CHAPTER SEVEN

Conclusions

This paper began with a look at the need for low-cost housing in America and how manufactured housing can be used to help fill this need. The main obstacle to the use of manufactured housing in this manner is the objection of neighbors, often referred to as the NIMBY syndrome. The paper then examined the sociological and psychological basis for NIMBY, aesthetic neighborhood preferences in America and what physical, social and psychological needs should be met for the neighborhood's residents.

The next two chapters examined how some of the problems and needs discussed in Chapter Two have been and might be met. Two case studies evaluated existing manufactured home communities and municipal codes to see if needs and problems were being adequately addressed. Three typologies were created to address some of these problems at the home/lot level and at the block level. A set of criteria were developed to meet the needs of residents and expectations of external viewers.

The project created to test the developed criteria consisted of two designs and one redesign of an existing manufactured housing community in Blacksburg. The first two designs were developed on the premise that no development had previously existed on the site. The third design was a retrofit of the existing neighborhood that used as much of the current infrastructure as possible.

The conclusions developed from this work are presented in four sections:

> The Design Process
> Meeting Needs and Expectations
> The Value of This Study
> Direction for Further Investigations

7.1 The Design Process

The process began with the literature review which encompassed a wide range of topics including studies on housing needs and desires, preference studies, neighborhood aesthetics, low-income housing and barriers to low-income housing. Further research was compiled on manufactured housing; its image, its history, its relevance to providing low-income housing and the current state of the manufactured home in the United States.

To supplement the reading, two case studies were conducted. The first looked at manufactured housing developments across the country, comparing a set of criteria that were readily available in print and on the internet. This study may have been more useful if I had been able to travel to several different newly built, non-utilitarian manufactured home developments throughout the mid-Atlantic region. The study then could have included interviews with the residents, interviews with people in surrounding neighborhoods and local government officials. The interviews may have given insights into what design elements make the most difference in the perception of a manufactured housing development. The only drawback would have been that such developments tend to be geared towards the middle class and often have expensive amenities such as golf courses and community club houses.

The second case study was a comparison of local municipal and county codes in Virginia and how they handle manufactured housing. This study led to the conclusion that many codes are greatly outdated.

Three typologies were created. The house typology showed the types of houses that would most likely appear in a working class manufactured housing neighborhood. The second typology used two of these houses to demonstrate three different ways of siting the houses on the lots. The third typology took the three types of lot typologies and built blocks from them. The typologies were very useful in designing the three site plans. It was possible to look at the typologies and see which would best serve the needs of the residents, fit the neighborhood context and be suitable for the physical parameters of the site.

Once the site was chosen, Clayton Estates in Blacksburg, Virginia, it was possible to do additional studies concerning local standards and preferences. The first exercise was a preference study using a focus group. The participants were a small group of local home owners. If this study had been done on a larger scale, with many more participants, the findings would have been more secure. It is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from the responses of just six people.

The second local study was meant to discover what communities in the region around Blacksburg found distasteful about manufactured housing developments. This study was a great disappointment. Though I have been told that this group or that complains constantly about manufactured housing near their residences, I was not able to get any specifics about what their objections were. In order to find this type of information it might have been better to conduct an anonymous survey with mailed questionnaires targeted to neighborhoods near manufactured housing developments. The questions would include queries about both aesthetics and the residents of the manufactured housing developments. This would help to determine how much of the objection is to the conditions of the physical neighborhood and how much is based on prejudice towards different socio-economic groups.

The visual survey was taken of four residential neighborhoods surrounding the site. The survey helped to identify certain characteristics which could be used to help fit the manufactured housing development into the context of the community. It also helped to identify certain advantages the site had over its neighbors, such as the stands of mature trees and the stream. These elements could then be incorporated into the design in such a way as to add to the prestige of the neighborhood.

The site analysis identified both the assets and problems of the site. In conjunction with the visual survey, it provided ideas for fitting the development into the character of the local neighborhoods and for providing possible connections to those neighborhoods, both visual and physical. It identified problems such as steep slopes and flooding from rain which could be addressed through the design.

7.2 Meeting Needs and Expectations

The purpose of this project was to design a working class neighborhood that met both the expectations of an external audience (nearby residents) and the needs of the working class residents. To meet this purpose an extensive literature review was conducted on both expectations, aesthetic preferences and residential neighborhood needs. It was discovered that the factors creating a NIMBY response to manufactured housing are:

- A prejudice towards people with lower incomes
- The use of mobile homes as rental units
- The negative images and stereotypes portrayed by the news and entertainment media
- The perception that homes are poorly built and hazardous
- The fear of increased impact on municipal services, utilities and taxes
- The belief that the people who live in manufactured homes are transients
- The aesthetics of the older style, utilitarian development designs
- The fear of negative change to neighborhood character
- The fear of decline in surrounding neighborhood property values

The first four factors cannot be addressed merely through good site design. But the last four of the above factors can be

positively addressed resulting in a well-planned and maintained, medium density, working class neighborhood. The three designs that were developed address these factors in the following ways:

➢ The belief that people who live in manufactured homes are transients.

By introducing design elements that symbolize permanence it is possible to overcome the misconception of transience that arises out of the history of the manufactured home. These elements can be at both the house site level and at the neighborhood level. Encouraging the individual home owners to landscape their lots will help to give a sense of permanence to the home. Foundation plantings help to anchor the home to the ground. Maintaining the yard and garden impart the sense that the home owner is going to remain in the home for a long period of time, not just a few weeks or months. A covered porch on the front of the home, large or small, also helps to impart a feeling of permanence. A deck with its unfinished wood and lack of roof, just does not create the same feeling of anchoring the home to the land that a porch does.

Design at the neighborhood level produces the clearest perception of permanence or longevity. Mature landscaping in the form of street trees and shrubs, not only creates a pleasing atmosphere for a neighborhood, but also a sense of history; of having a

past, a present and a future. The presence of mature trees also increases the perceived value of a property, not an idea synonymous with transience.

The shared community spaces add to this image of permanence. The inclusion of trees, shrubs, paving and brick furniture in these spaces give visual clues that lead to the perception of permanence. The use of brick in these spaces imparts a sense of permanence that plastic or even wood, which weathers quickly, does not. In Virginia, with its large number of existing colonial period brick buildings, brick can symbolize longevity. In other regions, different materials may play the same role in designing permanence into the landscape. But maybe the value of shared community spaces is found merely in their existence. Shared neighborhood spaces convey the idea of a living, functioning community: transients are seldom viewed by the public in this light.

By daylighting the stream through the valley and creating a naturalistic park along the stream corridor, another idea of permanence is introduced into the neighborhood. Rock, trees and water can all convey an air of timelessness and age to a landscape. By connecting this corridor to other green spaces outside the neighborhood, this space becomes a permanent part of the local community, adding another facet of stability to the neighborhood.

➢ The aesthetics of the older style, utilitarian development designs.

The objection to the older utilitarian design of layout is the streetscape of rows of closely spaced homes presenting their narrow, gable ends to the street, usually fronted by parked vehicles. This type of layout can create a closed-in, crowded feeling along the streets. By placing the homes with the front facade facing the street, much of the aesthetic objection to a utilitarian layout is reduced. The small lawn area, running the length of the home creates the perception of a more open, less densely constructed space along the street. The inclusion of street trees and landscaping add variety to the scene, further reducing the feeling of density.

In the Economical Design (Chapter 6.2) and Residential Sections 1 and 2 of the Retrofit (Chapter 6.3), this feeling of space is created by the inclusion of shared community spaces in the middle of the streets. This green space opens the closed feeling of the streets by widening the space between facades at predetermined intervals. The landscaping of the public squares adds variety to the streetscape, further reducing the feeling of monotonous density.

➢ The fear of negative change to neighborhood character.

Most of the surrounding neighborhoods in this project are single family, low density

developments. The houses usually sit back from the street behind a sparsely landscaped expanse of lawn. There is no systematic planting of street trees; what trees exist have been planted by the home owners and are mostly immature at this time. Almost every home in the surrounding neighborhoods has brick as an element in their design, whether it is just the foundation, the entire facade or a landscape element such as a retaining wall or column.

By introducing some of these characteristics into the three manufactured housing neighborhood designs, the overall character of the area has been preserved. This has worked most successfully in the Ideal design, where the relationship of the homes and streets mimic the relationship of the homes and streets in the surrounding neighborhoods. The addition of street trees and shared common spaces on each block and throughout the neighborhood help to further reduce the feeling of density endemic in most older manufactured housing developments. Even though the surrounding neighborhoods do not have a system of street trees, the trees planted by the home owners indicate the value that they place upon trees. Both the preservation of the existing trees and the addition of new trees planted in the new development will address this shared value. The introduction of brick into the design of the community spaces creates a further visual

link to the character of the surrounding neighborhoods.

The stream corridor park can become another link between the various neighborhoods. As part of a larger green corridor created through the town, it will serve as both a visual and a physical link to surrounding neighborhoods.

➢ The fear of decline in surrounding neighborhood property values.

The second case study on Virginia Municipal codes shows that many areas rely upon buffers to "protect" low density housing from the depravations of medium density housing. Much of this fear for property values can be answered by fitting the medium density, working class neighborhood into the character of the surrounding low density neighborhoods. More of this fear can be put to rest by maintaining the appearance of the homes, yards and shared community spaces. Part of this will be the direct responsibility of the development management. Maintaining the streets and green spaces will not only prevent the deterioration of the appearance of the neighborhood, but will encourage the claiming of secondary territory by the home owners. The management must also be diligent about enforcing neighborhood rules about visible clutter around homes, the number of vehicles allowed at each site, lawn maintenance and the type of skirting and add-ons allowed or required to the homes. The management should also find

ways to encourage the claiming of primary and secondary territory by the home owners. This claiming of territory is the best way to ensure that home owners take pride in their neighborhood and its appearance. By fitting the development into the context of the surrounding neighborhoods and maintaining the properties, it should be possible to eliminate the buffers as visual barriers and physical separators.

The aesthetic guidelines discovered during the literature review were:

➢ The presence of vegetation
➢ Areas for ornamentation and displayed symbols
➢ The absence or lowered perception of physical incivilities
➢ The provision of clear boundaries
➢ The character of featured materials
➢ The lowered perception of visual clutter

The presence of vegetation is provided for at different levels in all three site designs. At the neighborhood level are the trees and shrubs planted along the streets and in the shared community spaces. The street and pathway plantings present a very formal, regular pattern of vegetation. A different pattern of vegetation is created in the natural park along the stream corridor. The vegetation in the park area is very natural and informal.

The pocket parks and public squares provide another level of vegetation throughout the neighborhoods. In the beginning, these areas will relate to the formal plantings of the streets and paths. But as the residents of each block or section begin to claim these spaces as secondary territory, they are designed to take on more individualistic characteristics. Each space and its plantings should begin to define the character of its particular block or section. The most unique degree of vegetation will be created at the individual lot level as home owners begin to claim the territory around their homes. This level of vegetation may vary tremendously depending upon the interests and gardening skills of the home owners.

Provision has been made for the display of symbols and ornamentation at two levels; that of the individual lot and that of the block. The semi-public spaces of both the suburban style lot and the urban style lot provide each home owner space to express their personality through design of the landscaping and the display of objects. This works less successfully in the urban style layout because the location of the parking pad obscures most of the semi-public space whenever cars are present. At the block level, provision has been made for the residents to collectively stamp an identity or character on the public squares and pocket parks.

Physical incivilities such as blowing trash and poorly maintained homes impact the perceptions of a neighborhood. Residents, who claim both primary and secondary territory around their homes, are more likely to work to maintain the appearance of their homes and neighborhoods. All three designs provide for the claiming of primary and secondary territories.

The claiming of primary and secondary territories is partially dependent upon the clarity of territorial boundaries. All three site plans encourage the use of plant materials or objects to mark the lot boundaries around the homes. Because of the need to keep costs low, it probably will not be possible for the developer to erect fences or hedges around each yard. But the developer is responsible for letting each resident know where their lot begins and ends, even if it is just a rock or a stake at the corners of the lots. By locating the pocket parks at the center of each block, it is more easily identified as a territory of that block. The same idea works for the public squares. The natural park and path systems, by flowing through several blocks, reveal themselves to be open to more than just one group of residents.

Featured materials in the three site plans are brick and trees. The presence of mature trees rates highly in the preference studies conducted by Nelessen. (2003) All three plans encourage the preservation of existing mature trees and the planting of additional trees to mature over time. The other featured material is the brick used in the shared community spaces. Brick has a very positive association in this area. All of the surrounding homes incorporate brick into the facade to varying degrees. Brick is favorably associated with the history and culture of Virginia dating back to colonial times.

Visual clutter is a term for things that don't fit into the desired visual character of a landscape. In a residential area this can be cars parked along the street, trash containers, visible utility lines and poles or service areas. Since most residents projected for this working class neighborhood cannot afford to build a garage for their home it is not possible to park the cars out of sight of the street without taking up valuable private outdoor space. But where the site plans are able to use the suburban lot layout, the parking pad has been moved away from the street to the side of the home, making the parked vehicles less obtrusive. For the urban style lots, the cars are parked just off of the street in part of the semi-public space between the houses. To move the cars further back would reduce the amount of outdoor space available to the residents.

The designs call for the elimination of community dumpsters for trash in favor of curb-side pickup. Since this is a contracted service, curb-side pickup will mean a very large increase in price. But dumpsters convey an image of impermanence, almost a camp ground image that these designs are trying to overcome. The added expense needs to

be balanced against the negative perception and health issues that dumpsters create.

The service area of each block contains the mailboxes and an announcement center. These areas have been designed to contribute to the overall character of the neighborhood through the consistent use of a familiar material, brick, and basic landscaping. Instead of being a utilitarian space plunked down in the middle of a residential neighborhood, these areas help to define the overall character of the neighborhood and provide a space for gathering and greeting neighbors.

No neighborhood will be successful if it fails to meet the needs of the residents. The literature review conducted for this paper identified the following needs for residents of a working class neighborhood.

➢ Fitting the neighborhood into the context of the existing community.
➢ Creating a positive community identity.
➢ Keeping lot rents affordable.
➢ Reducing the perception of density.
➢ Creating variety in the streetscape.
➢ Assuring that there are safe play areas for children.
➢ Creating usable common open spaces.
➢ Assuring resident safety from traffic.
➢ Building well-sited community facilities.

➢ Creating well-defined private, semi-private, semi-public and public outdoor spaces.
➢ Allowing for aesthetic views.
➢ Providing adequate parking for each home.
➢ Providing a setting that does not stigmatize the residents as being different.

How each of the designs responded to this set of criteria was examined in Chapter Six. When evaluating the three sets of factors and criteria it becomes obvious that each set relates to and is dependant upon the other sets. What makes a good residential neighborhood for the residents creates a positive reaction in external viewers.

➢ External viewers tend to perceive working class manufactured home developments as being dirty and unkempt. By providing for the claiming of territory by the residents, good neighborhood design encourages the maintenance of yards and common spaces, negating the stereotyped perception.

➢ External viewers perceive working class manufactured home developments as overcrowded and visually cluttered. Good neighborhood design works to create a feeling of spaciousness while maintaining the necessary medium density to keep prices down. Visual coherence is achieved through a

hierarchy of public and private spaces around which the neighborhood is organized. The addition of repeated elements such as the brick and the trees add to this feeling of organized, coherent space.

➢ Aesthetic preferences are increased when there are areas for the display of the residents' personalities. Good residential design includes a semi-public area for the residents to express themselves through plants and objects.

➢ Aesthetic preferences favor the clear marking of boundaries. Good residential design allows for the private, semi-private and semi-public spaces that allow a resident to claim primary territory and mark it as such.

➢ Good residential design works to overcome the perceived stigma of lower economic status by fitting the neighborhood into the context of the surrounding neighborhoods. Fitting the neighborhood into the context of the surrounding neighborhoods decreases fears that a working class neighborhood will destroy the character of the surrounding neighborhoods and decrease property values.

By designing neighborhoods that meet the physical, social and psychological needs of the residents, Landscape Architects will

also be designing neighborhoods that will meet the aesthetic preferences of the larger community. This will help to reduce the NIMBY response to working class neighborhoods whether the homes be site-built or factory-built, single family or multiple family.

7.3 Assessing the Value of this Study

The findings of this study can be of use to three distinct audiences: developers, local planning agencies and home owners.

Developers

The most important idea arising from this study for developers is that a good neighborhood does not have to be an expensive neighborhood. Furthermore, good neighborhood design is good neighborhood design, whether for a working class resident or a middle class resident. In the three presented designs, the elements that create a good neighborhood are:

- ➢ meeting the residents' needs
- ➢ a clear hierarchy of outdoor spaces around the home which encourage the claiming of primary territory.
- ➢ a clear hierarchy of usable community spaces which encourage the claiming of secondary territory
- ➢ allowing for eventual resident input about the direction in which the community spaces will develop

- ➢ creating a welcoming, nurturing atmosphere through the retaining and introduction of trees and landscaping

The meeting of residents' needs goes beyond the physical need for shelter. There are social needs that can be met by providing meeting and gathering spaces, there are physical and mental growth needs that can be met by providing recreational spaces, there are aesthetic needs that can be met by creating vistas and planting vegetation. When provisions are made in a neighborhood to allow for the meeting of these needs, neighborhood satisfaction will rise. When people are satisfied with their neighborhood, it shows through increased maintenance and the development of a sense of community.

Creating a clear hierarchy of outdoor space for each home does not necessarily mean a yard around a single family home. The same hierarchy can be developed around townhouses or apartments. The importance is the quality and usability of the space, not the dimensions.

It is tempting to relegate the shared community spaces to leftover areas in a development rather than using these spaces as an organizing factor. In designing these three site plans, it was discovered that organizing the neighborhood structure around the community spaces actually allowed for more houses to be placed on the site, than would have derived from first placing the

houses and then using the leftover space for community use. Using the shared community spaces as an organizing framework for the neighborhood created a richness to the design in the form of relationships between the homes, the streets, the blocks and the shared spaces. Placing the houses first resulted in a very unsatisfactory design with little cohesion and a stark character.

A neighborhood does not have to be designed down to the last detail in order to satisfy resident needs. This is especially true in a working class neighborhood where it is necessary to keep costs down. By providing basic amenities such as shared community spaces that have the potential for adaptation and growth, a design can encourage the neighborhood residents to participate in community building activities and help direct the character of their neighborhood. Again, this is not restricted to single family housing or even a working class neighborhood.

Landscaping and the inclusion of street trees is a large, up front expense in the construction of a neighborhood. But it is an expense which will provide many benefits, long into the future of a neighborhood. Some of the benefits of trees are:

- Increased marketability. A neighborhood with mature trees receives the highest ratings in Nelessen's (2003) preference studies. Landscaping can add as

much as fifteen percent to the resale value of a home. Rental properties with trees and landscaping have a higher occupancy rate than rental properties without landscaping.

- Landscaping can lower heating and cooling costs by as much as twenty percent.
- Plants are the "fastest, most cost-effective agents for changing negative perceptions of an area". (Relf in Frank, 2003)
- Trees and other plants promote healing, relieve stress and increase neighborhood satisfaction.
- "Residents who participated in a tree-planting program in their low-income neighborhood in Oakland, California, reported feeling a stronger sense of community, enhanced communication with neighbors and more control over their environment." (Ames in Frank, 2003)
- Neighborhoods with trees and plants report a lower incidence of crime and domestic violence.
- Trees and other vegetation can reduce run-off, preventing erosion and stream pollution.

In a land-lease development, which includes many manufactured housing neighborhoods, these various benefits can help a development to remain economically viable by increasing the desirability of the neighborhood, decreasing outside objections and obstructions to the neighborhood, preventing a bad reputation due to crime and poor maintenance and avoid lawsuits due to erosion damage and downstream pollution. And as seen in Chapter 7.2, mature trees impart a sense of permanence and stability to a neighborhood.

The lot typologies and block typologies give developers and designers of small lot home sites several alternatives for organizing the spaces around the homes and in the neighborhoods. Although the typologies are not exhaustive, they can be used as springboards for designing layouts which fit the unique situations of different developments. Their value is in showing the importance and possibilities of neighborhood space, both around the home and in shared spaces on the block, in the building of a physical and social community. It is also important to transfer these spatial concepts from the small lot level to see how they can be used for low density developments and higher density developments such as apartments and townhouses.

Finally, knowing the social and psychological basis for the NIMBY reaction to low-cost or even high-cost medium density housing can arm a developer to answer objections to a proposed development. It will allow the developer to design and present the development in a manner which can help to allay some of the fears feeding NIMBY.

Local Planning Agencies

Case Study 2, which looked at municipal and county codes dealing with manufactured housing in western Virginia, shows that most local governments are writing regulations based on the manufactured housing of forty and fifty years ago. If a developer follows the codes, strictly as written, some very uninviting neighborhoods will be built. It is time for planning departments to examine today's manufactured housing more closely and rid themselves of existing stereotypes. Some areas to be addressed are:

➢ Zoning. All but two of the city and county ordinances examined for this study required manufactured housing to be segregated from other housing in either agricultural or manufactured housing zones. Local planning boards across the country are being successfully challenged in the courts because of their restrictive zoning for manufactured housing. (Land Use Law Report 2000, Locke 1994, Kwiatkowski 2000) Instead of banning or segregating this most affordable housing, planning departments should be looking at what makes a good neighborhood and applying these standards to manufactured housing. This paper looks at several factors that create a good neighborhood. The typologies demonstrate how the principles can

be applied to the design of a good neighborhood. The three site plans show how different approaches to the design can result in viable, healthy, good neighborhoods that enhance not only the residents' lives, but are a positive addition to the character of the whole community through the addition of usable, ecologically beneficial, green spaces.

➢ Buffers. It is obvious from some of the codes that the buffers are meant to screen or hide the manufactured housing developments from view. Requiring seven foot walls around a development could also be interpreted as a means of segregating the residents away from the rest of the community. Planning departments should be finding ways to integrate these communities and their residents into the context of the surrounding community, not walling them off.

➢ Lot Dimensions. Rather than an overall lot dimension, codes should concentrate on the quality of the space around the homes. The lot typologies (Chapter 3.4) demonstrate how the same house can need or use different size lots, just by how it is placed on the site. The important concept is to provide the residents with adequate, usable space around their homes. When there is no clear boundary between the homes, more space may be necessary. The addition of fences or hedges could change the required space because of their clear delineation of territory.

➢ Shared Community Spaces. Most of the codes call for green space or recreational space in manufactured housing communities. Most of these are regulated in terms of a percentage or so many square feet per home in the development. The shared common spaces created for this project illustrate that well designed spaces are more important than the square footage. Unplanned or left over spaces do not adequately provide for residents' needs or add to the ambience of the neighborhood.

Manufactured housing developments should be treated as a viable alternative for low-cost housing, not as a predetermined eyesore and nuisance. They need to be integrated into the community, not be set apart from the community. This will benefit not only the residents of the manufactured housing development, but also the entire community, which needs a diverse population in terms of economic and social status in order to thrive.

Home Owners

The guidelines presented in this paper can be used by people looking for a neighborhood that will meet their social, physical and psychological needs. It is time that home owners looked beyond the location of schools when deciding upon a neighborhood. There are many other factors, described in this paper, which are vital in determining the character and potential satisfaction level of a neighborhood.

If home owners living near a proposed development are cognizant of the factors which create a good neighborhood, they will be able to make informed decisions about the desirability or lack of desirability of the new neighborhood. Responsible citizens can then go to planning meetings prepared to see changes made to the design in order to meet these design criteria. The nearby residents then become active players in the building of good communities, rather than fearful proponents of NIMBY.

7.4 Directions for Further Investigations

During the course of this investigation, some questions emerged which were not addressed. These questions have the potential to add value to this study and any work that might derive from it.

➢ How can the buffers become connectors rather than separators?

It is pretty clear when looking at zoning codes for manufactured housing

developments that the main reason for requiring buffers is to separate them from "regular" houses and hide them from view. How can these buffers be designed to draw manufactured houses into the mainstream of the community rather than wall them off? How can they serve to draw positive interest to the community rather than provide socio-economic barriers? How can they become links between neighborhoods, rather than symbols of a ruptured community?

> Should the larger community be invited to use the natural park in the development, or will this cause resentment among residents who may feel unwelcome in the surrounding neighborhoods? How can this be rectified?

A great deal of this work has been focused upon how to achieve the acceptance of the external audience to working class manufactured housing developments. But there is resentment from the residents of these working class neighborhoods towards the attitudes expressed by outside observers. If the shared common spaces such as the natural park in this design, attract "outsiders" into the development, how will the residents respond? Would connecting this green space to a community-wide system of green spaces alleviate or exacerbate this resentment?

> How does mixing the lot typologies (Retrofit Design) affect the character of a neighborhood?

Will this result in jealousies and resentments between the residents of the different sections? Will it hinder the building of a sense of community within the development? Will it create confused perceptions in the external audience?

> If a block of residents does not adopt their shared community spaces, what kinds of initiatives can the management use to encourage this claiming of territory?

One of the main emphases of this paper has been the idea that home owners will first claim the primary territory around their homes and then expand into the secondary territories of the shared common spaces. The claiming of the secondary territories would result in the building of a sense of community and the well-maintained appearance of the neighborhood. How can the management encourage the claiming of secondary territories? Will announcements in a community newsletter be sufficient or will more complex steps need to be taken? If more complex steps are necessary, what might they be?