

Mrs. Pearson <sup>✓</sup> <sup>hor</sup>  
Street Interview

<sup>SP</sup>  
I like the openness, I like the width of the sidewalks, I like the feeling of uncrowded space (no matter how many people are here you can still have space to walk); I like the buildings with signs that are on the wall and not at right angles to the wall, even when they're mangled. I like the clock sitting <sup>SF</sup> in the middle of the sidewalk like a for you to stumble over. I like Mr. Worth's <sup>S, B</sup> of Boston over there which is very pleasant. But, generally, I like the simple and undecorated facade. Kakas <sup>S, B</sup> is another nice building, but the Bigelow-Kennard <sup>S, B</sup> sign out there spoils the front of it. I don't like tall buildings particularly; I think these are high enough <sup>C</sup> for a feeling of space. Of course, from here there's always the Common which is nice. -- it's trees, <sup>SP + H</sup> grass, and again the feeling of openness. <sup>B</sup> Of course, you get that at both ends of this, with the Copley down here and the library. So you never can feel at the bottom of a well on this spot.

<sup>B</sup>  
Arlington St. Church, which I would like a lot better if it weren't of red sandstone that peels. It discolors, peels, chips off and flakes. It's a nice old church. Very nicely situated, and again, on the corner it doesn't give you the feeling of being too cramped. <sup>B</sup> an eyesore, even though it's been peeled about as well as it could be peeled. Decorating under the palladium arch at the top we could do without.

<sup>C</sup>  
I think it's the hodge-podgeness of our streets, like down ahead of us, that is so sort of discouraging. Any city. It seems to me ~~that~~ Boston is more consistent because it's still has <sup>blocks</sup> lots of stores that are still approximately the same age, more consistent than a lot of other cities whose downtown areas are so -- look at that block. Every building is different in scale, in detail and material. That's alright; nobody wants a factory with everything just alike, but there should be some effort at coordination of affects and not with curved windows in a brick building next door to a modern Kodak or whatever that place is there. The rectangular windows on the two buildings this side are alright, then you get curves, then you get modern rectangles with horizontal stripes, then you get more rectangles. So, altogether it doesn't add up to much.  
(around the corner)

<sup>B</sup>  
There's very little around here, except the church. You see what I mean by peeling up there -- that light patch on the column. It would be much better if it were made of material that stood up. This doesn't mellow very well. It's partly pigeons, too, I expect. These, again, are our worse period buildings probably. The Ritz <sup>B</sup> is alright. The top <sup>SP</sup> but at least it's simple. That's a very nice iron railing, very lovely. But that probably was an addition.

<sup>M</sup>  
I think looking down the street here, where the sun hits the buildings two blocks or so down, is a sort of unified loveliness. At least, all are approximately the same height, all built at approximately the same time, all having certain characteristics very definitely in common. Of course, I'm wildly in love with Boston chimney-pots; I think they're the most fascinating things in the world. And I like the punctuation marks of church steeples here and there, particularly when they really are steeples like they are against buildings like this <sup>B</sup> block.

This is a real nice <sup>SP</sup> Do you suppose it's been redone on this side. By and large, the shop windows are so fascinating I saw them <sup>S</sup> in this block. On this whole block there's only one sign that sticks out, except down at the end.

<sup>S</sup>  
nicely designed. It's not as completely dull as <sup>SP</sup> and yet there are no great expressions. <sup>C</sup> Rather nice architecture. All fairly consistent. I imagine they must have all been remodeled at about the same time, because they do give a sort of unified effect. Lovely wide <sup>SP</sup> sidewalks. But I think the main thing is the fact that there aren't any old signs sticking out. Look across the street at the difference -- you have bow windows, bay windows and recesses, signs out all over the place. I should say that probably these buildings were of the same age but they had new fronts. That's a guess,

I don't know. They look much older, so I just wondered if maybe these had had a face-lifting and those hadn't. These do look like insipient slums. Someday they could be, like various sections of New York and other sections, the old brownstones have gone to pot. They just seem to have the seeds of decay. It's amusing that there is a right side and a wrong side, a good side and a bad side to a street. It is a fact. And how much the fact is influenced by the architectural unity or the beauty or anything else of the shops on the street, I don't know. Whether that's a result or cause. But that's kind of on the hideous side, the church. It's rather graceless. Not big enough to carry its points. And I think the color is hideous, the stone and the trim. Although I do like --- And I do like Mr. Bonwit. I like it largely because of space, the affect of non-crowding. I know it was an old MIT building at one time. It's very nice Georgian architecture. Its front windows have been remodeled at a later time, I presume, and ruined, but even so it's gay and distinguished, it's done with taste, and mainly it isn't space, I think, that makes it largely attractive. If the <sup>front</sup> steps were level with the sidewalk and there were a building on each side, it would just be something else, another rather homely spot.

(down the alley) Don't you mind because heaven knows what we're going to get into, in the way of rats and trash. This is really Boston, I suppose, <sup>SP</sup> it's back alleys, and they should all be done away with, I don't know how. This sort of <sup>Misc</sup> trash, <sup>SF</sup> garbage cans, discarded restaurant stuff, this sort of thing should definitely not be allowed on sidewalks and places through the city. They're horrible eyesores. People have to have back doors and they have to have ways to dispose of garbage, but they should have adequate containers. There's really no excuse for things scattered around on the ground with no attempt to put them into anything, just any old way. But there they are and they always are. I drive my car up this way very frequently and that's how I know about the rats. <sup>M</sup> There are enough cars and enough trucking up here so that they keep glass <sup>out</sup> out of the alley. That's <sup>max</sup>max about the only thing that's out of the alley; everything else is right with us.

Trucks have to be there, but cars park along and line and the \_\_\_\_\_ can't get through. <sup>T</sup>

Very dirty. The whole city is not really a very clean one. I suspect we've been walking around just about as clean looking a block as there is in Boston. <sup>max</sup>

Back end of everything. Ritz parking lot. \_\_\_\_\_ <sup>SP</sup>

(walk around the front of the church again) I'm glad it's not as cold as it was the day before yesterday or we wouldn't have done much strolling. (talk about the weather) <sup>M</sup>  
It's hard to

A wonderful job of post-hurricane repair work here. <sup>PP</sup> I remember where the big trees were. Right after the hurricane you thought the Garden was ruined and would never be useful again, and now you can't remember where the trees were. There were boardwalks on most of walks last winter. I think the hard-tops are much better. I used to walk across frequently in the wintertime, on and off the mud and the walks they had, and they were no fun. <sup>N</sup>