San Fernando Valley State College

ATTITUDES OF RESIDENTS IN A
HIGH RISE APARTMENT COMPLEX

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in

Home Economics

by

Sonia Judith Babar

September, 1968
The thesis of Sonia Judith Bubar is approved:

Committee Chairman

San Fernando Valley State College
September, 1968
"Nothing will ever be attempted if all possible objections must first be overcome."

Dr. Samuel Johnson
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to thank her committee for the time, experience, and guidance, which each member contributed so generously to this endeavor.

A very special thank you is also extended to those individuals without whose help this paper could not have been completed on schedule, Mr. Bradley Smith and Mrs. Mary Tomason.

Among those who were especially helpful to the author were:
Mr. Frank Mittelbach, Dr. Warren Campbell, Mr. James Hall and Mr. Emery Abraham.

And most especially to the respondents in the high rise apartment surveyed, the writer wishes to express her deepest appreciation for the honest evaluations expressed by each of the individuals in answering the questionnaire.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Origin and Importance of the Study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definitions of Terms Used</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Related Literature</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limitations of the Study</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION OF THE APARTMENT COMPLEX STUDIED</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>PROCEDURE OF THE INVESTIGATION</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of the Instrument</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of the Sample</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of the Data</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the Data</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Respondents</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents Reasons for Apartment Selection</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents Satisfaction with High Rise Living</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents Satisfaction with Rent</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Respondents Needs and Preferences</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Further Study</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cover Letter</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Questionnaire</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Mean Apartment Rental Ranges By Floor Level and Floor Plan</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Characteristics and Specifications of the Various Apartments by Floor Plan</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Distribution of Respondents by Age Ranges and Income Groups.</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of Respondents by Sex and Family Composition.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Occupancy of Various Apartment Plans by Family Composition and Sex</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Reasons Given by Respondents for Apartment Selection</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Apartment Vacancies by Floor Level.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Distribution of Floor Plans and Vacancies within the Apartment Complex</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Length of Occupancy in Apartment and Plans for Future Occupancy or Moving</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Percentage of Respondents Bothered by Noise from Various Areas</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Respondents Acceptance of the Design Features of their Apartments.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Frequency of Usage of Various Facilities by Respondents.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Respondents Acceptance of the Design and Other Aspects of Their Apartments and the Apartment Complex by Apartment Plan and Total Respondents.</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Satisfaction with Rent Schedule in Terms of "Getting Money's Worth" by Income Group ........ 63

15. Features Lacking in Apartments which Respondents Indicated as Essential to Comfort and Satisfaction. ............ 67
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Location Plan of the High Rise Apartment Complex Studied</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Apartment A</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Apartment B</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Apartment C</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Apartment D</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABSTRACT

ATTITUDES OF RESIDENTS IN A
HIGH RISE APARTMENT COMPLEX

by

Sonia Judith Bubar

Master of Science in Home Economics

September, 1969

This study was conducted to collect and analyze data concerning the family composition and the needs and preferences of occupants in a high rise apartment complex in Los Angeles County. The complex selected for the study was chosen because: (1) it was considered to be typical of high rise apartment complexes constructed for middle and upper-middle income occupants in Los Angeles County, and (2) it was the first phase of a four phase urban renewal project to construct 2000 dwelling units. The high rise apartment complex consisted of two, 17 story towers, each containing 266 apartments of four apartment plans; commercial shops; and recreational facilities.

The research instrument used to collect the data was a questionnaire. Two-hundred and sixty-six questionnaires were mailed to occupants of the complex, and of these, one-hundred and forty-one (53 percent) were returned for analysis.

Concerning the family composition of the respondents, seventy-eight of the total number were un-married, and sixty-one were married.
Of the total number of respondents, the median age range of the heads of households was 45 to 54 years, and the median income range was $12,000 to $14,999. Fifteen percent of the total number of respondents had lived at one time in another high rise apartment, and 70 percent of the total lived in Los Angeles County immediately before moving into their present apartment. Over half of the respondents selected their apartments for reasons of location.

Over half of the respondents expressed positive attitudes toward high rise living in terms of: (1) high rise living meeting their expectations, (2) having feelings of pride in residing in their present apartment, (3) intending to remain in their present apartment for one year or longer, (4) the amount paid for rent, and (5) the design of the total apartment complex. Over half of the total number of respondents were not satisfied with all aspects of the design of their individual apartment.

Based on the data it was found that high rise living was a new form of housing to 85 percent, and that the majority of the respondents selected their apartment primarily for location rather than the desire to live in a high rise apartment. Over half were satisfied with the concept of high rise living and the facilities, services, and conveniences provided by residing in a high rise apartment complex. They were not satisfied, however, with all aspects of the design of their individual apartments.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Metropolitan areas throughout the world now face a common problem, a housing shortage due to increased urbanization. Of the world's three billion people, almost one third reside in cities of over 20,000 residents. By the year 2000 world population is expected to double, with a corresponding increase in urban population from 33 percent to 60 percent (13:74); in the United States alone, "some 400 million Americans will be living in roughly the same area as today" (17:39).

At the present time the world lacks some 200 million dwelling units and the demand is constantly increasing. To correct this growing problem many countries are pursuing vigorously what is probably the primary and most accepted solution to housing—the high rise apartment. The inevitability of more intensive high rise apartment construction must be accepted, for as the architect, Nathaniel Owings, has said of the cities, "There is no possibility of their dying. They are viable, they are vibrant and their growth is rank" (17:39).

In the cities throughout the United states the preference for apartment dwellings over single family dwellings has increased (10:27) with a corresponding increase in the preference for high rise apartment living. More specifically, high rise apartments offer real and
potential solutions to the:

(1) increasing population density of urban areas
(2) growing scarcity of urban land and the corresponding rising costs of land
(3) increasing travel time and distance to and from work due to the geographic expansion of the cities
(4) increasing desire of individuals for mobility
(5) increasing number of managerial and white collar occupations, especially among women, with a corresponding increase in income
(6) increasing costs of home ownership, and
(7) increasing shift in preference toward rental accommodations.

The majority of apartment dwellers are single persons, newly married, childless couples, and older couples whose children have left home. The Bureau of the Census estimates that by the year 1975 there will be an increase in the single heads of households (55 percent more than in 1955, yielding nine million) and in persons between the ages of 20 to 29 years (as a result of the post World War II baby boom, yielding 36.7 million persons) (4:206). The majority of these persons are expected to seek apartment accommodations.

Because the high rise apartment is a relatively new building form, its development has introduced problems which are associated
with it and are at present incompletely understood. Design and construction, sociological needs and preferences of the occupants, and urban planning incorporating high rise buildings—all are new fields and must be studied intensively to better understand the overall problem and to exploit most effectively the advantages of this modern innovation. Meanwhile, high rise apartments continue to be built without the benefit of research—buildings which will be rented and occupied regardless of whether they are filling the needs of the individual. Research is desperately needed, for these buildings are durable—and it is important to design them for future needs and not for obsolescence.

This study involves an analysis of the results of a survey of the attitudes expressed in questionnaires mailed to the occupants of a middle and upper-middle income high rise apartment complex in Los Angeles County. The study emphasizes: (1) the family composition, or characteristics, of the respondents residing in the high rise apartments, (2) the design of the high rise apartment in relation to the needs and preferences of the respondents, (3) the placement of the high rise apartments on the site in relation to the surroundings.

The high rise apartment complex selected as the subject of this survey was chosen because: (1) it is typical of high rise apartment complexes designed today for middle and upper-middle income occupants in Los Angeles County, (2) it was designed by an architectural firm of international reputation, and (3) it is the first of a four phase community redevelopment project which will ultimately con-
prise 2000 dwelling units on twenty acres of ground in Los Angeles County.
Origin and Importance of the Study

This study is necessary because of the total absence of research concerning attitudes of middle and upper-middle income occupants of high rise apartment complexes. Numerous authorities have pointed out that modern high rise structures are conceived with almost complete disregard for the sociological and psychological effects on those who will live in them and on the community in which they are built. The reason for not fulfilling the needs of the individual and the community is not necessarily that city planners, architects, and developers are ignoring society—it is just as likely that information on the effects of their work is simply not available. Berger (18:2) reports that:

The characteristics and implications of the specific components of vertical space development...the economic, social and technological factors which have dictated the pattern which we find—have been largely ignored; in truth, our city skylines have inspired great awe, but little analysis.

The American Institute of Architects (A.I.A.), in organizing the Research Council, has recognized the need for research to solve many fundamental problems.

Such basic research, best done at universities and research institutions, is of primary value to society as a whole because it deals with fundamental problems related to people and their environmental needs (11:59).

Von Edirhardt states that the architect, Yamasaki, has pointed to the solution we must seek in the creation of buildings that can give us a sense of happiness, peace and security...success can only be insured by using the rigorous methods of scientific inquiry to determine the needs which artistic genius may then be able to meet (15:44).
It is not the architect alone who needs research data concerning the needs and preferences of individuals. Theoretically the role of the architect is to "maintain the balance between those aesthetic qualities that give grace to modern city living and the multiple commercial, cultural and humanitarian demands made on the organization of the city" (17:43). Yet, according to A.I.A. President George Kassabaum, too many of the important decisions have been made by politicians, sociologists, and economists before the architect is consulted (17:43). Victor Gruen also states (3) that the architect plays a very small role in the designing of major buildings. In many cases he merely "translates into blueprints the dictates imposed on him by the owner" (3:157). Gruen points out that once the design has been decided upon, the structure of the building is designed by engineers; the placement of the building on the site is determined by planners and legal technicalities; the building codes create the interior layout; the zoning ordinances determine the use, height, shape and form of the building; and the economic facts and the lending institutions determine the materials, methods, and decorations of the building and the interior. The role of the architect has been limited to the point where "it becomes a big deal for the architect if he is permitted the leeway of using colored glazed brick or deciding whether to use balconies" (3:157). It is clear that in addition to the architect, the developers, lending institutions, city planners, and building departments, all of whom exercise decisive influence on the quality of a building and who are shaping the communities of the present and
future, need access to reliable studies.

Possibly the most significant, direct benefit of such research is the determination of standards for design and construction. Between the conception of an apartment development and the architect's drafting board there lies the problem of translating the research into meaningful limitations for the designer. For example, we decide that an apartment will be erected on the site in relation to the topography, to other buildings, and to the neighborhood population density. But how far from other buildings? How many dwellings per unit of space are desirable? Even before such standards are determined, the values on which standards are based must be defined. According to the Editors of Fortune (2:26) one acre can comfortably accommodate seventy-five family dwelling units; this is the maximum number of units regardless of the type of construction. Such studies as these are of great value; more efforts of this nature are needed to bring sufficient information together for the use of planners and builders who are creating future housing projects and communities.

What does a society value that its architecture should promote? Some values are evident to almost all of us—space, location, convenience, and comfort. But other values are more elusive, like environment, which the architect Edward Stone considers so important that he surrounds his building with park-like settings, fountains, flowers, statuary, trees, shrubs, walkways, and paving to complement the building design (9:19). Owings is also concerned with environment
and he has predicted,

We are going to reach the point where environment planning will be the supreme thing in this country. It will be the equivalent of the railroad and highway booms. Then perhaps we can change and begin to build as did the Romans, the Greeks, and Persians, the Egyptians—begin to build a real environment that is a lasting investment rather than something to be destroyed (17:43).

Attitude surveys certainly can help define those values society wishes to preserve and those it wishes to develop more fully.

In general terms, the problems of the relationship between society and its dwellings have probably been stated well. Footnote (1:93) stresses the problem in economic terms,

Today's housing consumer is caught in a cost-space squeeze that leaves him two alternatives: highly-mechanized and space-stingy new housing, or an older dwelling with more space and less equipment.

In short, the problem is recognized but specific solutions have yet to be found. A profitable solution to high rise apartment construction can only be arrived at when the building industry is able to develop and utilize technological breakthroughs to interpret the needs and preferences of individuals which have been gathered through behavioral research studies. So far the construction industry has not made the advances necessary to erect dwellings larger and cheaper, and there are no behavioral research studies published. A leading apartment builder in New York City has observed,

We have not rationalized the building industry as other countries have. Their prefab is getting better and better and cut standard ways are getting more and more expensive. Sooner or later we will have to go prefabrication (13:80).

In addition to the problems of economics and research, apart-
ment redevelopment projects are often stifled by adherence to tradition.

Government officials, planners, developers and architects first envisioned the spectacular project, and little else, as the solution to rebuilding the city. Redevelopment legislation and the economics resulting from it were born of this thinking and tailored for prototype designs much like those being constructed today. The image was built into the machinery, now the machinery reproduces the image (FM 163).

"The process of getting the project through, in short, becomes more important than the project itself" (2:XVII). This is understandable due to the politics involved in the planning of a project. It takes a particular type of person to get things done under these circumstances, and urbanologist Patrick Moynihan thinks Orsins is that type of person, "He is ebullient, competent, and devoted--also a randy rogue, a bandit and a buccaneer. His great ability is to get other people to do good work" (17:41). Not all persons have this ability. The critics of high rise apartments have been many, and their evaluations have often been accurate, though harsh:

Every force...encourages shoddy, unimaginative construction. Zoning laws set minimum standards that speculative builders take as maximum. Antiquated codes bar technological breakthroughs (17:39).

"There is no such thing as a luxury rental building--only middle-income buildings at luxury prices" (17:39). Louis Winnick describes the situation most effectively:

If you were to blindfold someone, turn him around five times, and then take the blindfold off in the outskirts of any substantial city in Spain, France, Yugoslavia--or, for that matter, the U.S.A.--he'd be lost in an area of six-to-ten story buildings with between 150-200 dwelling units per building. Around him would be raw turned-up earth. In the background
would be a half-built shopping center, a half-completed school. He couldn't tell you for certain what part of the world he was in, but he'd know it wasn't beautiful--unless maybe he was in Finland, where apartments are designed, not just built (13:74).

These box-shaped structures hardly approach the concept which the architect Walter Gropius conceived of as functional architecture, "Functionalism was not considered a rationalistic process merely. It embraces psychological problems as well. We realized that emotional needs are just as imperative as any utilitarian ones and demand to be satisfied" (15:23). Obviously, architecture has stopped short of that concept, for many of today's box-like structures are stacked so closely together they almost defy air and sunlight.

Of course, even if the research were available, there is no guarantee that the information would be used in the planning of effective high rise structures. It is hoped that in the areas where the interests of society and profitable high rise development do not conflict that we could expect attitude research to be highly useful. Indeed, profit and better architecture could well go together. For example, a few years ago a well known developer situated a high rise apartment in an exclusive neighborhood in Los Angeles County on a site affording the occupants a gorgeous view of the surrounding areas. The structure was well designed, successful, and the occupancy was high. Then a decision was made to construct an almost identical apartment in the site adjacent to and only a few feet away from the original structure. The second structure: (1) obliterated the views from a substantial number of units in both buildings, and (2) greatly
increased the population density of the area. As a result, today both apartments are only partially occupied. Had the developer had access to research studies concerning the placement of high rise apartments on the site in relationship to tenant occupancy, it is presumed that his second structure would have been positioned differently.

Ultimately the responsibility for improving the planning of high rise apartment complexes rests with society's ability to adequately express its needs and preferences, and to make these needs known. Once this has been accomplished, the planning:

Should result from the fundamental desires and needs of the people weighed against the economic ability to satisfy them ...if planning doesn't begin with these fundamental human needs...the result will be what architects, engineers, and public officials interpret as their needs, not necessarily genuine needs (12:21). p. 21.

Los Angeles County provides the ideal setting for the environmental planning of high rise apartment complexes—sunshine, blue sky, greenery, and open space affording outstanding views. Also, the middle and upper-middle income community has accepted the concept of high rise living. Now, for the design of the high rise apartment to be autonomously accepted, the building industry must develop the technology to construct high rise apartments which not only satisfy the needs and preferences of individuals, but also provide profits to the developers and beauty to the total community. This study is dedicated to that end.
Definitions of Terms Used

ATTITUDES. Attitudes are interpreted as the feelings, opinions, and perceptions of the high rise apartment complex residents as expressed in their responses on the research questionnaire.

HIGH RISE APARTMENT. The term high rise apartment means an apartment dwelling of eight stories or above.

HIGH RISE APARTMENT COMPLEX. The term high rise apartment complex involves the apartment buildings and the total ground of the development as well as all other improvements on the site.

LOCATION. Location means one or all of the following areas: the geographic location of the apartment complex, the proximity of the high rise apartment complex to the beach, the proximity of the high rise apartment complex to the Santa Monica area, the proximity of the high rise apartment complex to shopping and business areas, and the view obtained as a result of living in the high rise apartment complex.

MIDDLE AND UPPER-MIDDLE INCOME LEVEL. Middle income level was interpreted as median income level. In 1960 the median income in the County of Los Angeles was $7,046.00 (8:32). The term upper-middle income was interpreted as income above the median income level.

SATISFACTION. The term "satisfaction" with various design categories, furnishings and structural features of the apartments and the apartment
complex has a special meaning in this study. Each design category, furnishing and structural feature for which 66 percent of the total number of respondents indicated (1) complete satisfaction or (2) above adequate satisfaction is said to have met the criterion of satisfaction. These design categories, furnishings and structural features are discussed as those with which the respondents are "satisfied" (Chapter IV, Hypothesis III).
The development of the apartment in the United States has had a short history, ninety-nine years. Richard M. Hunt designed and built the first apartment in New York City in 1869 based on the design of the French apartment of the 18th century. By 1880 apartment dwellings had become very popular and apartments were being built by the hundreds.

The elevator is of significance in the history of apartment development in terms of construction and of the occupant's acceptance of apartment living. The perfection of the first passenger elevator in 1857 made multi-story apartment construction feasible. The importance of the elevator in relation to the public's acceptance of apartment living was expressed in a passage from a popular play of the era, "The Elevator." "It's the only thing that makes life worth living in a flat. All these apartment flats have one" (7:124).

In 1885 William Le Baron Jenny's innovation in the structural concept of building opened the way for America's contribution to the world of architecture, the skyscraper. The new method did away with load bearing masonry, and instead utilized curtain walls hung on a skeleton of steel to support the building. High rise apartment buildings were constructed based on this principle and were widely accepted because the structures afforded: "grandeur of approach, visual impact, freedom from surface distractions, greater light and air, the possibility of spectacular views from upper floors, and the
prestige values derived from residing in an imposing structure" (18:39).

Today's high rise apartments are incorporating the basic structural principles invented in the nineteenth century, but modifications in architecture and building technology are continually being utilized as well and are changing the design and the construction techniques of the buildings. Marcel Breuer thinks that concrete used as a finished material is "The most important change in the art of building since World War II...you can sculpt concrete, you can mold it, chisel it, and increase the vocabulary of architectural expression" (17:39). In addition to the aesthetic use of concrete, the important technological advances are:

- Precast concrete beams that span 100 feet; cable-hung roofs that carry across distances of 420 feet; mass-production assembling techniques; and a rapidly expanding range of building materials, from glare-reducing glass and spun plastic to rust-sealing steel (17:39).

One leading architectural firm in the United States intends to use this arsenal of technology to better design high rise apartments to meet the needs of the individuals in the community. This firm has made the vow to society, "We're going to live with you and love you and learn to know you" (17:43). Hopefully, other architectural firms will follow this concept.
Review of Related Literature

Research on the design of high rise apartment complexes and on the attitudes and characteristics of their middle and upper-middle income occupants is relatively limited. Most of the research in these areas has been conducted by private research corporations and the information gathered has not been published. Of those studies available, pertinent studies on the design and characteristics include: a study of multi-unit buildings by Georgia-Pacific (19) (a manufacturing company of building materials), and a study of the characteristics of high rise apartment occupants by Fortune and ACTION (the American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods) (1:387).

In 1967 Georgia-Pacific surveyed the design of forty-one high rise apartment buildings throughout the United States. Comparisons were made of the total area in square footage of the one- and two-bedroom apartments. The area of the one-bedroom apartments ranged from 645 sq. ft. (North Central) to 897 sq. ft. (East); the average area of all one-bedroom apartments was 718 sq. ft. The area of the two-bedroom apartments ranged from 725 sq. ft. (South Central) to 1110 sq. ft. (East); the average area of all two-bedroom apartments was 1050 sq. ft. The percentage of apartments incorporating the following features was:

- 83 percent air conditioners
- 100 percent ranges, ovens, and refrigerators
- 93 percent garbage disposals
- 83 percent dishwashers
- 7 percent laundry equipment in individual apartments
- 57 percent carpeting
54 percent draperies
2 percent fireplaces
83 percent storage lockers
71 percent swimming pools
34 percent sauna baths
15 percent gyms
12 percent putting greens
17 percent recreation rooms
10 percent coffee shops
7 percent beauty shops
2 percent formal gardens

Fortune and ACTION in 1957 studied the family characteristics of residents in twelve high rise apartment buildings of 200 units or more built after World War II for the upper-middle income urban dwellers of Philadelphia, Chicago, and New York City. The data revealed:

(1) the monthly expenses for housing ranged up to $400.00 (median income was $15,000.00)
(2) there were children in 13% of the households
(3) the average age of the head of household was 54 years
(4) sixty-seven percent of the occupants had previously lived in another high rise apartment building.

In the field of behavioral research, (1) Raven has found that "One cannot substitute people’s stated preferences as a criterion of quality because people rarely know what they want until they have had experience with something better" (16:63), and (2) according to studies concerning tenant mobility, Rossi (6:8) has found that the most significant reason for moving was the occupant’s dissatisfaction with the amount of space within the dwelling unit.
Hypotheses

Owing to the paucity of research in the areas of concern to this study, the following hypotheses have been postulated which are to be investigated:

HYPOTHESIS I. The occupants of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will be mostly adults in the middle and upper-middle income level, married and unmarried, and without children.

HYPOTHESIS II. The majority of the occupants in the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will have considered location the single most important factor in the selection of their apartment.

HYPOTHESIS III. High rise apartment living will be an acceptable form of housing to the residents of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study; however, the residents will not be satisfied with all of the aspects of their individual apartment or of the total apartment complex.

HYPOTHESIS IV. Residents of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will be in agreement that the rental schedule will be high in relation to the satisfaction provided by the apartment design.

HYPOTHESIS V. The housing needs and preferences of the urban middle and upper-middle income occupants residing in the high rise apartment complex selected for this study are not being fully recognized by the individuals responsible for creating the dwelling structures or by the individuals living therein.
Limitations of the Study

The study was limited in its investigation to a select group of 266 occupants of a high rise apartment complex. The names, obtained from public records, constituted 61 percent of the total number of heads of households in the complex. The information collected represents the attitudes and characteristics of the respondents of the high rise apartment complex selected for the study.

The complex was selected because it was assumed to be similar to other newly constructed high rise apartment complexes designed for the middle and upper-middle income occupants in Los Angeles County.
CHAPTER II
DESCRIPTION OF THE APARTMENT COMPLEX STUDIED

The 532 unit high rise apartment complex selected as the subject of this study is phase one of a four phase urban redevelopment project to construct 2000 housing units on twenty acres of land under Title I of the Housing Act of 1949 (section 220 insured mortgage). The original project plan calls for the construction of 500 units on each of four, five-acre parcels of land. Negotiations for the second phase of development can commence when the high rise apartment complex of project one reaches 70 percent occupancy. All four phases of the project are to be related, but are to be developed separately. The complex studied was designed by one of the nation's leading architectural firms in accordance with the plans set forth by the redevelopment agency, the developers, and the lending institutions.

The complex is located adjacent to the Pacific Ocean in the County of Los Angeles sixteen miles from downtown Los Angeles and within one mile and one half of the principal shopping and commercial areas of Santa Monica. The five-acre parcel is bounded on the northwest and the southwest by a temporary nine-hole golf course (parcels 3 and 4 of the redevelopment project), on the northeast by a four-lane road (connecting the beach cities), and on the southeast by cleared land (parcel 2 of the redevelopment project). Public beaches
and parking areas and the Pacific Ocean are situated approximately 700 yards southwest of the complex (see Figure 1, page 22). The residential and commercial areas of the surrounding neighborhood are also under study for future improvement projects.

The complex is composed of two, seventeen-story towers, A and B, which were opened for occupancy in September 1966 and February 1967, respectively. Parking for tenants is provided on two subterranean levels within each tower; guest parking in specified areas is provided outside of the buildings. Between the two towers are located: two, two-story buildings, the pool area, and landscaped gardens and walkways. The view afforded the tenants is unobstructed on three sides of each tower; however, due to the placement of the towers in direct parallel alignment with each other, the view from 50 percent of the apartments which face the opposite apartment building, is limited. Transportation is available to residents by bus line or automobile. The entrance to the freeway is located one mile from the complex.

The apartment towers rise one-hundred and sixty feet above the surface of the ground and are of concrete frame construction. Each tower contains 266 apartments, of which sixteen are located on each floor from the second to the seventeenth floor (see Appendix, question one of the Questionnaire), and ten are located on the first level. All apartments open onto a long hallway which is reached by using an elevator or one of the stairways (one at each end of the hallway). There are three elevators in each building (travel speed,
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350' per minute). One elevator (40" x 77") will accommodate 15 persons (capacity 2500 pounds), and the other two (41" x 70") will each accommodate 12 persons (capacity 2000 pounds).

Four apartment plans are available in each building: (1) apartment A (Figure 2, p. 24) a one-bedroom, one-bathroom apartment, which comprises 50 percent of the total number of apartments; (2) apartment B (Figure 3, p. 25) a two-bedroom, two-bathroom apartment, which comprises 26 percent of the total number of apartments; (3) apartment C (Figure 4, p. 26) a one-bedroom and den, two-bathroom apartment, which comprises 12 percent of the total number of apartments; and (4) apartment D (Figure 5, p. 27) a one-bedroom, one-bathroom apartment, which comprises 12 percent of the total number of apartments. Balconies are provided for all apartments on the second to the seventeenth floors, and terraces are provided for all apartments on the first level.

The rental schedule established for the complex is under the control of FHA. Since the complex opened there has been one rent increase, which was approved by FHA. The rent varies according to the apartment plan, the floor level, and the location of the apartment on the floor. The rent increases $5.00 per floor from the second to the fourteenth floor, and $10.00 per floor from the fifteenth to the seventeenth floor. Because of modifications in the apartment design, the first level apartments are $10.00 higher than similar apartments on the second floor. Apartments on the street-side of the complex are $10.00 lower than comparable apartments on the ocean side, and apartments on the southwest side of building A
APARTMENT "A"
753 SQUARE FEET
FIGURE 3
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are $10.00 lower than all other apartments of the same plan on the same floor level in either of the buildings. The rental range for each apartment is: (1) $160 to $260 for apartments A and D; (2) $245 to $345 for apartment B, and (3) $240 to $340 for apartment C (see TABLE 1, below). All apartments are leased unfurnished for a minimum period of one year.

TABLE 1

MEAN APARTMENT RENTAL RANGES BY FLOOR LEVEL AND FLOOR PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor Plan</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>10-12</th>
<th>13-15</th>
<th>16-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>227.50</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>312.50</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>307.50</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>227.50</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first level of each building contains an entry lobby, two sitting rooms (with card tables), two recreation rooms (with billiard and ping pong tables), the mail delivery area, and ten apartments. The doors leading into the lobby from the guest parking area are locked. Non-residents can be admitted only by using the intercom system to contact the person within the building with whom they wish to visit. The doors to the lobby from the central area of the complex are not locked during the day. Security police in uniform patrol the apartment premises 24 hours per day.

Located on the first sub-level in each building are the laundry and hobby rooms. The laundry room contains ten washing
machines (12 pound capacity), four dryers (25 pound capacity), and two dryers (12 pound capacity). The counter area for preparing and folding laundry is 3' x 6'; there is no laundry tub.

Two trash chutes are located on each floor, each is located in a 4' x 4' room located at the end of each hallway. The metal trash chute door opening is 12" deep x 15" wide x 16" high.

The entrance to the subterranean parking area is controlled by a security card key system. There are 600 stalls in the complex (1.1 parking stalls per apartment). At the time of this study, 50 percent of the stalls were rented at $12.50 per stall per month.

Facilities located in the central area of the complex and available to tenants are: a post office sub-station, a beauty shop, a snack shop and delicatessen, the business office of the complex, the pool area and party room, shuffle-board, and the garden and walkway areas. The pool area is protected from the wind by a glass enclosure; the pool is olympic size. There are twenty chairs, twenty chaise lounges, and a number of benches surrounding the pool. The entrance to the party room is reached from the pool area; for this reason the room is most adaptable to casual, open parties. Once a year the management of the complex gives such a party for all of the residents.

The furnishings and structural features found in each of the apartments within the complex are:

**Color Scheme.** All wall areas in each apartment are painted eggshell; flat paint is used in the bedrooms, hallways, and the living-dining rooms, and semi-gloss paint is used in the kitchens and
the bathrooms. The wall-to-wall carpeting in the bedrooms, hallways, and the living-dining rooms is light-gray-green. The color of the vinyl asphalt tile in the kitchens and bathrooms is cream. The color of the draperies in the bedrooms and the living-dining rooms is beige. The color of the formica counter tops in the kitchens and the bathrooms is off white, the kitchen appliances are white, the bathroom cabinets are cream, and the kitchen cabinets are stained walnut.

**Draperyes.** The draperies in all bedrooms and living-dining rooms are constructed from a loosely woven flame resistant fabric, Verel modacrylic.

**Carpeting.** The carpeting is continuous filament nylon, with a relatively short pile.

**Windows.** All windows not starting at floor level start 18" above the floor. Rooms having one wall of glass are: all living-dining rooms (all apartments but B incorporate a sliding glass door which opens onto the balcony), the master bedroom in C, and bedrooms one and two of 2 (both of which open onto a balcony). The two, one-bedroom apartments (A and D) each have one 20" wide window and a sliding glass door which opens onto the balcony; the second bedroom in C has two 22" windows. Screens are provided for most windows and sliding doors on all floors. There are no windows in the bathrooms or kitchens.

**Space and Water Heating.** Each apartment is metered separately for space and water heating. Thirty-gallon water heaters are provided for the one-bedroom apartments (A and D), and forty-gallon water heaters are provided for the larger apartments (B and C). All apartments
are heated by an electrical baseboard heating system; the heat output is regulated by a thermostat control in each bedroom and living-dining room. The baseboard heater follows along one wall and is placed 5" out from the wall in an upright position 5" high and 3" deep. (Fig. 2-5, pp. 24-27). The heating unit is indicated by the long, broken lines forming a rectangular box. The placement of the heating unit takes more space than would have been needed had it been mounted according to the manufacturer's specifications, flush to the wall. In the second bedroom of B the baseboard unit runs in front of the glass door leading onto the balcony, necessitating one to step over the unit to enter the balcony.

Storage. Each apartment is provided with a broom and linen closet (indicated in Fig. 2-5, pp. 24-27 by a B and an I, respectively) and most apartments have a garage storage locker. Each linen closet has five shelves, however, the dimensions vary. The walk-in closets of apartment A and B provided additional area for the storage of large articles. There are 438 storage lockers in the garage area, measuring 1'x4'x8' (0.62 per apartment).

A description of the rooms within each of the four apartment plans follows:

The Living-Dining Room. Variations in the design of the living-dining room will be found in TABLE 2, p 34.

The Kitchen. The following features are available in all kitchens: a central ceiling lighting fixture (containing two, 48" fluorescent blue-white tubes producing 80 watts); a refrigerator; a hood,
two-speed exhaust fan and light placed over the four unit electric
clock top; an electric oven; a garbage disposal in the double sink;
and a Dishmaster (found in all apartments except those which have
dishwashers: B and C on floors fifteen and sixteen, and all apartments
on the seventeenth floor). More deluxe kitchen appliances are instal-
led in kitchens on the seventeenth floor. All kitchens are open and
visible from the living-dining room. Apartments A, C, and D have a
pass-through area which connects the kitchen with the living-dining
room. The bar is 8" wide and 42" above the floor. In C and D there
are kitchen cabinets 20" above the bar; however, in Plan C there are
no doors on the kitchen cabinets. In general, the counter length in
each kitchen varies in direct proportion with the storage area and the
work space available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apartment Plan</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counter Length</td>
<td>9' 8&quot;</td>
<td>7' 8&quot;</td>
<td>12' 2&quot;</td>
<td>5' 9&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of the kitchen appliances are found in TABLE 2, p 34).

The Bathroom(s). All bathrooms are furnished with the follow-
ing items: an exhaust fan that operates when the lighting fixture is
switched on, a ceiling heating unit (3-250 watt infra-red lamps), a
novel built-in medicine cabinet (16"x24"x4") with a mirrored door (locat-
ed next to the sink in all bathrooms but the second bathroom in B),
light green ceramic tile around the bathtub and in the stall shower,
and a shower head installed 60" above the shower floor. Within each
bathroom the size of the lighting fixture, the mirror area, and the
cabinet are determined by the size and design of the room. The 36"
wide cabinets (B and C, bathroom one) do not contain drawers or shelves other than the lower shelf of the cabinet itself. The lighting fixture above the 36" long cabinet is 36" wide and holds a 36" fluorescent blue-white tube producing 30 watts. Apartments A, D, and C (bathroom two) have longer cabinets (48" - 54") with drawer and shelf space, more mirror areas, and larger lighting fixtures (48" fluorescent blue-white tube producing 40 watts). Additional information concerning bathroom furnishings is in TABLE 2, p 34.

The Bedroom(s). Variations in the design of the bedrooms will be found in TABLE 2, p 34. All closet areas within the apartment are discussed in conjunction with the bedroom design. The closet area is indicated by a C in the apartment plans (Figure 2-5, pp 24-27). The bedroom closet door in apartment A was relocated in building B to open into the hallway as is shown in Figure 2, p 34. In building A the closet door opens into the bedroom, which interrupts the wall space. The second bedroom of C is closed off from the living-dining room by a folding wooden door.

The phone jacks are found in the kitchens and the bedrooms in all apartments. Television recepticals are found in the living-dining rooms and in the bedrooms. There is no special antennae for UHF reception.
### TABLE 2

**CHARACTERISTICS AND SPECIFICATIONS OF THE VARIOUS APARTMENTS BY FLOOR PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics and Specifications</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living-Dining Room</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kitchen</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerator</td>
<td>11 cu. ft.</td>
<td>13.5 cu. ft.</td>
<td>13.5 cu. ft.</td>
<td>11 cu. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range Top and Oven</td>
<td>drop-in</td>
<td>built-in</td>
<td>built-in</td>
<td>drop-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedroom(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom(1)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom(2)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-in closet</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closet Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear Dimension</td>
<td>13'</td>
<td>17'6&quot;</td>
<td>19'5&quot;</td>
<td>10'9&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Depth</td>
<td>2'</td>
<td>1'10&quot;</td>
<td>1'10&quot;</td>
<td>2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bathroom(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Shelves and Drawers in Cabinet</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shower</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tub</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wattage of Lighting Fixture</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURE OF THE INVESTIGATION

Development of the Instrument

The instrument used to collect data for the study was a questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed specially for the high rise apartment complex studied for the purpose of obtaining data regarding the characteristics of the occupants and their attitudes toward their apartments and the entire apartment complex.

Once developed, the questionnaire was subjected to a pretest in a similar high rise apartment complex in Los Angeles County. The results of the pretest were analyzed and the questionnaire was revised into the final form found in the Appendix.

Each respondent selected for the study was mailed a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study, the questionnaire, and a stamped-return envelope addressed to the investigator.

Selection of the Sample

The sample selected, 266 heads of households, represented 50 percent of the total number of apartments in the complex, 532 units. At the time of this study there were 436 apartments occupied in the complex. The names of the 266 respondents selected for the study were obtained from public records (public records April, 1968).

Collection of the Data

From the total number of questionnaires mailed to the 266 heads of households within the high rise apartment complex surveyed,
53 percent were completed and returned. This return represents 32 percent of the total number of heads of households living in the complex at the time of the study.

**Analysis of the Data**

All data received were put onto computer cards for tabulation and correlation of the variables. The data were tabulated in three categories: (1) the total number of respondents, (2) the total number of respondents divided into four income groups, and (3) the total number of respondents divided into four groups according to apartment plan.

Data not susceptible to computer analysis was treated separately. Simple basic statistical analysis was used to interpret the data.
CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Characteristics of the Respondents

Sixty percent of the total number of respondents completing the questionnaire were male, 30 percent were female, and 10 percent did not indicate sex. Seventy-eight of the respondents (55 percent) were unmarried: thirty-six were single, twenty-five were divorced, eight were widowed, and nine did not indicate their sub-group; sixty-one respondents (43 percent) were married; and two respondents (2 percent) did not indicate their marital status.

The age ranges and income groups of the respondents are presented in TABLE 3, below:

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE RANGES AND INCOME GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Ranges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-65 and over</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 11,999</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000-14,999</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 and over</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The median age range of the total number of heads of households was 45-54 years and the median income range was $12,000-$14,999. Definite conclusions cannot be drawn between these findings and those by Action and Fortune (1:387) because of the different age and income boundaries used in the two studies. The assumption is, however, that the income level and the mean age of the occupants of the high rise apartment in Los Angeles County are slightly lower than those reported by the previous study.

Children were found in 12 percent of the households (see Table 4, p. 39); the average number of children per household was 1.3. From these findings and those of the Action-Fortune study (1:387) it may be assumed that the number of households with children is small compared to the total number of households in the high rise apartment complex.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Unmarried Females</th>
<th>Unmarried Males</th>
<th>Married Couples</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age Ranges</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income Ranges</td>
<td>9,000-11,999</td>
<td>12,000-14,999</td>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Percentage of Income Paid for Rent*</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households with Children</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children (under 18 Years)</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Computed for each respondent by dividing the mean figure of the income group by twelve months, and then dividing this figure into the mean figure of the monthly rental expense.
The one-bedroom apartments (A and D) were selected by the unmarried respondents over the married by a ratio of 2:1, whereas the larger apartments (B and C) were selected by the married respondents over the unmarried by a ratio of almost 2:1 (see TABLE 5, below).

TABLE 5

OCCUPANCY OF VARIOUS APARTMENT PLANS
BY FAMILY COMPOSITION AND SEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couples</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifteen percent of the total number of respondents lived in another high rise apartment building previous to their present occupancy. These findings were in sharp contrast to those in the study of Action-Fortune (1:367). It may be assumed that high rise living is a relatively new form of housing to the majority of occupants in the high rise apartment complex surveyed in Los Angeles County.

Of the total number of respondents, 10 percent were born in California. Immediately before moving into their present apartment, ninety-three respondents had lived in Los Angeles County; seventeen had
lived outside of Los Angeles County, but within California; twenty-five had lived outside of California; and seven respondents did not indicate their previous area of residence.

Hypothesis 1 stated: The occupants of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will be mostly adults in the middle and upper-middle income level, married and unmarried, and without children.

The hypothesis is accepted. Based on the data from the questionnaire, it was established that: (1) the median age range of the heads of households was 45-54 years; (2) the median income level of the respondents was $12,000 to $14,999, which is upper-middle income level; (3) fifty-five percent of the respondents were unmarried and forty-three percent were married; and (4) children were found in 12 percent of the total number of households.

**Respondents Reasons for Apartment Selection**

The motivating factors dominant in the occupant's selection of a high rise apartment have been largely a topic of speculation. It has been assumed that persons selecting high rise apartments do so for reasons different from those of persons selecting low rise apartments, however, information on this subject is inconclusive. In an effort to learn why occupants of the high rise apartment complex studied selected their apartments, the respondents were asked: (1) "Would you have rented your apartment if it were not located next to the beach?"

Fifty-two percent of the total number of respondents replied "No", 20
percent replied "Yes" and 28 percent were "Uncertain"; and (2) "Why did you select your apartment? Check the deciding factors" (see TABLE 6, below):

TABLE 6
REASONS GIVEN BY RESPONDENTS FOR APARTMENT SELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to live near the beach</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted an apartment with a view</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to live in the Santa Monica area</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted security</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to live in a high rise apartment</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted privacy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted convenience to shopping and business areas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liked the design and features of the apartment I selected</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three items checked most frequently were those having to do with location: "to be near the beach," "an apartment with a view," and "to be in the Santa Monica area."

View was high in priority among the factors of apartment selection and is one of the factors which distinguishes high rise apartment selection from low rise. Yet, view per se is difficult to define for it is largely a subjective value. Associated with view are: large window areas, contact with the outdoors, and a feeling of spaciousness regardless of the actual amount of space within the apart-
ment. The view one actually sees from his apartment may consist of a variety of things: the terrace, the ocean, the sky, the neighborhood, the mountains, the pool, the opposite building, and it may be termed good or bad depending upon the individual. View is considered to be such an important value that the rental schedule is based upon it. The "best" views are considered by the management to be those obtained from the upper floor levels; therefore, the rent increases in direct proportion to the increase in floor level (for the same apartment design and features, with the exception of select kitchen furnishings mentioned).

In analyzing the vacancies of the total apartment complex, it was found that the greatest number of vacancies were on the upper floors (see TABLE 7, p. 144). In building A there was an equal distribution of 51 vacancies on both sides of the building (the northeast side faces the pool area and building B, and the southwest side faces the neighborhood). In building B there was an unequal distribution of 46 vacancies (the northeast side faces the mountains and the coastline - there were five vacancies, whereas, the southwest side faces the pool area and building A - there were 40 vacancies). There was no significant difference in the distribution of vacancies on the street side of the complex compared to the ocean side.

The reasons for the occupant's selection of an apartment in terms of view may be: (1) the "best" view (not necessarily determined by floor level, and (2) the "best" view weighed against: economic factors, the design of the apartment desired, the availability of the
TABLE 7
APARTMENT VACANCIES *BY FLOOR LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>Vacancies</th>
<th>Building A</th>
<th>Building B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*July 1, 1968

apartment desired, the location of the apartment on the floor, and
the orientation of the apartment building in the complex. In analyz-
ing the vacancies it appears that the occupant's concept of "best"
view is not determined by floor level alone. If one considers view
as the basis for apartment selection, the most popular view was from
the northeast side of building B and the least popular view was from
the southwest side of the same building. The occupants seem to pre-
fer the northern exposure to southern exposure by a ratio of approx-
imately 2:1.
it is significant that at the time of this study there were no other high rise apartment buildings in the area to obstruct the view or to interfere with the air space of this complex. The symmetrical placement of the buildings on the site, however, did limit the view from 50 percent of the apartments in the total apartment complex, which was not only unfortunate, but unnecessary. It is hoped that future high rise developments in this area will give consideration to the view and the air space of the occupants in existing buildings and those to be built. Positioning the high rise apartment to take advantage of the natural landscape is just as important to the owner of the complex as it is to the occupants. In this complex the vacancy factor was 4 percent for the northeast side of building B (133 apartments), 30 percent for the southwest side of the same building (133 apartments), and 18 percent for the total apartment complex (532 apartments). These figures speak for themselves; when a desirable view is provided, the occupancy level is high and the owner-developer has a better opportunity of making his investment a profitable one.

These responses unquestioningly indicate that location was the single most important motivating factor in apartment selection. The second most important factor was the design of the selected apartment. According to the total number of apartments occupied, the apartment most preferred by the occupants was D, followed by B, A and C (see Table 6, p. 46). The apartment plans will be discussed in the next section, Respondents Satisfaction with High Rise Living.

Only one-third of the total number of respondents indicated
that they selected their apartment because they wanted to live in a high rise apartment. It may be assumed that two-thirds of the respondents selected their apartments for other reasons, primarily location. Convenience to shopping and business areas, generally thought to be important to occupants of high rise apartment, was considered the least important of all the items listed in the questionnaire according to the responses received.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF FLOOR PLANS AND VACANCIES*
WITHIN THE APARTMENT COMPLEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Vacancies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*July 1, 1968

Hypothesis two stated: The majority of occupants in the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will have considered location the single most important factor in the selection of their apartment.

Hypothesis two is accepted. Location was the most important consideration; of the total number of respondents, 82 percent wanted to live near the beach, 52 percent would not have rented their apart-
ment if it had not been located next to the beach, 68 percent wanted an apartment with a view, 46 percent wanted to live in the Santa Monica area, and 27 percent wanted the convenience to shopping and business areas. The second most important reason of the total number of respondents for their apartment selection was "Liked the design and features of the apartment I selected" followed by "Wanted security", "Wanted to live in a high rise apartment," and "Wanted privacy." The assumption is that of the respondents studied, location was the single most important factor in the selection of their apartment, and that 66 percent of the respondents selected a high rise apartment primarily because it was located in the area in which they desired to live.

Respondents Satisfaction with High Rise Living

Mobility is often an indication of an occupant's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with his present dwelling unit. To determine the satisfaction based on mobility of the occupant with his apartment in the high rise apartment complex studied, the respondents were asked questions regarding the length of time they had occupied their apartments, and if they were moving to give reasons in terms of: "rent" "apartment" and "other" or if they were "not moving soon" (see TABLE 9 p.48).

It was found that 69 percent of the total number of respondents had occupied their apartments for six months or longer. Forty-six percent of the total number of respondents planned to remain in their present apartment for one year or longer, 35 percent of the total number of respondents were "unsure" about the length of time they would
remain in their apartments, and 19 percent were definitely planning to move within one year. Of the 35 percent who were "Unsure," 60

### TABLE 9

LENGTH OF OCCUPANCY IN APARTMENT AND PLANS FOR FUTURE OCCUPANCY OR MOVING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Occupancy and Plans for Future</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Occupancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under six months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months to one year</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year or longer</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time Planning to Remain in Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under one year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to two years</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Moving Soon, Reasons for Moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, Rent*</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, Rent, Other**</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Apartment, Rent, Other)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Moving Soon</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (Persons checking both reasons for moving)

** (Persons checking all 3 reasons for moving)
percent stated that they were not planning to move. The 19 percent who were definitely planning to move and those respondents who were considering moving gave their reasons (in order of the highest frequency): "other," "rent," and "apartment design."

In terms of expressed mobility it may be assumed that about 50 percent of the occupants were satisfied with high rise living, 20 percent were dissatisfied, and 30 percent were uncertain. It is assumed that the 30 percent who were uncertain were more satisfied than dissatisfied with high rise living; therefore, over 66 percent of the respondents were satisfied with high rise living.

Satisfaction may also be considered as one component of many, which when taken together result in "meeting one's expectations." The respondents were asked, "Does high rise living meet your expectations?" To this question 75 percent answered "Yes," 6 percent "No," 16 percent were "Unsure" and 3 percent did not indicate their feelings. Based on these findings it may be concluded that high rise living meets the expectations of over 66 percent of the total number of respondents, and that they were receiving satisfaction from residing in a high rise apartment complex.

Pride is derived from satisfactions. Respondents were asked, "Do you have a feeling of pride about living in your present apartment?" Fifty-nine percent of the total number of respondents answered "Yes," 23 percent answered "No," and 17 percent were "Undecided." Of the total number of respondents in the income group $11,999 and below, 54 percent answered "Yes" compared with 68 percent who answered
"Yes" in the income group $20,000 and above. Persons in the highest income groups derived greater feelings of pride than those in the lowest income group. It is assumed that those persons who responded "Undecided" were more satisfied than dissatisfied, thus 66 percent of the total number of respondents derived feelings of pride from residing in a high rise apartment.

Respondents were asked to rate the following design categories in terms of their satisfaction with the design: (1) the rooms in their apartment: living-dining room, kitchen, bedroom(s) and bathroom(s); and (2) the total apartment complex. A five point scale was used with (1) representing complete satisfaction, (3) adequate satisfaction, and (5) dissatisfaction. Each design category for which 66 percent of the total number of respondents indicated (1) or (2) is said to have met the criterion of satisfaction; those with which the respondents are satisfied. The following is a discussion of the findings concerning the respondents satisfaction:

**The Living-Dining Room.** The only living-dining room to meet the criteria of satisfaction was D. Forty-six percent of the total number of respondents rated the living-dining room (for all apartment plans) with scores of (1) and (2); thus, the living-dining room design did not meet the criteria of satisfaction (TABLE 13, p. 62). The design of the living-dining room did not meet the criteria of satisfaction primarily because of the size and the shape of the room. Respondents considered the rooms too small (especially A) and the design unacceptable to allow for flexible furniture arrangement,
particularly the dining area (especially A and C). The rooms designed in an "L" shape (B and D) were more acceptable than those with a rectangular shape (A and C) primarily because the "L" shape provided an area for dining, although it was considered too small by some respondents.

Other reasons for rating this room with scores lower than (1) and (2) were: heating unit, draperies, carpeting, open view into the kitchen, no light over the dining area, color scheme, broken wall space, and the television connection on one wall and thought to be the wrong wall (in B).

Respondents especially liked the design features of the windows and the balcony off the living-dining room. Seventy-eight percent of the total number of respondents felt that a balcony was essential to the apartment design.

The Kitchen. The kitchen design and features did not meet the criteria of satisfaction in any individual apartment plan. Forty-eight percent of the total number of respondents rated the kitchen (for all apartment plans) with scores of (1) and (2), thus, the kitchen did not meet the criteria for satisfaction. (TABLE 13, p.62)

The three most important reasons for rating the kitchen with scores lower than (1) and (2) were: size, exclusion of a dishwasher, and inadequate cabinet and storage area. The kitchen was considered too small (especially A) for family meal preparation. Other reasons for incomplete satisfaction were: refrigerator too small (especially A and B) and not equipped with an automatic defrost device, no place
to eat in the kitchen, counter area inadequate (especially A, B, and
D), kitchen open into the living room, pass-through bar too narrow
to be useful, and poor ventilation (due to odors from other kitchens
backing up through the ventilation system).

The Bedroom(s). The only bedroom to meet the criteria of
satisfaction was D; however, C came within two percentage points of
the criteria, close enough to be accepted. Forty percent of the
total number of respondents rated the bedroom(s) (for all apartments)
with scores of (1) and (2), thus, not meeting the criteria of satis-
faction. (TABLE 13, p. 62)

The bedroom(s) not meeting the criteria were lacking in design
quality due primarily to: size and shape. The bedroom in apartment A
was too small and too narrow to allow for flexible furniture arrange-
ment; the wall space was broken by: the closet door opening (which
was corrected in building B, but not in building A), the heating unit,
the window, and two door openings. The bedrooms in Plan 3 were small,
and had insufficient wall space to allow for flexible furniture
arrangement. Because of the size, furniture selection was limited
in: scale, number of pieces which could fit into the room, and place-
ment.

Other reasons for rating the bedroom(s) lower than (1) or (2)
were: placement of the heating unit (especially the second bedroom in
B); exclusion of lighting; unlined draperies; the small window area
in A, D, and C (the second bedroom); color scheme; and carpeting.
The master bedroom in Plan C was well designed; however, the second
bedroom in C was the smallest of all bedrooms. It was used by nine of the fourteen respondents as a combination bedroom-den. The second bedroom in B was used by half of the forty respondents as a bedroom and by fourteen as a den.

The clothes closet areas in A and D met the criteria of satisfaction (see TABLE 13, p. 62). The lowest rating was received by B in which the closet space was considered inadequate and too narrow in some closets (hangers scraped the doors).

The Bathroom(s). The only bathroom to meet the criteria of satisfaction was D. Fifty-four percent of the total number of respondents rated the bathroom(s) (for all apartment plans) with scores of (1) and (2); thus, the bathroom(s) did not meet the criteria of satisfaction. (TABLE 13) The bathroom in apartment A came within five percentage points of acceptance and is similar in design and size to B.

The bathroom(s) of B and C received the lowest ratings due to the size and the features. Both bathrooms in B and the number one bathroom in C received the poorest ratings because of: inadequate storage and counter area, inadequate size, inadequate lighting, and the exclusion of a shower in each bathroom. Eighty-two percent of the occupants felt that a bathroom should have both a shower and a tub.

The general lighting in all bathrooms was insufficient, especially over the mirror, the tub, and in the shower. The lighting produced from the blue-white fluorescent tube was insufficient and produced glares. A deluxe warm white tube should be used in all.
living areas in the apartment (to produce light more similar to sunlight). Respondents reported using the ceiling heating unit for illumination in conjunction with the lighting fixture in order to increase the light output.

Other reasons for rating the bathroom(s) lower than (1) and (2) were: shower head too low (although 60" may be code, some men complained that the shower head hit them in the chest), poor quality bathroom fixtures (small tub), poor drainage, color scheme, and the noise from the fan.

The furnishings and structural features within each apartment were also rated for satisfaction by the respondents on a scale from one to five. The same criteria for satisfaction was used to analyze the furnishings and structural features as was used to analyze the design categories (TABLE II, p. 57)

The items meeting the criteria of satisfaction were:

The Windows. The outstanding feature about the windows was the length; all windows started at floor level or 18" above the floor and continuing to the ceiling, thereby permitting full vision of the outdoors. In apartment B there are three rooms each with one wall of windows (and the only apartment plan to have cross ventilation); in C there are two rooms each with one wall of windows; in A and D there is one room with one wall of windows.

Insulation of the Exterior and Interior Walls. The insulation was above the minimum set by the code. Respondents were asked if they were bothered by noise (the findings are in TABLE 10, p. 56)
The respondents in B were bothered by noise from the trash chute, but were not at all bothered by noise from adjoining apartments (because of structural necessity there was increased insulation between B and the adjacent apartment -- A).

The items not meeting the criteria of satisfaction were:

**The Heating Unit.** The unit was criticized for being: "unsightly," taking too much floor space, making furniture arrangement difficult or impossible, creating a safety hazard due to over heating (the draperies were reported to have been scorched,) and placement, and heating inefficiently.

**The Storage Area.** The storage area was found to be inadequate within the apartment (especially B and C), and in the garage area (especially B and C).

**The Carpeting.** The main objections were: light color which soiled easily and showed the soil, poor quality, and lack of color choice.

**The Artificial Lighting.** There was no light provided: over the sink in the kitchen, in the bedroom(s), or over the dining area in the living-dining room. The lighting was inadequate in all of the bathrooms (especially B and C, bath one).

**The Color Scheme.** Comments ranged from "No color," "Blah," "What color?" "No color choice," and so on. The respondents indicated that they wanted more choice and an expression of individuality.

**Size of Rooms.** The size of all rooms was rated "too small" by over half of the respondents. The greatest number of criticisms came
from respondents in A and B, especially in reference to the size and design of the bedrooms.

The Draperies. The draperies were criticized because: they were unlined; the fabric was loosely woven and of a light color, which permitted the passage of sunlight (especially a problem in the bedrooms in the apartments with the southern exposure); no color choice; and poorly constructed.

### TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BOTHERED BY NOISE FROM VARIOUS AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall area</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street noise</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining apartment</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash chute</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Bothered by Noise</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-five percent of the total number of respondents rated the design of the total apartment complex with scores of (1) and (2); the complex met the criteria of satisfaction (see TABLE 13, p. 62). The respondents frequent or regular usage of the service and recreational facilities provided by the complex are found in TABLE 12, p. 61.
TABLE 11
RESPONDENTS ACCEPTANCE OF THE DESIGN FEATURES
OF THEIR APARTMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Features</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage Acceptance*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior wall insulation</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior wall insulation</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage space</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpeting</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial lighting</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color scheme</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Rooms</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draperies</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Acceptance is based upon the respondents rating of each item as "1" or "2" (above adequate satisfaction).

The main reason expressed for rating the complex with scores lower than (1) and (2) was the elevator service. Complaints about the elevator were: elevators are too small, too infrequent, not a sufficient number of elevators, need a separate service elevator, and a frequent number of elevator failures. According to the respondents, the elevator service is inadequate generally on: (1) the weekends, (2) in the summer, (3) when persons are moving in and out, and (4) when persons are going-to, or coming-from work.

Other complaints concerning the complex design were: the complex was placed too close to the street resulting in street noise and dirt into the apartments; poor ventilation in the halls and in the
kitchens; inadequate laundry facilities owing to the size and the design of the room, the insufficient number of appliances, and the insufficient supply of hot water; the additional parking fee; the neighborhood; the rent; the insufficient number of chairs by the pool (occupants bring their own chairs with them); the congestion at the pool area on weekends and in the summer; no area in which children can play (other than the elevators); location and size of the trash chute; lack of a gym and sauna; children and pets; "prison atmosphere" of the complex because of the uniformed security guards and the locked lobby doors; no UHF antennae; and finally the stark, unimaginative design of the complex itself.

From the data collected pertaining to renting parking stalls, it was claimed that seventy-two percent of the total number of respondents rented one car stall, 21 percent rented two or more stalls and 7 percent did not rent any. These figures give only an indication of the number of cars per family. Some persons park their cars across the street from the complex in the municipal lots ($4.00 a month).

Some of the outstanding design features of the complex are:

- the placement of the largest apartment (B) at the corner of each hallway (afforded the greatest view, cross ventilation, and the greatest amount of privacy and quiet); designing the rooms within each apartment so that like rooms of adjacent apartments are located on the same wall (bedrooms back up to bedrooms, kitchens back up to kitchens, etc.); placing the elevators across from each other in the hallway so
that the noise is reduced; using better quality insulation than was required by the building code; designing the layout of the apartment so that the structural members are hidden between the walls of the apartments and do not protrude into the rooms; providing each apartment with a balcony or terrace; providing each bathroom with a bathtub and a shower (A and D); providing two bathrooms in apartment B and C, and providing window areas starting at the floor or 18" above the floor; and providing a variety of recreational facilities for the occupants.

In comparing the design ratings of the total number of respondents for all of the rooms (all four apartment plans) in the total apartment complex, the order in which the occupants rated the design categories, beginning with the highest rating was: (1) the total apartment complex, 65 percent; (2) the bathroom(s), 54 percent; (3) the kitchen, 40 percent; (4) the living-dining room, 46 percent; and (5) the bedroom(s), 40 percent. The total mean acceptance of the designs of all four rooms within the complex was 51 percent, thus the rooms did not meet the criteria of satisfaction. The total complex was the only design category to meet the criteria of satisfaction. It may be assumed, then, that persons living in the high rise apartment complex were more satisfied with the concept of high rise living, the location of the complex, and the facilities and services provided by the complex than with their individual apartments within the complex.

When asked what features the respondents liked best about their apartments, 69 respondents replied, "View." There is no question that view is highly valued by the respondents of the complex,
but view is not enough to keep occupants satisfied indefinitely, for as one respondent stated, "After six months the view wears pretty thin." The design of the apartment, therefore, is also of very great importance.

According to Fortune (2:26) 75 units per acre constitute the maximum number of units for comfortable living. The project studied consists of 106 units per acre. At present the population density does not seem to be a problem because of the open spaces surrounding the complex. With future development, however, parcel 2 and the golf course will be eliminated (parcels 3 and 4). It is hoped that the future developers will consider the population density of the total 20 acres, and not just each individual five acre parcel as it is to be developed. If the comfort of the individual is not considered, it will be a step backward in the environmental planning of high rise developments.

It is hoped that high rise apartment developments will satisfy the needs and preferences of the individuals for whom they are being built, will not be built for obsolescence, and will be profitable constructions that will contribute to the community. With these considerations in mind, it is suggested that the present high rise apartment complex be totally re-evaluated before future developments are begun.

Hypothesis III stated: High rise apartment living will be an acceptable form of housing to the residents of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study, however, the residents will not be satisfied with all of the aspects of their individual apartment or of
the total apartment complex.

TABLE 12
FREQUENCY OF USAGE OF VARIOUS FACILITIES
BY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency and Usage by percentage Using Frequently and Regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Room</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Shop, Deli</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiard Rooms</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garions</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Room</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The hypothesis is partially accepted. Based on the findings of the respondent's satisfaction with high rise living, it was found that 56 percent of the total number of respondents were satisfied in terms of: (1) the length of occupancy in their present apartment and their intention to remain in their present apartment, (2) their feeling that high rise living met their expectations, and (3) their feeling of pride in living in a high rise apartment. The respondents were not satisfied with all aspects of their individual apartment depending on room rated by the total number of respondents of all four apartment plans met the criteria of satisfaction.
The hypothesis is rejected in part, based on the findings of the respondent's rating of the total apartment complex. The respondents reported that they were satisfied with the design of the total apartment complex.

**TABLE 13**

**RESPONDENTS ACCEPTANCE OF THE DESIGN AND OTHER ASPECTS OF THEIR APARTMENTS AND THE APARTMENT COMPLEX BY APARTMENT PLAN AND TOTAL RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Evaluated</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living-Dining Room</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Acceptance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape Acceptance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;L&quot; Shaped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedroom(s)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closet Area</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom(s)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Apartment Complex</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents Satisfaction With Rent**

The rent paid for an apartment dwelling should be a just compensation for the satisfaction received by the occupant residing therein. National figures indicate that the majority of individuals
pay 20 percent of their income for rent. It has been observed, however, that as one's income increases, beyond a certain point, the percentage paid for rent may decrease, and that a woman living alone may often pay a higher percentage of her income for rent than does the average individual. According to the figures obtained from this survey, the average unmarried woman paid 22 percent of her income for rent, whereas, the average unmarried man and the married couple each paid 17 percent of their incomes for rent (see TABLE 5, p. 40).

The respondents in this study were asked, "Do you feel you are getting your money's worth for the rent you are paying for your present apartment?" Fifty-five percent of all respondents answered "Yes," 26 percent answered "No," 15 percent were Undecided, and 4 percent did not express an opinion. Of the total number of respondents the least satisfied were in the income group $15,000-19,999, and the most satisfied were in the income group $20,000 and above. (see TABLE 14 below).

## TABLE 14

SATISFACTION WITH RENT SCHEDULE IN TERMS OF "GETTING MONEY'S WORTH" BY INCOME GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>Percentage Satisfied or Dissatisfied with Rent Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,999 and under</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000-14,999</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000-19,999</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 and above</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over half of the respondents felt they were getting satisfaction from their apartment for the amount of rent they were paying.

When asked, "If you are planning to move soon, is it because of dissatisfaction with the rent?" only 11 percent of the total number of respondents gave rent as a reason for moving; five percent gave rent, apartment, and other as reasons for moving. It is assumed that the respondents who were "Undecided" regarding the rent schedule were more satisfied than dissatisfied. Thus, it may be assumed that the rental schedule appears to be acceptable to the majority of respondents.

In addition to the rent, each head of household also pays his own heating, water heating and parking, which can amount to approximately $20.00 to $25.00 each month. Many high rise apartments include these items in their rental schedule.

Hypothesis IV stated: Residents of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will be in agreement that the rental schedule will be high in relation to the satisfaction provided by the apartment design.

The hypothesis is rejected. Over half (35 percent) of the occupants felt that they were "getting their money's worth," 26 percent did not feel they were getting their "money's worth," 15 percent were "Undecided," and 4 percent did not indicate an opinion. It may be assumed that there is a more positive feeling toward satisfaction than dissatisfaction by the respondents with the rental schedule established in terms of the apartment design.
Recognition of Respondents Needs and Preferences

To determine the respondents values in terms of the items which he considers essential to his comfort and satisfaction, the respondent was asked to check items which he would like to have incorporated in his present apartment. The results are found in Table 15, p. 67. The items checked as most essential were: (1) dishwasher, (2) larger rooms, and (3) more closet space.

The question is not can these needs be satisfied, but can they go unsatisfied? These items are purely functional, practical housing needs. The respondents were extremely conservative and honest in checking only the items which they felt were essential. If developers would satisfy these expressed needs, it could make the difference between holding an occupant for a short period of time (one or two years as is often the case) or holding the occupant for a longer period of time by providing him with an apartment which incorporates the basic ingredient of a home--space necessary for flexible furniture arrangement and for the individual to have the opportunity to express his individuality.

The other items listed which were requested by a smaller number of respondents and would be considered by many to be "luxury" items--items not often found in middle to upper-middle income apartments. Raven has said (16:68) that individuals do not know what they want until they have experienced something better, and perhaps that reasoning applies here. Other explanations for the small percentage of respondents requesting these more "luxurious" items may be:
(1) the respondents really did not feel these items were essential, or
(2) they did not have them in previous apartments and felt reluctant
to ask for them.

The respondent may still not recognize his apartment as his
home, for as one respondent commented, "After all, let's face it ---
it's only an apartment!"

It is the responsibility of the high rise apartment occupant
to begin to analyze his own needs and preferences and to make these
needs known to designers and developers. Once this has been done, it
will be the most significant step the occupant can take toward achiev-
ing an apartment designed as a home and not just as a temporary resid-
ency.

Hypothesis V stated: The housing needs and preferences of the
urban middle and upper-middle income occupants residing in the high
rise apartment complex selected for this study are not being fully re-
cognized by the individuals responsible for creating the dwelling
structures, or by the individuals living therein.

The hypothesis is partially accepted. Almost half of the res-
pondents indicated that a dishwasher and larger rooms were essential
for their comfort and satisfaction, and 42 percent of the respondents
wanted additional closet space. These are essential housing needs
and could be satisfied by the developers. It is of interest to note
that the respondents were very conservative in their response, and
checked only the items which they thought essential, and not items
considered to be luxurious.
Both the occupants and the developers will be responsible for tomorrow's high rise apartment complexes. It is hoped that both parties will work together toward achieving better housing design and more profitable buildings.

**TABLE 15**

FEATURES LACKING IN APARTMENT WHICH RESPONDENTS INDICATED AS ESSENTIAL TO COMFORT AND SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number and Percentage of Respondents Desiring Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger Rooms</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Closet Space</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplace</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors to Divide Kitchen From Living Room</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built-in Cabinets and Shelves</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Room</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry Equipment in Apartment</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Wall Treatment</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Floor Treatment</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet Bar</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Rooms</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment Well Designed The Way It Is</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS WITH RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The construction of high rise apartments is increasing, yet the vital research necessary to implement the improvement of each succeeding building is lacking. This study is concerned with one phase of the needed research, the sociological needs and preferences of middle and upper-middle income occupants in the high rise apartment complex selected.

The subject of this study is a five acre, 532 unit high rise apartment complex in Los Angeles County. The complex is the first phase of a four phase urban renewal project which will ultimately consist of 2000 apartment dwellings. It was assumed that the complex selected was typical of other middle and upper-middle income high rise apartment developments built in 1966-1967. The complex studied consists of two, 17 story apartment towers and select recreational and commercial facilities. Within each apartment tower there are four apartment plans: two, one-bedroom plans (A and D), comprising 72 percent of the total number of apartments in the complex; one, one-bedroom and den plan (c), comprising 12 percent of the total number of apartments in the complex; and one, two-bedroom plan (b), comprising 26 percent of the total number of apartments in the complex.

The research instrument used in this study was a questionnaire. The questionnaire was mailed to 266 heads of households in the apart-
ment complex; the names were obtained from public records. One-hundred and forty-one questionnaires were returned to the investigator, resulting in a sample which was representative of 32 percent of the total number of heads of households in the complex at the time of the study.

The following hypotheses were analyzed in terms of the data collected from the research instrument:

**Hypothesis I**: The occupants of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will be mostly adults in the middle and upper-middle income level, married and unmarried, and without children. Hypothesis I is accepted: Of the total number of respondents (141), 60 percent were male, 30 percent were female, and 10 percent did not indicate sex. Fifteen percent of the total number of respondents had at one time lived in another high rise apartment complex. Immediately before moving into their present apartment, ninety-three of the total number of respondents had lived in Los Angeles County. The median age range for all heads of households was 45 to 54 years; the median income was $12,000 to $14,999. Children were found in 12 percent of the households. Fifty-five percent of the total number of respondents were unmarried, 43 percent were married, and 2 percent did not indicate marital status.

**Hypothesis II**: The majority of the occupants in the high rise apartment complex selected for this study will have considered location the single most important factor in the selection of their apartment. Hypothesis II is accepted. Based on the findings, the
occupants selected their apartments primarily because of location. The three reasons most often given were, proximity to the beach, view, and proximity to Santa Monica. Other reasons for apartment selection were: liked the design and features of the apartment, security, wanted to live in a high rise apartment, privacy, and to be near shopping and business areas.

**Hypothesis III.** High rise apartment living will be an acceptable form of housing to the residents of the high rise apartment complex selected for this study; however, the residents will not be satisfied with all of the aspects of their individual apartment or of the total apartment complex. Hypothesis III is accepted in part. Based on the findings, the respondents were satisfied with high rise living in terms of: (1) length of occupancy in their apartment and their intention to remain in their apartment, (2) their expression of high rise living meeting their expectations, and (3) their feelings of pride from living in a high rise apartment. The respondents were not satisfied with all of the aspects of the individual rooms in their apartments. The hypothesis was partially rejected based on the findings that the respondents were satisfied with the design of the total apartment complex. It is assumed, based on the data, that the respondents were satisfied with the concept of high rise living, the design of the apartment complex and the services and facilities offered by the complex and the location, but were not satisfied with the design of their individual apartments within the complex.

**Hypothesis IV.** Residents of the high rise apartment complex
selected for this study will be in agreement that the rental schedule will be high in relation to the satisfaction provided by the apartment design. Hypothesis IV is rejected. Over half of the respondents (55 percent) felt that they were "getting their money's worth" in terms of the rent paid, 15 percent were undecided, and 26 percent were not satisfied with the rent schedule. It may be assumed that there were more positive feelings than negative feeling toward the rent schedule.

**Hypothesis V.** The housing needs and preferences of the urban middle and upper-middle income occupants residing in the high rise apartment complex selected for this study are not being fully recognized by the individuals responsible for creating the dwelling or by the individuals living therein. Hypothesis V is partially accepted. Approximately fifty percent of the respondents expressed as essential their need for a dishwasher and larger rooms; 43 percent wanted additional closet area.

These are basic, functional housing needs which the respondents felt were essential to their comfort and satisfaction. Only a small percentage of the respondents expressed a need for the items not frequently found in middle and upper-middle income apartments, the more "luxurious" items.

It is assumed that most of the respondents are not recognizing their own essential housing needs, and that those individuals are still thinking of their apartments the way they have been designed---as temporary residences and not as their homes. The occupants are
not demanding the same comforts from their apartments that they would have demanded from a home. If apartments are to become more comfortable and satisfying places in which to live, the occupants as well as the developers must recognize the occupant’s essential housing needs and the two must work toward making the necessary modifications in present apartment design to meet these needs.
Conclusions

It is significant that of the 266 high rise apartment occupants who were mailed questionnaires, 57 percent (151 respondents) completed and returned the questionnaires (because of the investigator's time limitation, however, the data from only 141 questionnaires were compiled in this study). This response is evidence of the occupant's concern with the design of future high rise apartment complexes and his willingness to offer his honest opinion regarding his present housing.

When architects, developers, and city planners commence planning the remaining three phases of the urban redevelopment project, it is hoped that they will give serious consideration to the data compiled from the questionnaires, and to other extremely important factors, namely:

1. the population density of the total area (20 acres)
2. the view possible from all apartments
3. the recreational facilities available to the occupants
4. the environmental planning of the total project (four phases).

Fortune (2:26) has specified that 75 apartment units per acre is the maximum number of units for comfortable living. The number of units in parcel one (the high rise apartment complex studied) is 106 per acre; therefore, there are 151 units above the maximum number for comfortable living according to Fortune. This population density is
not a problem at present because of the undeveloped land adjacent to the complex. However, should the present redevelopment project plans to be followed (to construct 500 units per acre), the area will be overbuilt by 620 units. If such high density construction does occur: (1) there will be an overpopulated area in terms of comfortable living, (2) the possibility of a good view from the largest number of apartments will be diminished if not totally eradicated, (3) recreational facilities will all but disappear (the golf course) or be inadequate to accommodate the number of occupants (swimming pool area), and (4) gardens, walkways, and children's play areas will be limited or nonexistent.

The following concluding remarks were contributed by the respondents. On the last page of the questionnaire the respondents were invited to make comments if they wished. Some of the typical comments were:

1. "My opinion is that the two-bedroom apartment should have 1500 to 1600 sq. ft., providing larger rooms with more closet area, and that we should have the option of selecting the carpets and draperies we'd like."

2. "This apartment complex does accept children, but my greatest wish is that they would have provided some play area - complete with swings, slides, jungle gyms, and sand boxes for the younger set. It's one recreational aspect they completely ignored."

3. "The three most outstanding criticisms of the apartment (in order of importance) are: 
(1) No dishwasher (unbelievable)

(2) Heater poorly placed and creates safety hazard

(3) Not enough elevators (should have four; often wait five minutes or more

However, lack of a dishwasher is the only deficiency which would cause us to move. I have often said that the view, grounds, pool, management and location are so nice that if I had a dishwasher I'd never leave."

4. "If high rise apartments are the way of living for the future, then architects will have to use more imagination in designing them so that the buildings aren't slabs of concrete which conform to a set of rules that rob the individual of his identity and his identification with the place in which he lives."

5. "Glad to have had the opportunity to answer this questionnaire. Generally I liked living in a high rise apartment and would have re-rented one in Newport Beach if it had been possible. Am now living in a split level 2 bedroom, 2-1/2 bath condominium complex with a pool, recreation room, sauna bath, private garage, patio, dishwasher, washer and dryer, separate kitchen, separate dining area and for approximately the same rent ($200.00 mo.) In addition the area is more elegant."

6. "The person answering this questionnaire likes living near the beach, and the beautiful view of the ocean and the mountains. He enjoys living in a high rise apartment, generally speaking, because of the opportunity to meet interesting people of different backgrounds, color, economic levels, and ages, and to occasionally ac-
quire new friends. The atmosphere is friendly and the presence of children adds considerably to the pleasure. Unfortunately, the architects did a poor job of creating a complex which somehow mars the beautiful environment. In some areas of South America, Europe, and the Middle East high rise apartments complement and enhance the environment; this one does not. I must admit that I enjoy living here and that I do like the idea of high rise living. Hopefully, the builders of new high rise apartments will take into account some of the opinions expressed by the residents in their answers to your questionnaire."
Recommendations for Further Study

It is recognized that some developers, architects and city planners are not concerned with the findings of research, yet there is reason to believe that these individuals are the very individuals who need research most desperately. It is the task, therefore, of the individual in society to demand that his housing needs and preferences be heard and that the information collected be utilized in the future design of high rise apartments.

The writer believes that each high rise apartment occupant must take an active role in: (1) evaluating high rise apartment living in terms of his own needs and preferences, and (2) in providing suggestions for future high rise apartments. Because of these beliefs, the writer suggests that a committee be formed composed of the occupants of the high rise apartment surveyed, and that this committee meet together with the individuals who are presently making the plans for the second phase of the redevelopment project. It is to the advantage and benefit of the developers to listen and to consider the recommendations and evaluations presented by the occupants. Through the co-operative venture of the developers and the occupants working together could result: (1) improvement of the apartment complex design in terms of satisfying the needs and preferences of the occupants, (2) positioning the building on the site for better utilizing of air space and view potential, and (3) involvement in the community.
This study was concerned exclusively with the characteristics and attitudes of middle and upper-middle income level occupants in a particular high rise apartment complex. It would be of great value to conduct a similar study of a similar apartment complex in Los Angeles County in order to test the replicability of the data reported in this study. Other suggestions for studies might include:

1. Attitude studies of occupants in high rise complexes - a comparison study between the occupants of an older high rise apartment and the occupants in a recently constructed high rise complex designed for the same income level.

2. A comparison of high rise apartments (designed for occupants of a certain income level) in terms of cost per unit, apartment design, amenities provided, and rental schedule.

3. Analyze the design of the individual rooms within a selected high rise apartment and then re-design the apartment into a more liveable plan.

4. Analyze the overall design of a selected high rise apartment complex and then re-designing the complex (rather than the individual apartments within the complex) to meet the needs of the occupants.

5. Compare two high rise apartments, one considered a "luxury" apartment and one considered "middle-income" in terms of design, features, services, family composition, amenities and rent.

Architects, developers, and other individuals interested in building future high rise apartments that will: (1) satisfy the housing needs and preferences of the occupants, and (2) result in a profitable investment, have a potentially outstanding opportunity.
By encouraging and promoting research in all fields pertaining to high rise construction (economical, technological, and sociological) on existing high rise apartment buildings in Los Angeles County, a collection of findings could be accumulated which could result in improved design and profits, and could contribute to the future design of high rise apartment buildings.
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SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
Northridge, California 91324

Dear Occupant:

Sonia Bubar, a graduate student in housing research, is studying the attitudes of persons living in high rise apartments for her master's thesis. Your participation in this study will be greatly appreciated. All information received will be confidential; you need not sign your name.

The once flat Los Angeles skyline is now being dotted with high rise apartments such as the one in which you live. By residing in a high rise apartment, you are actually "ahead of your time" in terms of California housing. For this reason, your ideas about apartment living are extremely valuable to architects, developers, city planners, and those individuals who are shaping our future apartments, our cities, and consequently our lives.

Won't you please take just a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it today in the self-addressed stamped envelope? Your thoughts and suggestions will be of extreme importance to the future of high rise apartment developments in the Los Angeles area.

Very truly yours,

Gordon Kilgour, PhD
Chairman of
Home Economics Department
Confidential Housing Research Questionnaire

You can answer most of the questions by putting a check in the box next to the answer which comes closest to what you think.

1. Please darken the square in this floor plan which corresponds to the apartment which you occupy.

   North


   Elevator

   Hall

   Hall

   East

   South


   2. On what floor is your apartment located?
      (□) 1-3 (□) 4-6 (□) 7-9 (□) 10-12 (□) 13-15 (□) 16-17

   3. How many garage stalls do you rent? (□) 0 (□) 1 (□) 2 or more

   4. How long have you lived in your present apartment?
      (□) Less than 6 months (□) 6 months to 1 year
      (□) 1 year or longer

   5. How long do you plan to remain in your present apartment?
      (□) Less than 1 year (□) 1 to 2 years (□) 3 or more years
      (□) Unsure

   6. If you are planning to move soon is it because of dissatisfaction with (□) The apartment (□) The rent (□) Other
      (□) Not moving soon
7. In what type of residences have you lived before moving to your present apartment?

( ) Single family residence
( ) Low rise apartment (Less than 8 stories)
( ) High rise apartment (8 stories or higher)
( ) Other

5. Before moving to your present apartment, in what area did you live?
   City_________________________ State_________________________

9. Why did you select your present apartment? Check deciding factors:

( ) Wanted to live in a high rise apartment
( ) Wanted to live near the beach
( ) Liked the design and features of the apartment I selected
( ) Wanted to be in Santa Monica area
( ) Wanted an apartment with a view
( ) Wanted the security of a high rise apartment
( ) Wanted privacy
( ) Wanted a convenient location to shopping and business areas
( ) Other

Would you have rented your present apartment if it were not located next to the beach? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Uncertain

10. Do you feel you are getting your money's worth for the rent you are paying for your present apartment? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Undecided

11. What features do you particularly <b>like</b> about your apartment?

_________________________________________________________

12. What features do you like <b>least</b> about your present apartment?

_________________________________________________________

13. Does high rise living meet your expectations? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Unsure
14. Please circle the number which comes closest to the way you feel about the following questions: (1 represents your complete satisfaction, 3 is adequate satisfaction, and 5 represents dissatisfaction)

1. Are you pleased with the Living-Dining Room? (Consider: size and shape, design, entertaining needs, window area, eating area, etc.)
   1 2 3 4 5 Undecided

2. How do you like the way the kitchen is planned? (Consider: equipment, lighting, counter area, storage area, cabinet design, ventilation, etc.)
   1 2 3 4 5 Undecided

3. Would you say that the Bedroom(s) is/are well designed?
   1 2 3 4 5 Undecided

4. Do you find the Bathroom well planned? (Consider: Water temperature, fixtures, mirror area, storage area, etc.)
   1 2 3 4 5 Undecided

5. Do you think the apartment complex as a whole is well designed (Consider: entry lobby, hallways, orientation of building to sun, wind, streets, landscaping, entertainment rooms, security, parking)
   1 2 3 4 5 Undecided

Please comment on the above answers which you rated 4 or 5

15. Do you have a feeling of pride about living in a high rise apartment? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Undecided

16. If you have a Den, do you use it as: ( ) Den ( ) Bedroom
   ( ) Other

   If you have a second Bedroom, do you use it as: ( ) Den
   ( ) Bedroom ( ) Other

17. Are you bothered by noise from:
   ( ) The hall area ( ) Adjoining apartment(s)
   ( ) The elevator ( ) Trash chute
   ( ) Street noise ( ) Other noise
   ( ) Not at all bothered by noise
18. How would you rate the following items within your apartment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insulation of interior walls</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation of exterior walls</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artificial lighting</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color scheme</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating system</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpeting</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draperies</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closet area for clothing</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage area</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of rooms</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment on any rating of Fair or Poor:


19. Do you think that a bathtub and a stall shower are both necessary in a well designed bathroom? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Undecided

20. Do you use your balcony as a place for:
- ( ) Relaxing, sunning
- ( ) Standing, walking outside
- ( ) Flowers and plants
- ( ) Not at all

21. Do you feel that a balcony is essential to your apartment?
- ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) Undecided

22. How often do you use the following services and recreational facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf course</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiard room</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundry room</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party room</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack shop, deli</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>(</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Of the following items, please check only the items which you feel are essential to your comfort and satisfaction and should be included in your apartment:

- Larger rooms
- More rooms
- Additional closet space
- Built-in cabinets and shelves
- Doors to divide kitchen from living room
- Laundry equipment in apartment area
- Other
- Apartment well designed the way it is

24. Do you prefer an apartment designed for ( ) one level
   ( ) split level ( ) undecided

And Finally:

Would you please answer the following questions about yourself and any persons living with you.

How many persons occupy the apartment? (Including yourself) ______________

Were you born in California? ( ) Yes ( ) No

Are you: ( ) Male ( ) Female ( ) Single ( ) Married
   ( ) Divorced ( ) Widowed

What is your approximate age? ( ) Under 21 ( ) 21 to 34
   ( ) 35 to 44 ( ) 45 to 54 ( ) 55 to 64 ( ) 65 or above

What is your occupation? ______________ Spouse's Occupation? ______________

How many adults 18 years and older live with you? ______________________

What are their ages? ( ) Under 21 ( ) 21 to 34 ( ) 35 to 44
   ( ) 45 to 54 ( ) 55 to 64 ( ) 65 or above

What is their relationship? ( ) Spouse ( ) Family ( ) Not related

How many children under 18 years live with you? ______________________

What are their ages? ( ) Under 6 years ( ) 6 to 12 years
   ( ) 13 to 17 years

Which of the following most nearly corresponds to your family's total annual income last year before deductions?

- Less than $6,000 ( ) $6,000 to $8,999 ( ) $9,000 to $11,999
- $12,000 to $14,999 ( ) $15,000 to $19,999 ( ) $20,000 or more
Please do not sign your name.

Comments

I sincerely appreciate the time you have taken in contributing to this research project. Thank you very much.