be remembered that the approaches and therefore final forms are fundamentally different.

The value of the urban environment is reassessed positively at

¹⁴⁸ Alan Colquhoun. Modernity and the Classical Tradition (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989):236.

Barry Goodchild presents a good working definition of postmodernism in his article "Postmodernism and Housing: A Guide to Design Theory": "Postmodernism challenges the assumption that novelty is always desirable; it breaks with the distinction between high art and popular culture and it abandons the 'imperialism' of 'enlightened modernity'. Postmodernism can degenerate into 'anything goes' eclecticism. But it also has a progressive side. It heightens awareness of social differences, 'otherness' and so hastens the acceptance of the claims of the women's movement and ethnic minorities." Housing Studies (Vol. 6 no. 2, 1991):131-144, p. 140.

Alexandra Park, but there is still a strong aversion to the integration of the private realm of the home with the public life of the city and its streets, so that the relationship between the two maintains some distance. As well, standardization of the living units (interior and exterior) is still acceptable, although there is the beginning of interest in the organic nature of older European towns. The concepts of specificity and multiplicity are not possible in the institutional, patriarchal and partly anonymous environment of Alexandra Park. Thus while the two projects share some similar precedents and sources, the solutions to the housing problem are qualitatively different.

Post-Modern urban design presents three concepts which are fundamental to the adoption of the infill housing type in the Housing on Main Streets Competition: the specificity of place, the notion of polyvalent space, and the character of the urban form derived from the combination of these two.¹⁴⁹ The specificity of place is approached by different architectural theorists in different ways; through history, typology and collective memory, although most tend to use some combination of the three. It is concerned with a full understanding of the form of a building, a street or a neighbourhood, and not only

¹⁴⁹ Herman Hertzberger, 1963, cited by Kenneth Frampton, "Place, Production and Architecture: Towards a Critical theory of building," in (ed.) K. Frampton, Modern Architecture and the Critical Present (London: Architectural Design Profile, 1982):28-46, p. 42.

how that form came to be, but why it came to be where it is. The notion of polyvalent space is tied up with the notion of the city as a collective living space; it permits and even engenders "individual interpretations of the collective pattern."¹⁵⁰ Finally the character of the urban form evolves from the constant interaction of this specificity and polyvalency, from the process of this negotiation. It is this character which defines the spaces and the forms of the city as the city: culturally, socially and physically.

While this approach may appear on the surface to be pragmatic in its dealings with the existing urban morphology, it has as strong an ideological base as Modernism, but one which is romantic not only toward the future but also to the past. In this sense Post-Modern urban theory promotes an 'ideal type' for the city which can be appropriated by interest groups across the contemporary political spectrum (with the possible exception of large developers and their promoters) because it appeals to the 'grassroots' liberalism of both the left and the right.

The 'ideal type' promoted by the Main Streets Initiative is therefore essentially a populist model - of a lively but friendly main street supporting the stable neighbourhoods behind. The city is viewed as a series of interconnected semi-

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

autonomous neighbourhoods focussed on their main street, and deriving their character from this core. As a result the main street becomes the major public space of the neighbourhood, the main forum for public activity and services.¹⁵¹

Kenneth Frampton connects the shift from the Modernist concept of spatium in extensio to the Post-Modern reassertion of place, through the realization by architects in the 1960s that the former contributed to a "loss of cultural identity."¹⁵² The approach of the organizers of the Housing Competition and many other 'postmodern architects' is influenced and exemplified by the typological analysis of city form developed by neo-Rationalist Aldo Rossi in the late 1960s. Rossi and other members of the Tendenza were concerned with a return to 'rational' design based on context and historical tradition, rather than the rationalism of Modernist "megapolitan technology and economy."¹⁵³ Rossi was particularly concerned with the development of an 'analogical architecture', which lay "suspended... between 'inventory and memory'."¹⁵⁴ 'Inventory' was concerned with the recognition of the importance of traditional building typologies in defining the structure of a historically evolving urban morphology, while

¹⁵¹ Proposals Report, p. 13.

¹⁵² Frampton, p. 44.

¹⁵³ Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 40.

'memory' was embedded within these typologies and was considered collective.¹⁵⁵ Building typology is thus closely related to 'form and way of life'. Type is constant, but its specific architectural form varies from place to place and culture to culture through such issues as economic needs and land speculation practices.¹⁵⁶ In The Architecture of the City, Rossi characterizes urban architecture as representative of the contrast between the "particular and universal", and the "individual and collective."¹⁵⁷ For Rossi, "[t]he city is composed of many people seeking a general order that is consistent with their own particular environment."¹⁵⁸ Four main themes emerge in his analysis of the architecture of the city: individuality, locus, design and memory.¹⁵⁹ The first three of these themes can be related to the concept of specificity, while the overlapping last three are related to multiplicity. In this sense these dual issues can be consolidated to become a more complex conceptual ordering: specificity in multiplicity/multiplicity in specificity. This can be better understood by considering that the multiplicity of an urban neighbourhood or street comes about from the

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁵⁶ Rossi, Aldo. The Architecture of the City (revised American Edition by Aldo Rossi and Peter Eisenman) (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1982):36.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 32.

heterogeneous gathering of specific or discrete treatments of that space by individual builders, and the diverse uses of that space by individuals. In this sense it is composed of a collection of uses and forms. At the same time the place, or locus gains its own specificity - its identity - through this collection, and through the collective memory of the use of the space over time.

One of the first American architects to explore and celebrate this new attitude in relation to the North American urban fabric was Robert Venturi in his Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture (1966). In this book, Venturi asserted the 'almost all rightness' of Main Street America, and in his later collaboration with Scott-Brown and Izenor, Learning from Las Vegas (1972), argued that architects should be looking to the 'ordinary' buildings of American cities and towns for their inspiration.¹⁶⁰ In an anti-Modernist reference to Le Corbusier's anti-historical position, Venturi also declared that "Architecture is evolutionary as well as revolutionary."¹⁶¹

In its romanticized (although more crudely populist) view of Main Street America, Venturi's work can be ideologically linked to Jane Jacobs' earlier critique of Modern urban

¹⁶⁰ Goodchild, p. 136.

¹⁶¹ Venturi, cited in Frampton, p. 36.

planning. Jacobs' work prefigures much of the Post-Modern design philosophy with its,

...preference for diversity in the built environment rather than uniformity, for small-scale, community-based rather than large-scale or structural change and for mixed-use rather than single-use urban zones.¹⁶²

Venturi's dual concern for the appreciation of 'ordinary' architecture, and for the understanding of the development of the urban fabric as an evolutionary (historical) process, in many ways sums up the architectural reaction to the postmodern concern for reviving a sense of place or locus. It celebrates rather than denigrates the development of the North American main street and town as part of the laissez faire capitalist system mythologized in our culture. But it also promotes heterogeneity over homogeneity, and history over newness. In this sense it is a rejection of the project of the Modernist City, but a celebration of the modern (nineteenth century) city, and of the importance of the street as public space in this precedent.

While this approach may be seen to be a great improvement over the over-institutionalized and scientific abstractness of Modern architecture, it does present problems for the production of publicly assisted housing. First and foremost it

¹⁶² Goodchild, p. 135.

promotes a positive view of the development of the city as 'naturalistic' - that cities grow best when left alone, and that all the needs of the city will be somehow met in this process. This is very rarely the case, largely because the Canadian city does not operate at any natural, supply and demand level, and deregulation would only lead to extreme speculation by developers. Secondly, the promotion of heterogeneity, while positive in its attempt to remove the stigma of identifiable 'projects', can lead to the devaluation of standards in both living accommodation and social services. The romanticized heterogeneity and density of nineteenth century street facades often hid highly inadequate housing, built largely for speculative purposes.

The influence of Aldo Rossi's approach to the analysis and appreciation of urban form began to be felt in Canada in the 1970s. In 1975, George Baird and his associates undertook a Built Form Analysis for the City of Toronto Planning Board. For Baird, the work of the European architects such as Rossi and O.M. Ungers,

corresponded to our own growing suspicion that the roots of the generic form we were seeking would lie in the historical evolution of Toronto itself.¹⁶³

This lead to a typological study of the area of North Jarvis

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 24.

in 1977, which was fundamentally a critique of the Modernist apartment blocks and land assembly techniques combined in the 1970s massive renewal project of the area known as St. Jamestown.

Baird was not the only Toronto architect concerned with the effect that projects such as St. Jamestown, Regent Park or even Alexandra Park were having on the traditional social and built environment of the city. The firm of Diamond and Myers was also heavily involved in the 'reform movement' in Toronto's architectural community, producing two housing projects, Dundas-Sherbourne (also known as Sherbourne Lanes) and Hydro Block, worthy of note in the development of the infill housing type in Canada. For Myers,

... Infill has many virtues: it tends to spread out the population, creating a multi-centred city: it rebuilds and thus maintains the health of existing neighbourhoods; it allows for and even develops neighbourhoods which contain a variety of people and places.¹⁶⁴

Diamond and Myers developed two early infill housing prototypes in the Dundas-Sherbourne and Hydro Block projects. The first (Dundas-Sherbourne) was infill in the back lanes which are common to many of Toronto's residential neighbourhoods (58,59), the second (Hydro Block) is a

¹⁶⁴ Barton Myers, "Urban Consolidation," Design Quarterly (no. 108, 1978): 8-15, p. 15.

perimeter block development, that is in many ways is simply a more urbanized version of Alexandra Park.¹⁶⁵ Both projects follow the Alexandra Park concern for locating family apartments at ground level, to provide direct access to private yards and play areas for children. Nonetheless, Dundas-Sherbourne was rightly criticized by Kuwabara and Sampson for not allowing greater flexibility in apartments for the individual and unique needs of the inhabitants. The critics also felt that the distinction between private and public spaces around the project was unclear in a manner reminiscent of projects such as Alexandra Park, and thus lacked the ability to provide the associational symbols necessary for personal identity.¹⁶⁶ As will be shown, these two issues - the flexibility of unit plan, and the relation between public and private space in the design of the building - have become fundamental issues in contemporary infill housing design.

An alternative model to the infill type currently being developed in Toronto is the Ataratiri site. This site is a sixty-six acre redevelopment project located on obsolete industrial lands in the core of Toronto. The City has decided

¹⁶⁵ Bruce Kuwabara and Barry Sampson, "Diamond and Myers: The Form of Reform," The City Book: The Politics and Planning of Canada's Cities. ed. James Lorimer (Toronto: James Lorimer and Co. Publishers, 1978):78-96, p.87.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 90.

to use the land to develop a large 'affordable' housing community there. While Ataratiri shares some characteristics with the clearance and renewal schemes of the 1960s: a large scale redevelopment project carried out by a single public developer (the City of Toronto) of a heterogeneous social character, the approach taken by the City and its consultants clearly place the project in the same chronotope as the Main Streets Initiative. Most significantly, there is a consistent interest among all the proposals to reassert the importance of the street as the main public space, and to use the building forms to shape and give meaning to these spaces. And while the development of such a large parcel of land as a single project seems to lead almost inevitably to a homogeneous environment, the consultants are aware of this problem, and make attempts to break down the monolithic character of the site and provide opportunities for diversity and character through the development process.¹⁶⁷

The Grand Prize Entry

The Grand Prize project by Gauthier, Carle and Roquet is in many ways a design articulation of the concepts behind the competition, but in a manner that takes these concepts to their metaphorical extreme, ultimately providing a broad base

¹⁶⁷ See Vicki Superina, "Ataratiri: Urban Transformations in Toronto," A/R/C (Spring 1990):16-20.

for the proposed reformulation of design and planning regulations. This is the basis of the appeal of the entry to the jurors; it explored a wide range of issues regarding the building of housing on Main Streets, and provided both a social and architectural typology for the realization of this goal.

In general, the jurors agreed that this project 'got behind' what all the other projects were dealing with, and served as a continual referent during the adjudication process.¹⁶⁸ This is in large part because of the design idea and process used by Gauthier, Carle and Roquet, developed in part in their Atelier d'architecture urbaine, taught by Irena Latek and Georges Adamczyk at the Universite de Montreal. The workshop concentrated on ideas of the 'collective memory of place' embedded in the specific form of the city. The physical and conceptualized form of the city is seen to be constantly changing, a successive layering of architectural 'inscriptions'. "Chaque projet en est un fragment autonome, a la fois inscrit et emergeant de sa totalite; il est aussi le nouveau texte fondateur pour une autre intervention urbaine."¹⁶⁹ The specificity of the places of the city, in

¹⁶⁸ Melvin Charney, "City Structure as the Generator of Architectural Form," Places (Vol. 7 no. 2, Winter 1991):54-59, p. 57.

¹⁶⁹ Irena Latek, "Le Concours Housing on Toronto's Main Streets. Le Grand Prix," ARO 58 (Decembre 1990):25.

this case the Main Streets of Toronto, is figured by the continuous and collective way of living in these places; the meshing of specificity and multiplicity.¹⁷⁰ The concept is essentially a populist one, which allows for the inclusion of the ordinary in the design of the urban fabric. This is represented in the form of the drawings, which work to present the design ideas without resorting to stylistic presumptions.

Denyse Gauthier and Alain Carle have defined the project as an exploration of "recognizing how individual uses become collective on Main Street."¹⁷¹ These two issues - individual and collective living - are not polarized in this project, as they are in suburban development, or even in the relationship of the Main Street to the neighbourhoods behind, but are in essence dialogic - reacting to each other, but also to the other aspects of the urban social and physical context around them. The project takes the ideal type espoused by the competition - of Main Street as the public space of the city's neighbourhoods - to the limit as the location for collective urban life.

The Grand Prize project is comprised of proposals for how to deal with the problem of infill on all three of the typical

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Denyse Gauthier and Alain Carle, interview, Montreal, March 28, 1991.

sites provided by the competition organizers (corner, midblock and large sites) (57). The three proposals are synthesized by a general approach which is outlined for each project, before being manipulated for the specific characteristics of each site. In this sense the project does develop a typological approach, what Gauthier and Carle termed as 'strategic' rather than theoretical.¹⁷² The project is a mapping of the design and production process to be taken in the Main Streets Initiative, rather than a theoretical position on the development of the city and its architecture. The typological analysis is repeated graphically and in writing on the panels of each of the three entries. The drawing "Topography, Main Street, Ravine and Lake," (60) serves as a metaphorical representation of the starting point for their analysis of the city of Toronto, accompanied by the following text:

The city in itself is the genesis of the project: a mythical geography, in which lake, ravine and main street are the specific actors. At this territorial scale, Toronto's main streets appear as an autonomous system in the city.

Beyond the limits of Downtown, main streets propose an alternative model for the construction of the city: they constitute a linear and sequential public space for display and parade. They are the public equipment irrigating the neighbourhood they pass through. They compound individual and collective uses. They are both homes, therefore permanent, and stage sets for consuming, therefore ephemeral.

The main street is stripped down to its essential elements and translated into a conceptual model. Projected onto the existing city, it acts as a catalyst.

¹⁷² Ibid.

In the drawing, the main streets are graphically exaggerated to appear as physically significant on the urban landscape as the ravines and the Lake, "as autonomous a construct as the geographic formations of its site."¹⁷³ With this drawing the students thus establish the main street as the primary object and starting point for the project.¹⁷⁴ The analytic process began with a study of historic maps of the city to understand the morphological development of the main street.¹⁷⁵ The pattern of small narrow lots facing onto the street, and the influence this had on the form of the street's buildings is explored and expressed in other drawings, always with an eye to how the streets serve as collective spaces (63). In one drawing for instance, graphics of a Roman arcade are superimposed over the main street, to indicate how the Main Street has become the primary public space in the city of Toronto. It is from this point that the relationship between the street and the proposed housing units is defined.

The character of the specific main street is in turn defined by the individual and collective uses of the space, and its buildings. In this sense the main street is both ephemeral and permanent. The street serves in the immediate term as a space

¹⁷³ Charney, p. 57.

¹⁷⁴ Denyse Gauthier and Alain Carle, interview, March 28, 1991.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

for consumption, ephemeral in its functional fluctuation over both the short and long term. But the street is also the locus for the community, and the home for those who live above it, and is therefore permanent. In a manner reminiscent of Rossi, the students locate this permanence in collective memory, and the memory in the urban form and buildings in a drawing titled "The Memory of a Site is Construction." They have in essence set up a series of dichotomies which serve to characterize the experience of living and building on Main Streets: permanent/ephemeral, private/public, individual/collective, which all relate to the dialogism of specificity in multiplicity.

This strategy has major implications for their approach to the housing unit. The students have expressed the above dichotomies in their building designs through the clear architectonic separation of commercial and residential uses (61,62,64). One must be careful to understand this representation as conceptual and strategic rather than actual, and also to understand that the dichotomy is problematized rather than polarized. Therefore, although the graphics of the project seem to represent a clear triad of uses in these designs: commercial space (in white), residential space (in red) and recreational space (in green), these typological criteria begin to break down in the specifics of the floor plan. This is more clearly stated in the text which

accompanies these drawings:

Housing: The traditional main street apartment is extended to its limits. In this way, the housing unit is a representation of the street: a passageway slung from room to room.

This exaggeration in scale encourages a collective appropriation of the flat. Without eliminating traditional uses, the multiplication of single private rooms allows independent inhabitants to cohabit.

The facade negotiates the variable conditions of the main street, and acts as a public extension to the flats behind (mixed use).

In this sense Carle, Roquet and Gauthier have taken the Competition goal of exploring the Main Street as a collective public living space to the extreme: the Main Street has invaded the living units in a way which would be considered inappropriate for the stable neighbourhoods behind, proclaiming that collective living is the way of life on these streets. The only compromise to the neighbourhoods behind are the inclusion of the 'green spaces', although these too are represented as collective.

While the students' approach to the living units may be considered radical, particularly in comparison to most other entries which adapted the traditional private residential environment to their main street design, it may also be considered the most innovative, and in some ways pragmatic. The approach also holds great potential for the development of public housing on main streets. The Grand Prize entry realized

that the Main Streets are public in a way that no other places or spaces of Toronto are, and have conceived their living spaces accordingly. Thus the individual units are large and flexible in a manner which opens the possibility for a number of alternative modes of living, from large families, artist studios, small apartments or rooming houses, or other forms of collective units (64-66). The units resemble a large scale version of much of the apartment space found in Montreal: a long corridor with a series of rooms strung along one side. What is important here is the acceptance that a certain segment of the population has housing needs which are not currently met in the neighbourhoods of Toronto in terms of affordability, tenure, amenity or access to various services. These needs could be more precisely met through the various groups' appropriation of these units for their needs. One can think of such a unit being well used by single mothers wanting the support of a collective living arrangement, or of students or other singles who need only minimal private living space but also need access to various private and public services. At the same time it is less likely that these units will be desirable to the traditionally provided for nuclear family, and therefore they do not need to be manipulated unduly to meet the standards expected by this group.

Conclusion

The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition and its Grand Prize winner were chosen as the final type of public housing design and production in this thesis because they were felt to represent one of the currently emerging and potentially dominant approaches toward the provision of affordable housing in Canada: infill housing in the urban core. In this chapter I have discussed the typology of infill as reflective of a more broadly based attitude toward urban form which relies on notions of specificity and multiplicity, and the dialogic relationship of these two.

While I have shown certain similarities existing between the Housing Competition and the earlier examples of Lindenlea and Alexandra Park, it is difficult not to come to the conclusion that the project of the Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Initiative - to provide a sizeable amount of affordable housing in the core area through infill on the Main Streets - differs substantially from these previous efforts. These differences are consistently apparent in the ideological, political, and design and production aspects of the project. The shift can be conceptualized as the emergence of a new chronotope, here called post-modernism, in which the motifs of public/private and scenography are predominantly

problematized, while the other motifs take on more secondary roles.

Ideologically, the concept of community has been redefined through the new concern for the promotion of the notions of specificity and multiplicity. This has important implications for the production of public housing as it puts into question the whole issue of the institutionalization of the provision of affordable housing for low-income groups. The slow but steady decline of direct government provision of such housing, and the increasing reliance upon the private and third sector housing markets confirms this analysis. In the postmodern chronotope, the specific character of an urban 'community' is celebrated for its uniqueness; it provides a heterogeneity for the larger environment through its own specificity. And yet the community is expected to absorb a heterogeneous social group itself - the new urban community is supposed to provide room for all types of social position and behaviour, in effect becoming blind to social difference.

It is more difficult to state whether this actually happens. Certainly there appears to be more room for marginalized groups to integrate in the urban fabric, but there still seem to be places and spaces which are considered appropriate and inappropriate for their occupation. One of the underlying political motivations of the Housing on Main Streets

Competition was to provide a form of integration that would be palatable to the powerful community associations which more often than not object to any social or physical changes to their neighbourhoods, and especially to the intrusion of social housing which is felt to negatively affect house prices. It was felt that infill housing along main streets would allow a more dispersed and therefore less noticeable effect on these neighbourhoods, adding density without physically intruding on the areas behind the strip. What is important to note here however, is the fundamental difference in approach to the provision of affordable housing. The integration and dispersion of public housing is in strong contrast to the separation used in both Lindenlea and Alexandra Park.

The use of the competition form helped to promote the Initiative as a community activity, rather than a series of decisions which would take place in municipal offices. Through the Competition and Initiative the City of Toronto is working to involve the small business owners along main streets to become involved in the provision of housing, once again integrating and dispersing this responsibility throughout the community. The idea behind this dispersion of development is that it will respond to the specific and diverse needs of the community much more effectively than could a large private or government developer.

Finally, it should be noted that there is a typological integration and dispersion of public housing in the Main Streets Competition. Although the City is interested in encouraging the provision of private, non-profit and public sector housing through the Initiative, markets which are usually treated separately, they have been conflated to a single proposition in the Competition programme. The architectural programme and form of all three forms of housing are implicitly considered identical in the document and in the entries. In this sense the Competition is more about generating scenographic and formal ideas about the infill type than developing any set of social or functional criteria. As reflected in the Grand Prize entry, the Main Street is assumed to provide for all the needs of all the diverse people living along its boundaries. The effect is the seeming disappearance of any need for the separate category of public housing, except on the basis of cost. All other specific needs can be met through the multiplicitous form of the Main Street, and there is some vague hope that the use of small developers and small development will also solve the problem of affordability.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

In the introduction it was suggested that one of the major aims of this thesis was to test critically for the possible existence of a 'culture of [public] housing' in twentieth century Canada. According to the definitions set out, this culture would have a common set of values, customs and ideas which could be considered to influence and be influenced by the design and production of public housing. It was shown that participation in this culture was not limited to architectural designers, but would also include institutional clients, various levels of government and politicians, planners, social agencies, private interest groups and critics. Such a culture of housing, it was stated, is really a sub-culture of the larger 'culture of modernity', in which the period under consideration can be located. Architecture was defined as a 'cultural object' so that the design of public housing would be understood to be recursively related to this culture of modernity.

Bakhtin's analytical model of motifs and chronotopes was introduced as a way of conceptually ordering and understanding this relation between the architectural design and production of public housing and its cultural context. The relation is dialogic and occurs at a semantic, as well as a spatial-

temporal level. That is, in human culture we give all 'phenomena' (ie. both experience and objects) meaning, and this meaning is expressed and configured through spatial-temporal actions.

All of this leads to what may be considered the principal question of the thesis: what is the 'meaning' of the architectural design and production of the public housing projects discussed? While the search for a single meaning is a questionable endeavour, what is being sought here is a definition of a common "set of values, customs and ideas", a common cultural meaning which can be found in the design and production of all three types of public housing under analysis. It was hypothesized at the beginning of the thesis that their common location would lie within the 'modern chronotope', inclusive of the three sub-chronotopes of early, late and post-modern to which the three types corresponded. The question now must be, can these three types be critically considered within the single modern chronotope? This is particularly relevant in the case of the infill housing type represented by the Housing on Main Streets Competition, where it was suggested that there were considerable differences with the previous two types.

Lindenlea was designed and built by the federal government (and the Ottawa Housing Commission) to serve as a model

project for other municipalities across Canada. The use of a model project reflects the aims of the early modern reformers to incorporate the poor into their middle class culture through the production of a normalized and homogeneous environment. The early modern ideology which informed the design and production of Lindenlea was characterized by beliefs in direct links between moral and physical health, the inappropriateness of the city as a family environment, the sanctity of the family and the place of women in the home, and finally by a strong almost ontological belief in the value of private home ownership. The approach of the reformers toward the provision of publicly-subsidized housing was patriarchal, ethnocentric, class bound and environmentally deterministic. These characteristics led to a chronotope in which the single family, detached suburban house was promoted as the one appropriate type of living environment for all Canadians by the reformers. The result at Lindenlea was what might be termed a proto-modernist housing development which combined elements of modern theory with traditional middle class values, both socially and architecturally.

The urban housing project of **Alexandra Park** can be located within a late modern discourse, characterized in part by an interpenetration of functionalist Modernism and more populist and humanistic influences, which arose concomitantly with a growing interest and maturation of the social sciences, and in

particular sociology. Its architectural design and production can be understood as strongly influenced by the belief in the separation of uses and the value of community. The separation of uses, in zoning, in the segregation of cars and people, and in the hierarchical ordering of architectural spaces and spatial practices, may be considered as the late modern configuration of the modern motifs of rationalization and functionalism. Unfortunately, this combination of the notions of community and separation resulted in the creation of public housing 'ghettoes', which even the more 'humanistic' row housing environment of Alexandra Park could not alter. The design and production values linked to the concern for community hint at the beginnings of post-modern thought, in the predominance of issues of site location and design (public) rather than individual unit design (private). The romanticized view of the urban community and of the working class community as promoted by Jane Jacobs, Herbert Gans and others was beginning to have an influence on the architectural community by the time of Alexandra Park, although it was tempered by the continuing force of the Modern Movement. The 'project' form of Alexandra Park thus reflects the late modern chronotopic belief in the creation of a separate social community which could be most efficiently and best served within an institutionally designed and controlled environment. The inhabitants of the project could best be helped to gain or regain entrance to a normal standard of living, it was felt,

through the 'gateway' of such a (temporary) institutional setting, which would in effect train the inhabitants how to behave in a normal community environment. Of course, the urban clearance and renewal approach also reflects a broader agenda of core area redevelopment geared toward the interests of the business and development communities.

The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition and the **Grand Prize** entry represent one of the currently emerging and potentially dominant approaches to the provision of publicly subsidized and affordable housing in Canada: infill housing in the core area. The infill type can be characterized by the post-modern chronotopic notions of specificity and multiplicity, in a dialogic relationship. In the post-modern chronotope the concern with the motifs of public vs. private and scenography combine to dominate the issue of housing. The concept of community is redefined through the new promotion of specificity and multiplicity, with the notions of public place and space as prevalent social and architectural issues. This reconfiguration has put into question the whole issue of the institutionalization of the provision of affordable housing for low-income groups, as represented by Alexandra Park. Institutions and communities are not compatible concepts in the postmodern chronotope. Infill housing as conceptualized in the Housing on Main Streets Competition is closely allied with a position which celebrates the specific character of an urban

community and neighbourhood, and its role in adding to the heterogeneous (multiplicitous) quality of the city. Yet the community is expected to absorb a heterogeneous social group into itself, to provide for all types of social position and behaviour in this celebration of difference. While one of the aims of this intensification programme is the strengthening of the community and the street (the public), another could be considered to be the dispersion of marginal groups and their housing needs (the private) through integration. This accentuation of the public combined with the dispersion and integration of the private has led, as is apparent in the Competition and in the Grand Prize entry, to the conflation of the design and production of private, public and non-profit housing, with the attached implication that the private and non-profit markets can probably serve all the needs of the communities. This position serves well the current governments of Canada which need to find areas in which spending can be reduced or cut altogether in order to act on what they refer to as the 'fiscal crisis of the state'. The declaration that an area of the economy can be more effectively and more efficiently served by the private sector is commonly and widely used by the conservative governments of the post-modern chronotope.

Normalization, Hegemony and Public Housing

Given these critical analyses of the three housing projects and types, we can now return to the question of their cultural meaning and their location relative to the modern discourse. This discourse has been defined by the rise of the following elements to productive and everyday life; liberal capitalism and industrialism, science and its application to technological capacity, and the middle class to political and sociocultural dominance. There is a division and organization of labour and production processes leading to mass production and specialization, new modes of mass consumption, the rise of institutional government, and unprecedented urbanization.

It can be posited that all three projects and the types they represent have a normalizing and hegemonizing agenda which can be clearly related to their location within the modern discourse. This is explicitly represented in the case of Lindenlea, in which the housing was designed and produced to closely imitate the middle class housing of the early modern chronotope and thereby incorporate the inhabitants into that culture. It is not so obvious in the case of Alexandra Park. Nonetheless, the use of a modified garden suburb form, the concern with the social community, and the view that the project is a temporary place for the inhabitants to gain a

foothold into middle class society all point to a desire to normalize the poor through a resocialization programme. Normalization and hegemonization take place in the Housing Competition by two means: the reappropriation of the heterogeneous space of the street as an appropriate public space, and the integration of marginal groups and their housing needs into the larger community.

The identification of this common agenda helps in defining the shared cultural meaning of the three types, and in their location within the modern chronotope. The common set of values and goals attached to the three types of public housing under discussion lead to a tentative definition of public housing (here understood as publicly-subsidized housing) as a modern social institution in Canada.¹⁷⁶ This role is especially clear when we consider the 'institutionalization' of the middle class way of life in the modern discourse, with its emphasis on such things as the nuclear family, private home ownership, the separation of home and wage labour and the specialization of labour, and the standardization of education, consumption and leisure activities. All of these

¹⁷⁶ The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology defines institution as, "social practices that are regularly and continuously repeated, are sanctioned and maintained by social norms, and have a major significance in the social structure." It also notes that, "changes in social practice both modify existing institutions and create novel forms," allowing that institutions are not "given and unchanging entities." Nicholas Abercrombie, Stephen Hill and Bryan S. Turner, The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology (Second Edition. London: Penguin Books, 1988):124-25.

play some role, directly or indirectly in the normalizing and hegemonizing agenda of the projects. But this institutionalization within the modern discourse occurs at other levels as well, and is visible in the design and production of the three types.

One of the major effects of the rise of capitalism has been the commodification of both land and housing. For many nineteenth and twentieth century housing reformers, including Garden City Movement founder Ebenezer Howard, land speculation was the main problem in the provision of affordable and decent housing to the under classes. It was through the work of Howard and other reformers of the period that the notion of a social responsibility toward the living environment for the poor began to gel into forms which could be adopted by modern governments, and which did not severely threaten the capitalist base of middle class society. Lindenlea is an excellent example of this. The government avoided land speculation through its control of the project, yet still maintained that institution so important to middle class ideals and economics: the privately owned home. In projects such as Alexandra Park, the problem of competition with the private market was circumvented by doing the opposite of Lindenlea: the project was clearly identifiable as a public housing development and tenants paid under a rent-geared-to-income programme which was supposed to encourage them to leave

as soon as possible. At the same time, projects such as Alexandra Park are the result of the growing domination of land speculation and development in the economy, such that urban clearance and renewal (not always replacing the housing that existed) became a favourable option for municipal governments, and especially for developers.

The effect of the commodification of housing is especially clear in the design and production of Lindenlea. Through modern ideology and social practice the act of private home ownership has become reified, and with this reification has come the assumption that there is choice available to the purchaser. The commodification of housing has heightened this assumption of choice. While the home retains symbolic value, including its reflection of class status through ownership, the house becomes just another item on the market to buy and sell competitively and profitably. The Federal Housing Scheme strongly reflected a belief in both the symbolic and commodity characteristics of housing, and the government would not consider a programme of publicly run housing. At the same time, the designers of Lindenlea considered it important to give potential owners a choice of house designs, in order for the development to appear as normal as possible. Once again, at Alexandra Park the same set of beliefs about the inviolability of private home ownership and choice are present. The housing authorities convinced themselves and

others (although rarely their clients) that they were acting beneficially to rid the clearance areas of exploitive slumlords, while providing a temporary setting for the poor until they could improve themselves enough to enter the private housing market. The assumptions about the appropriateness of the single family detached suburban house as designed for Lindenlea remained largely intact, and strongly influenced the design of Alexandra Park.

It is clear from the design analysis of the three projects that they are in many ways reduced models of the major urban architectural and planning theories of their respective periods. The modern chronotope itself is characterized by a motif of rational planning, from the largest national or city scales through production assembly lines to efficient kitchen design. As a modern institution, public housing shares this concern, which is also part of the project of normalization. Planning allows a single approach, in the case of the three projects three design approaches, to be applied to a variety of situations, creating a standard set of 'best' solutions based upon a single and sometimes totalizing concept. Marshall Berman is particularly lucid on this motif in his writings on Faust and development, and on twentieth century urban planning.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁷ Marshall Berman, All that is solid melts into air, op. cit.

But modern planning is first and foremost about the rationalization of life, the division of activities and functions. These divisions manifest themselves differently in the three chronotopes according to prevalent ideological thinking about the appropriate separation or mixing of environments and activities, for example of home and work. This suggests that the motif of the public/private dichotomy plays a major role in the architectural design of living environments. The separation of these two modes is very clear at Lindenlea, where the suburb itself is separated from the work environment of the city, the house is separated from others and from the public street by its yard, and the various living spaces, such as kitchen and living room are also clearly defined. At Alexandra Park the motif is reconfigured so that more emphasis is placed upon the hierarchy of public spaces than private, but the separation of home and work environments is still unchallenged, and the individuality of the living units is maintained as much as possible.

The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets competition and the Grand Prize Entry show some differences from these modern characteristics, and lead to a questioning of its place within the modern chronotope. It is worthwhile to compare the characteristics of this project and its post-modern chronotope with those discussed above. In the case of the Main Streets Initiative the problem of land speculation and its effect on

the provision of affordable housing is dealt with through an attempt to fragment the development market, by promoting a more informal, 'local-amateur economy'.¹⁷⁸ One of the aims of the Initiative and the Competition is to encourage small land and building owners along the main streets to develop their properties for mixed residential-commercial use. Through various development regulations, the Initiative will also work to discourage land assembly and large developments on these streets. It is felt that this small scale approach is better suited to providing the needed alternative forms of affordable housing which would be appropriate for the amenable development of main streets.

The house as a commodity is accepted as a natural state of affairs and is encouraged through a return to the private market to provide affordable housing. However, the symbolic value of home that went along with the commodity role in earlier periods is questioned in the Main Streets Initiative and especially in the Grand Prize Entry. The infill main streets type subverts the suburban type as the appropriate modern housing form and social environment. The Main Streets Initiative and the Grand Prize Entry allow for and encourage both alternative social groupings and living environments. The Modernist insistence on scientifically standardized green

¹⁷⁸ On local-amateur economies see Roger Krohn et. al., The Other Economy: The Internal Logic of Local Rental Housing.

space, fresh air and sunlight is clearly rejected here in favour of a dense urban configuration, with the street as the main public and recreational space.

In conjunction with this shift, the dominance of the middle class as the chief hegemonizing force in society is also questioned, although by no means submerged. The rising popularity of the infill housing type will not mean the end of the middle class suburban lifestyle, but it will mark the fragmentation of a previously largely monolithic housing market. This should not be taken to mean however, that the normalization agenda of the modern chronotope is not at work here. In the case of the Housing on Main Street Initiative, the will to normalization is steeped in a romantic, bourgeois vision of the traditional life of the village. The programme of integration and dispersion may perhaps be viewed as a last option of maintaining the middle class vision of life in the neighbourhoods behind the main streets, first through the strengthening of those streets, and second through the prevention of the infiltration of undesirable social groups or uses into the physical boundaries of the neighbourhoods themselves.

First and foremost however, the Main Streets Initiative and the Grand Prize Entry are marked by a reconfiguration of the public/private motif, which really began with the work of

people such as Jane Jacobs.¹⁷⁹ The modern separation of the home and work and home and leisure environments is beginning to break down, and in direct contrast to Lindenlea it is the public which dominates over the private. In Gauthier, Carle and Roquet's project the public domain infiltrates the private, breaking through the boundaries and social groupings set in place in such projects as Lindenlea and Alexandra Park. The living units are "a representation of the street: a passageway slung from room to room," encouraging "a collective appropriation of the flat." In fact the development of additional housing through the Initiative is almost marginal compared to the primary aim of developing the Main Streets as renewed public spaces.

The other characteristic of the Housing on Main Streets project which subverts its possible modern chronotopic location is its move towards the deinstitutionalization of the provision of public housing, and therefore the spatiotemporal integration of subsidized housing into the private sector. This institution is now under question, socially, politically, economically and architecturally. In the postmodern discourse

¹⁷⁹ Alternative residential environments such as settlement houses and communes, promoted at the turn of the century by feminists and utopianists are also potential models for new housing types. See Dolores Hayden, The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighbourhoods and Cities (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981), and Seven American Utopias: The Architecture of Communitarian Socialism, 1780-1975 (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976).

of the Initiative, the characteristics of normalization and institutionalization no longer mesh as they did at Lindenlea and Alexandra Park. The project's normalization is now directed towards the social and architectural integration of affordable housing into a culture which, at the very least, is redefining its institutions. There is an underlying feeling to the Competition and the Initiative that if things could just be returned to the way they were, that is to small, village-like developments, then all the problems associated with modern city living could be resolved. There would be no need for public housing, no more land or building speculation, and no more social problems because no one would be marginalized in these heterogeneous communities. The conflation of the design and production of public, private and third sector housing in the Main Streets Competition (as well as in such projects as Ataratiri) certainly subverts the role of public housing as a modern social institution.

This leaves us in a rather paradoxical situation regarding the definition of a 'culture of housing' as linked to a culture of modernity through the three projects. On the one hand all three projects share an important modern characteristic in their normalizing agendas, and it could be stated that this is one of the defining characteristics of public housing. This agenda is transmitted in the architectural design and production of all three projects, which follow the major

design 'discourses' of their respective chronotopes, for ideological rather than merely stylistic reasons. On the other hand, the Housing on Main Streets Competition and the Grand Prize Entry demonstrate a movement toward the devolution of public housing as a social institution, perhaps ending in its disappearance from public policy altogether. The architectural integration of both the infill type of the Initiative, and the work at Ataratiri and other such projects hint in this direction. In the post-modern project of the Main Streets Initiative it would seem that the two modern factors of normalization and specialization have collided. Thus while the essential meaning of public housing has remained the same throughout all three projects - to provide an environment through which the inhabitants will be encouraged to gain access to the predominant customs and values of culture - the premise itself is now being questioned.

The Design of Community

The drive to normalization in the design and production of public housing as represented in these three projects is linked to another common characteristic - the designing of community. The importance of this aspect of the design problem of public housing in relation to the modern chronotope became increasingly clear during the process of thinking and writing this thesis. All three projects can be conceived of as dealing with this problem in one way or another, as it relates to the desire to create a uniform culture of housing.

Lindenlea was in part an exercise about designing the community at large, and to a lesser extent about designing itself as a specific suburban community. It was first of all a model project, a model for the design of low-income housing communities across Canada. Secondly, its form was based upon the middle class model of preferred living which the reformers hoped to apply throughout Canadian society. Alexandra Park and the Housing on Main Streets Initiative are more about creating community in and through the design and production of that specific project. Two different notions or definitions of community influenced these projects, resulting in distinct architectural typologies.

The recognition of this aspect of the design and production of

public housing raises the fundamental issue of whether community can be designed by architects. The Housing on Main Streets Initiative is paradoxical in this regard. Whereas Alexandra Park was designed under the premise that community could be made through design, the Main Streets Initiative has what may be considered the ultimately romantic view of community - that it occurs in some sort of naturalistic manner, and that it is the fault of Modern planning, with its overly rationalized and technocratic programme which destroyed this natural state. The conclusion on which the Main Streets Initiative seems to be based is that community cannot be designed - at least not under the rationalistic logic of the Modern Movement. Rather the programme of the Initiative, and of the Grand Prize Entry is to build upon and strengthen existing patterns of community that developed before the restructuring of the urban fabric by the Modernists. This pre-Modern (in the architectural category rather than chronotopic sense) pattern is understood to have developed in an informal and hence more responsive manner. The success of the Initiative will depend to a large degree upon whether it can succeed in penetrating and encouraging the informal economies of these existing communities. It is doubtful however, that public housing could exist within this situation, as it is institutional and bureaucratic by nature.

Possibilities for Future Study

One form of compromise between these two states - that of essentially private, small-scale housing development, and public housing development may be found in co-operative housing. Although co-op housing is a form of subsidized housing that is looked upon favourably by interest groups across the political and ideological spectrum it was not discussed in this thesis because it is not specific in its architectural typology. Indeed it cannot be, or it would not function effectively as a flexible form of housing production. However, co-operative housing is a form of affordable housing that needs more scholarly attention, for it presents a number of options: it allows ownership to many levels of income earners; works toward the integration of income groups and living situations, or toward the provision of specialized forms of housing for special needs groups; it is non-institutional, as it is managed by the owner-occupants; and it is non-profit. All of these characteristics provide a degree of flexibility and self-control (ie. choice) in the design and production of affordable housing that does not seem to occur elsewhere, including the private market. Co-operative housing thus has the potential to allow for a wide variety of living situations, from private family apartments to more communal, shared arrangements which may suit single parents, the handicapped, the elderly, artists or other non-family groups.

One other alternative route which has been taken in the provision of affordable housing and which deserves further study lies in the development of alternative construction technologies. Previous attempts in this area have met with limited success at best, for a variety of reasons. Most of these experiments have focussed around the development of techniques which would allow housing construction to take place in a factory production line process. This form of rationalized mass production of housing was clearly a Modernist project, beginning with Walter Gropius at the Bauhaus and reaching a climax with Moshe Safdie's Habitat projects of the late 1960s. Architects continue to grapple with the problem, although now in a characteristically 'post-modern' fashion. Witold Rybczynski and Avi Friedman's Grow Home for instance, is a caricature of the single-family home, designed to fit on an extremely narrow lot (15 feet), of traditional 'styling', and allowing for later additions by the home owner (70).¹⁸⁰ The design thus promotes individual choice and private ownership and initiative, while pandering to the current desire for a return to 'traditional' forms and styles of housing. The fundamental flaw of the Grow Home scheme however, is that it relies on the purchase of individual, undeveloped parcels of land in order to retain any sense of affordability. While Friedman and Rybczynski

¹⁸⁰ Pamela Young, "Redefining a dream: the search for more affordable housing," Maclean's (July 16, 1990):46-47, p. 46.

estimated that such a lot could be purchased in suburban Montreal for twelve thousand dollars, a similar lot in Scarborough may cost up to fifty thousand dollars, and continue to promote urban sprawl and its attendant problems.¹⁸¹

The production of the essentially conservative Grow Home from an architectural programme (the McGill School of Architecture's M. Arch in Housing) whose mandate is to develop alternative housing forms and solutions points to the continued entrenchment of the conservative, middle class attitudes toward housing so influential in the design and production of Lindenlea. The Housing on Toronto's Main Streets Competition challenges some, although not all of these attitudes in its promotion of an intensive urban living experience in which both the internal living spaces, and their relation to the external public spaces are radically reconsidered. Equally important, the Main Street Competition and the Grand Prize Entry also reconsider the issue of housing tenure, with proposals which promote private development but not private home ownership. The typological analysis of the three projects in this thesis has revealed that there is a dialogic relationship between housing design and housing tenure which owes much to our cultural attitudes towards the appropriate housing environment, that is to a 'culture of

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

housing' which has dominated design and production throughout the twentieth century. While this may help to explain the failures of public housing in the past, it may also lead to a broader discussion of housing solutions in the future. These discussions, which seem to be currently led by feminist housing critics, will have to account for the importance our culture has placed upon private home ownership, the effect this has had on design and production, and the changes which will need to occur in both areas before innovative and responsive housing can be built.

GARDEN CITY AND RURAL BELT

[illegible]

WARD AND CENTRE OF GARDEN CITY

1. *Ebenezer Howard. Diagrams illustrating principles of the Garden City Concept.*

2. Plan of the Garden City of Letchworth, England.

3. Plan of the Garden City of Welwyn, England.

4. Plan of Lindenlea.

5. Housing Suggestions by the Housing Committee of the Cabinet, Canada.

Canadian Government Housing Scheme—Single House, Type A.

MR. W. D. CROMARTY, Architect. (MR. THOMAS ADAMS, Housing and Planning
Adviser to the Canadian Government.) (See p. 17.)

**6. Housing Suggestions by the Housing Committee of the Cabinet,
Canada.**

**7. Two types of detached houses recommended in the Report of the
Ontario Housing Committee.**

3 of/de 3

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 4 FT TO IN

10. Plan. House for C.A. Menard, Lindenlea.

FRONT ELEVATION

NORTH SIDE

SECTION

11. Elevations. House for M.M. Reid, Lindenlea.

FRONT ELEVATION

13. Elevation. House for J.A.C. Roy, Lindenlea.

14. View down Rockcliffe Way to children's playground, Lindenlea.

15. Gambrel roof houses off Maple Avenue, Lindenlea.

16, 17. Houses, Lindenl

18. House, Lindenlea.

19. Houses on Rock Avenue, Lindenlea.

20, 21. Houses, Lindenle

22. Clarence Stein and Henry Wright, 1929.
Neighbourhood Unit, Radburn, New Jersey.

23. Review and analysis of Radburn, New Jersey, in Architectural Review January 1951.

24. "Suggested Re-housing Scheme no. 3," Bruce Report.

REGENT PARK
HOUSING PROJECT
TORONTO
J. E. HOARE JR. ARCHITECT

25. J.E. Hoare Jr. Bird's eye view of Regent Park North, Toronto.

26. Page and Steele. Regent Park South
Toronto. Site Plan, showing placeme
of apartment slabs irregularly to t
existing street pattern.

27. Page and Steele. Regent Park South
Toronto. Section through building.

28. Peter Batchelor. "Landsdown Crescent, Bath, England. The intimacy and repose of Georgian streets and spaces rose from the simple repetition of an elegant and highly refined basic housing unit."

29. Peter Batchelor. "Malt Mill Lane, Alcester, England. Streets of Charmless Time."

BY OF 1111 W. 11224

30. Klein and Sears. Don Valley Woods, Toronto. Site Plan. Typical site planning by this architectural firm in the 1960s.

31. Site Plan. Alexandra Park, Toronto. Webb Zerafa and Menkes; Jerome Markson; Klein and Sears.

A unit type g, five bedroom
 first and second floors.
B unit type h, three bedroom
 first, second and third floors.
C unit type c, three bedroom,
 first and second floors.
D unit type c, two bedroom
E unit type a, one bedroom.
F unit type b, one bedroom

33. "Area before Redevelopment, showing Alexandra Park sit in black."

34. "Alexandra Park - Centennia Award Winner," illustrating oriel window used throughout the project.

35. Typical housing form extant in Alexandra Park before clearance and renewal.

36. View from Alexandra Park off Vanauley Walk.

37. Entrance to Alexandra Park off Vanauley Street.

38. Pedestrian walk, Alexandra Park.

39, 40. Row houses, Alexandra Park

41, 42. Row houses, Alexandra Park.

43. Row houses, Alexandra Park, illustrating 'Georgian' repetitiveness.

44. Rear of row house units, Alexandra Park.

45. *Enclosed green space,
Alexandra Park.*

46. *Pedestrian walk,
Alexandra Park.*

47. Rear of two and three storey units, Alexandra Park

48. Rear gardens, Alexandra Park

49. Lord Simcoe's 1793 Plan for Toronto drawn by Aitken.

1890

1988

51. Current pattern of narrow lot subdivision on Queen Street West from at least 1890.

Context Plan 1:4000

Ground Floor Plan (Retail)

Second Floor Plan (Residential)

Third Floor Plan (Residential)

52. 1880's Main Street building.

Centre Bay Plans

Ground Floor Plan (Retail)

Second Floor Plan (Residential)

Third Floor Plan (Residential)

Fourth Floor Plan (Residential)

Context Plan 1:4000

19th Century Streetscape

53. Late 19th Century Main Street building.

Second Floor Plan (Residential)

Ground Floor Plan (Retail)

Context Plan 1:4000

54. Early 20th Century Main Street building.

Context Plan 1:4000

Ground Floor Plan (Retail)

Second Floor Plan (Residential)

55. Typical 1930's Main Street building.

Ground Floor Plan (Retail)

Second Floor Plan (Residential)

Third Floor Plan (Residential)

Context Plan 1:4000

56. 1960's Main Street building.

CATEGORY A, CORNER SITES

1. Site A-1, 1024 Avenue Road
2. Site A-2, 307 Sherbourne Street
3. Site A-3, 2857 Dundas Street West

CATEGORY B, MID BLOCK SITES

4. Site B-1, 1488 Queen Street West
5. Site B-2, 512 Church Street
6. Site B-3, 685 Danforth Avenue
7. Site B-4, 1965 Yonge Street

CATEGORY C, LARGE SITES

8. Site C-1, 1068-1090 Queen Street West
9. Site C-2, 2300 Danforth Avenue
10. Site C-3, 1200 Dundas Street West
1221 Dundas Street West
1230 Dundas Street West

58. Diamond and Myers. Sherbourne Lanes, Toronto, 1977.
Sectional Perspective.

59. Sherbourne Lanes, Toronto, 1977. Roof Plan.

60. Denyse Gauthier, Alain Carle and Nicholas Roquet. Grand Prize Entry. Strategic Drawing. "Topography, Main Street Ravine and Lake."

The city in itself is the genesis of the project: a mythical geography, in which lake ravine and main street are the specific actors. At this territorial scale, Toronto's main streets appear as an autonomous system in the city. Beyond the limits of Downtown, the streets propose an alternative model of the construction of the city: to constitute a linear and sequential public space for display and parade. They are the public equipment irrigating the neighbourhood they pass through. They compound individual and collective use. They are both homes, therefore permanent and stage sets for consuming, therefore ephemeral.

The main street is stripped down to its essential elements and translated into a conceptual model. Projected onto the existing city, it acts as a catalyst.

61. Grand Prize Entry. Axonometric\Gro Large Site C-3. 1220-1221-1230 Dundas Street West.

65. Grand Prize Entry. Plans. Corner Site A-1. 1024 Avenue Road
Eglinton Avenue.

63. *Grand Prize Entry. The Territory; and Typology: A Fragment of the Street. Large Site C-3. 1220-1221-1230 Dundas Street West.*

64. Grand Prize Entry. Clockwise from top left:
 a) Axonometric. Lakeview b) Front Elevation.
 Lakeview c) Ground Floor Plans d) Exploded
 Axonometric. Large Site C-3. 1220-1221-1230
 Dundas Street West.

65. *Grand Prize Entry. Plans. Corner Site A-1. 1024 Avenue Road Eglinton Avenue.*

Housing: The traditional main street apartment is extended to its limits. In this way, the housing unit is a representation of the street: a passageway slung from room to room. This exaggeration in scale encourages a collective appropriation of the flat. Without eliminating traditional uses, the multiplication of single private rooms allows independent inhabitants to cohabit.

The facade negotiates the variable conditions of the main street, and acts as a public extension to the flats behind (mixed use).

67. *First Award Entry. Paul Walker Clarke,
Alexandria Va.*

68. Honourable Mention Award Entry. Brown and Storey Architects, Toronto.

69. Honourable Mention Award Entry.
James Colizza, Jacques Belleau and
Jacques Hamel, Ottawa.

70. *Grow Home. Avi Friedman and Witold Rybczynski.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Abercrombie, Nicholas et. al. The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology Second Edition. London: Penguin Books, 1988.

Archer, John, "The Ideological Basis of Federal Government Housing Policy and Programs: An Historical Analysis," Research Paper. Institute of Canadian Studies, Carleton University, 1980.

Associate Committee on the National Building Code, Residential Standards Canada 1965 Third Printing. Supplement No. 5 to the National Building Code of Canada. Ottawa: National Research Council, 1967.

Bakhtin, M.M. The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays. (ed.) Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981):87.

Berman, Marshall, All That is Solid Melts into Air. The Experience of Modernity. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.

Canadian Housing Design Council Canada. Housing Design/Logement-Type (Awards for Residential Design, 1967) Ottawa: Canadian Housing Design Council, 1967.

Canter, David, "Action and Place: An Existential Dialectic." In (eds.) David Canter, Martin Kampen, David Shea Environmental Perspectives Aldershot: Avebury (1988): 1-17.

Colquhoun, Alan. Essays in Architectural Criticism: Modern Architecture and Historical Change. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981.

Colquhoun, Alan. Modernity and the Classical Tradition. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

Crow, Dennis. Philosophical Streets. New Approaches to Urbanism. Urbs et Orbi: The Urban Project Vol. 1. Washington: Maisonneuve Press and Institute for Advanced Cultural Studies, 1990.

Dennis, Michael. Programs in Search of a Policy: Low Income Housing in Canada Toronto: Hakkert, 1972.

Fishman, Robert. Urban Utopias in the Twentieth Century: Ebenezer Howard, Frank Lloyd Wright, Le Corbusier. Cambridge Mass.: MIT Press, 1982.

Frampton, Kenneth. Modern Architecture: A Critical History. (Revised edition) London: Thames and Hudson, 1985: 286.

Frampton, Kenneth, "Place, Production and Architecture: Towards a Critical Theory of Building," In Kenneth Frampton (ed.) Modern Architecture and the Critical Present London: Architectural Design Profile, 1982.

Fraser, Graham. Fighting Back: Urban Renewal in Trefann Court. Toronto: Hakkert, 1972.

Giddens, Anthony. Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory London: MacMillan Press, 1982.

Giddens, Anthony, "Structuralism, Post-Structuralism and the Production of Culture," in Social Theory and Modern Sociology Cambridge: Polity Press (1987): 73-108.

Giddens, Anthony. The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984.

Holston, James. The Modernist City: An Anthropological Critique of Brasilia Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Howard, Ebenezer. Garden Cities of Tomorrow. (ed.) F.J. Osborn. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965.

Jones, Andrew Eric, Beginnings of Federal Government Housing Policy, 1918-1924 Ottawa: Centre for Social Welfare Studies, Carleton University. Occasional Paper no. 1/78 (1978).

King, Anthony, "Cultural Production and Reproduction." In (eds.) David Canter, Martin Kampen, David Shea, Environmental Perspectives Aldershot: Avebury (1988):72-84.

King, Anthony, The Bungalow: The Production of a Global Culture. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984.

Klein, Jack. The Row House - its place in the urban community. Ottawa: Canadian Housing Design Council, n.d.

Kostof, Spiro. A History of Architecture: Settings and Rituals. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Krohn, Roger, et. al. The Other Economy: The Internal Logic of Local Rental Housing. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates, 1977.

Kuwabara, Bruce and Sampson, Barry, "Diamond and Myers: The Form of Reform." In (ed.) James Lorimer The City Book: The Politics and Planning of Canada's Cities. Toronto: James Lorimer and Co. Publishers, 1978):78-96.

Lawrence, Roderick J., "Translating Anthropological Concepts into Architectural Practice." In (eds.) Setha Low, Erva Chambers Housing, Culture and Design: A Comparative Perspective Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (1989): 89-113.

Mackenzie, Suzanne, "Building Women, Building Cities: Toward a Gender Sensitive Theory in the Environmental Disciplines." In (eds.) Caroline Andrews, Beth Moore Milroy Life Spaces: Gender, Household, Employment Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press (1988): 13-30.

Miron, John R. Housing in Postwar Canada: Demographic Change, Household Formation, and Housing Demand. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Newman, Oscar. Defensible Space. New York: Collier Books, 1973.

Ockman, Joan (ed.) Architecture, Criticism, Ideology. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Ontario Association of Housing Authorities. Good Housing For Canadians Toronto: Ontario, 1964.

Peddie, Richard, "Residential Mobility, Occupancy Conversion and Neighbourhood Change," University of Toronto, PhD dissertation, 1978.

Pendleton, Glenna Carolyn, "An Exploratory Study of New Infill Housing in Toronto's Central City Planning Area," M.A. Thesis, School of Regional Planning and Resource Development, University of Waterloo, 1983.

Rose, Albert. Regent Park: A Study in Slum Clearance. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Rosler, Martha and Brian Wallis, ed. If You Lived Here. The City in Art, Theory and Social Activism. New York: Dia Art Foundation Discussions in Contemporary Culture 6.

Rossi, Aldo. The Architecture of the City. (revised American Edition by Aldo Rossi and Peter Eisenman) Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1982.

Rutherford, Paul. Saving the Canadian City: The First Phase 1880-1920. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

Saunders, Peter. Social Theory and the Urban Question. (Second Edition) London: Hutchinson Education Ltd., 1986.

Sayegh, Kamal. Housing: A Canadian Perspective. Ottawa: Academy Books, 1987.

Schaffer, Daniel. Garden Cities for America: The Radburn Experience. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.

Scully, Vincent. American Architecture and Urbanism. (New Revised Edition) New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1988.

Shields, Rob, "Toward a Theory of Social Spatialization," M.A. Thesis, Carleton University, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, January, 1986.

Simpson, Michael. Thomas Adams and the Modern Planning Movement: Britain, Canada and the United States, 1900-1940. London and New York: Alexandrine Press Book, Mansell, 1985.

Steadman, Phillip and Owers, Janet (eds.) Transactions of the Martin Centre for Architectural and Urban Studies University of Cambridge. Volume One. Cambridge: Woodhead-Faulkner, n.d.

Strong-Boag, Veronica. The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939.

Suttles, Gerald D. The Social Construction of Communities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Tausky, Nancy and DiStephano, Lynne D. Victorian Architecture in London and Southwestern Ontario: Symbols of Aspiration Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Urry, John, "Social Relations, Space and Time." In (eds.) Derek Gregory, John Urry, Social Relations and Spatial Structures. London: MacMillan Press, 1985.

Wright, Gwendolyn. Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980): 245.

ARTICLES

"Alexandra Park," Architecture Canada (January, 1967): 41.

"Apartments: Regent Park South, Toronto," The Canadian Architect IV, 9 (September 1959):62-73.

Archer, John, "A History of Housing Standards." Habitat Vol. 24 No. 4 (1981): 10-16.

Armstrong, Alan, "Thomas Adams and the Commission of Conservation." Plan Canada Vol.1 no.1. (1959): 14-32.

Bacher, John, "W.C. Clark and the Politics of Canadian Housing Policy 1935-1952." Urban History Review Vol. XVII No. 1 (June 1988): 5-15.

Baird, George, "Theory/Vacant Lots in Toronto." Design Quarterly no. 108 (1978):16-31.

Batchelor, Peter, "Horizontal Multiple Housing: A Study of Low Rise Multiple Housing Developments in Western Europe and Scandinavia." Journal of the RAIC (February, 1965): 22-38.

Bradley, Robert B. "Public Housing for the Future." Urban Renewal and Low Income Housing in Canada Vol. 6 No. 4 (1970): 8-13.

Charney, Melvin, "City Structure as the Generator of Architectural Form." Places Vol.7 no.2 (Winter 1991):54-59.

Christiaanse, Kees, "Urban Design for Architectural Diversity." Places Vol.7 no.2 (Winter 1991):66-69.

Colfe, Timothy J.S. "From Urban Renewal to Housing Rehabilitation: An Evolution of Post-War Housing Policy." Geoscope Ottawa. Vol. XVI No. 1 (1986): 15-20.

Craick, W.A. "Cottage Flats in Toronto" (Toronto Housing Company) Architectural Record (December, 1914): 540-544.

Culler, Samuel, "Urban Renewal and Social Programs." Journal of the RAIC (Special Issue on Urban Renewal), (June 1966): 60-62.

Darke, Jane, "Architects and User Requirements in Public Sector Housing: 1. Architects' Assumptions about the Users." Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design Vol. 11 (1984): 389-404.

de Wolfe, Ivor, "The Death and Life of the Great American Citizen." The Architectural Review Vol.133 no.792 (February 1963): 91-93.

Diamond, A.J., "Urban Renewal Introduction." Journal of the RAIC (Special Issue on Urban Renewal), (June 1966): 33-35.

"Don Valley Woods," The Canadian Architect (August 1964): 40-46.

Doucet, Michael J., John C. Weaver, "Material Culture and the North American House: The Era of the Common Man 1870-1920." The Journal of American History Vol. 72 No. 3 (Dec, 1985): 560-587.

"First Public Housing Project to Win CHDC Award." Urban Renewal and Public Housing in Canada (1st quarter, 1967): 4.

Folch-Serra, M. "Place, voice, space: Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogical landscape." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space Vol. 8 (1990):255-274.

Forrest, R. "The Meaning of Homeownership." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space Vol. 1 (1983): 205-216.

Franklin, Mark, "A Modest Beginning: Housing on Toronto's Main Streets." The Canadian Architect (September, 1990): 37-41.

Freedman, Adele, "A welcome blueprint for a new Toronto." Globe and Mail Saturday, June 30, 1990.

Goodchild, Barry, "Postmodernism and Housing: A Guide to Design Theory," Housing Studies Vol.6 no.2 (1991):131-144.

Gregson, N. "Structuration Theory: Some Thoughts on the Possibilities for Empirical Research." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space Vol. 5 (1987): 73-91.

Hewitt, G. Trafford, "Canada and the United States as a Field for the Garden City Movement." Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference on City Planning (Toronto, May 25-27, 1914). Boston (1914): 180-193.

Hodgetts, C.A., "Housing and Health." Canadian Municipal Journal (March, 1920): 86-87,93.

Holdsworth, Deryck W., "House and Home in Vancouver: Images of West Coast Urbanism, 1886-1929." In (eds.) Gilbert Stelter and Alan Artibise, The Canadian City Ottawa: Carleton University Press, (1984): 187-209.

"Housing Activities Around the World: Housing in Canada; Notes from the Government Statement," Journal of the American Institute of Architects Vol. VII No. 6 (June, 1919): 271-274.

King, Anthony, "Cultural Hegemony and Capital Cities," Capital Cities: How to ensure their effectiveness and harmonious development. Ottawa: National Capital Commission (December 6-8, 1990): 16.

King, Anthony, "The Colonial Bungalow-Compound Complex: A Study in the Cultural Use of Space." Journal of Architectural Research Vol. 3 No. 2 (May 1974): 30-43.

King, Anthony, "The Social Production of Building Form: Theory and Research." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space.

Knesl, J.A. "The Powers of Architecture." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space Vol. 2 (1984): 3-22.

Latek, Irena, "Le Concours Housing on Toronto's Main Streets. Le Grand Prix," ARQ 58 (Decembre 1990):23-25.

Murray, James A., "Search for Shelter." The Canadian Architect (January, 1965): 38-44.

Myers, Barton, "Urban Consolidation." Design Quarterly no. 108 (1978): 8-15.

Nairn, Ian, "The Mindless Master." The Architectural Review Vol. 127 no. 758 (April 1960): 229-231.

Preview Issue," Architectural Review Vol. 129 no. 767 (January, 1961).

"Proposed or Completed Developments: Site Planning at Lindenlea, Ottawa," Journal of the Town Planning Institute of Canada (April, 1921): 4-5.

"Redevelopment: Alexandra Park, Toronto," The Canadian Architect (11, July 1966): 48-50.

Rutherford, Paul, "Tomorrow's Metropolis: The Urban Reform Movement in Canada, 1880-1920," in (eds.) Gilbert Stelter and Alan Artibise. The Canadian City: Essays in Urban and Social History. Ottawa:Carleton University Press, (1984):435-455.

Simpson, Louis, "Civic Improvement Organization for Canada." Conservation of Life Vol. II No. 1 (October 1915): 1-6.

"The Housing Problem and Production," Conservation of Life Vol. VI No. 3 (July 1918): 49-57.

Thrift, N.J., "On the Determination of Social Action in Space and Time." Environment and Planning D: Society and Space Vol. 1 (1983): 23-57.

Trabalzi, Feruccio, "Low-Cost Housing in Twentieth-Century Rome," in Diane Ghirardo (ed.) Out of Site. A Social Criticism of Architecture. Seattle: Bay Press, 1991.

"Urban Renewal: Alexandra Park Toronto," The Canadian Architect (September, 1969): 54 - 66.

Vidler, Anthony, "The Idea of Type: The Transformation of the Academic Ideal, 1750-1830." Oppositions 8 (Spring 1977): 95-115.

Vipond, Mary, "The Image of Women in Canadian Mass Circulation Magazines in the 1920s." Modernist Studies: Literature and Culture 1920-1940 Vol.1 No.3 (1974-75): 5-14.

Weaver, John C., "Reconstruction of the Richmond District in Halifax: A Canadian Episode in Public Housing and Town Planning, 1918- 1921," Plan Canada Vol. 16 (March, 1976): 36-47.

Wright, Gwendolyn, "Sweet and Clean: The Domestic Landscape in the Progressive Era." Landscape Vol.20 No.1 (October 1975): 38-43.

Young, Pamela, "Redefining a Dream," Maclean's (July 16, 1990):46-47.

REPORTS AND ARCHIVAL MATERIALS

Adams, Thomas. Letter to the Ottawa Housing Commission June 27, 1919.

----- "Report on the Planning and Redevelopment of the Lindenlea Estate, Ottawa," to the Ottawa Housing Commission, July 25, 1919. City of Ottawa Archives, RG22.

Advisory Committee on Alexandra Park Improvement. Report on the Improvement of The Alexandra Park Area. Toronto: Advisory Committee, 1962.

Bryce, Dr. Peter H., "Measures for the Improvement and Maintenance of Public Health." Commission of Conservation First Annual Report, 1910.

Canada. Report of the Task Force on Housing and Urban Development Ottawa: Queen's Printer, January, 1969. (The Hellyer Report).

Canadian Welfare Council. Special Project on Low-Income Housing, and Community Funds and Councils Division of the Canadian Welfare Council. Integration of Physical and Social Planning With Special Reference to Public Housing and Urban Renewal. Report Number One, 1967.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Some Basic Questions and Answers on the Urban Renewal and Public Housing Provision of the NHA. Ottawa:CMHC, 1966 (pamphlet).

City of Ottawa Archives. Papers of the Ottawa Housing Commission.

City of Toronto Planning and Development Department. Housing on Toronto's Main Streets: A Design Competition. Conditions and Programme. Toronto: City of Toronto, January 1990.

City of Toronto. Planning and Development Board, et. al. Housing on Toronto's Main Streets: Proposals Report. Toronto: City of Toronto, July 1989.

City of Toronto Planning Board. Redevelopment Study: Area No. "2" Alexandra Park: First Stage Area. Toronto: Planning Board, August 1960.

Commission of Conservation, Annual Reports 1910-1919. Ottawa: Commission of Conservation.

Commissioner of Development. Redevelopment Plan for Alexandra Park. Toronto: Municipality of the City of Toronto, 1965.

Community Planning Branch. Department of Planning and Development, City of Toronto. Urban Renewal Notes Revised Edition. Toronto: City of Toronto, 1958.

Corporation of Metropolitan Toronto. Report on Metropolitan Participation in the Proposed Redevelopment of the Moss Park and Alexandra Park Areas. Toronto: Corporation of Metropolitan Toronto, n.d.

Doyle, Cassie. Municipal Initiatives in Housing 1900-1970: The City of Ottawa. City of Ottawa, 1970.

Hodgetts, C.A., "Unsanitary Housing," Commission of Conservation Second Annual Report, 1911.

Housing on Toronto's Main Streets. Proposals Report. Toronto: City of Toronto, 1989.

Martin Goldfarb Consultants Ltd. Public Housing. A Research Report for CMHC Ottawa:CMHC, 1968.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Ontario Housing Corporation. Ontario Housing Corporation 1964-1984, Toronto: Ontario, 1984.

Ontario. Ontario Housing Corporation. 1966 Annual Report. Toronto: Ontario, 1967.

Ontario. Report of the Lieutenant-Governor's Committee on Housing Conditions in Toronto. (Bruce Report) Toronto: Ontario, 1934.

Ontario. Report of the Ontario Housing Committee: Including Standards for Inexpensive Houses Adopted for Ontario and Typical Plans. Toronto: A.T. Wilgress, 1919.

Paper 4.4. Federal-Provincial Conference on Poverty and Opportunity. Ontario Housing Corporation. The Social and Economic Aspects of Public Housing. November 25, 1965.

Power Plant. Housing: A Right. Catalogue to the Exhibition at the Power Plant Gallery. Harbourfront, Toronto, 22 June to 3 September, 1990.

Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference on City Planning (Toronto: May 25-27, 1914) Boston: 1914.

Rose, Albert, Prospects for Rehabilitation of Housing in Central Toronto. Toronto: City of Toronto Planning Board, 1966.

Webb, Zerafa and Menkes; Jerome Markson; Klein and Sears, The Alexandra Park Redevelopment Area Proposed Public Housing Project: A Report by the Architects for Alexandra Park, unpublished, June 24, 1966.

INTERVIEWS

Jerome Markson, Toronto, February 18, 1991.

Jack Klein, Toronto, February 18, 1991.

Henry Sears, Toronto, April 12, 1991.

Lorne Cappe, Toronto, February 18, 1991.

Denyse Gauthier and Alain Carle, Montreal, March 28, 1991.

Telephone interview with Irena Latek, June 18, 1991.

END

01·06·92

FIN