

difference between the two maintenance costs. It will take the form largely of interior decorating, but I would think that as the years went by, say after five or ten years, the apartment type of dwelling will have lower maintenance costs than the individual units. There is one other important difference too, and that is that the apartment type of unit probably has a lower heating cost per annum by some \$60 to \$80 a year I would think.

*By Mr. Pearkes:*

Q. May I ask a question. I notice in a lot of these individual buildings, some are almost side by side, and in other cases they are separated in fairly wide spacings. Is there any reason why a large number of these houses are so widely spaced, because that must add to servicing, heating costs, maintenance, roads, drains and all that sort of thing, plus the landscaping which is necessary around it. Are some of these houses for different ranks, or is there any particular reason why some are far more widely spaced than others?—A. Well, General Pearkes, in the early stages of married quarters, the lots I think ran up as high as 100 feet. It became obvious that the occupants were having the greatest difficulty in looking after these large expenses of land. When we became associated with the Department of National Defence in the married quarters program, we suggested, and they readily agreed, that lots 75 & 100 feet in width were too big and generally speaking the layout at the moment is on a 50 foot basis. I believe that the 50 foot basis is probably the best compromise that can be found. I think that anything lower—the next step down would be 40 feet—would bring you back to some of the undesirable features of some of our metropolitan communities. On the other hand, if we went to 60 feet, I feel you would get into the very type of trouble which you have mentioned, so that the plot planning of these projects generally is taking the form of 50 foot lots. Now, some of the projects General Pearkes, the Radburn type—as it is called in the United States,—in Canada we call the Wildwood plan—take the form with the roadways around the back of the house and with the front of the houses looking out on to open park areas with the sidewalk going down the center. That tends to increase the landscaping cost as you have suggested, and although it gives a very attractive layout, it does have the effect of raising costs, not only original landscaping costs, but also continuing maintenance. I think that whereas 15 or 20 of these projects have been done in what we call the Wildwood fashion, that the trend now is back to the conventional layout.

Q. After all, service personnel are continually changing. They are not like civilians who purchase a home and expect to keep it for 20 or 30 years perhaps. Service personnel are changing quite frequently, and perhaps every two years. My experience is that I do not want to be bothered keeping up a park. I am glad to hear that the wide spacing is not being used.—A. I may say that we have done a certain amount of promoting with the Department of National Defence, and they have accepted in certain instances, row housing. I think there is a great deal to be said for row housing with the lots kept down to virtually the width of the row housing and with the playing space and lawn areas provided in bulk rather than being flanked to each one of a group of individual houses.

Q. How many houses have you to the acre on the 50 foot lot?—A. About four and a half sir, on the average with 120 foot depth. They can be squeezed to five, but about  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , compared with the apartment house density of about 18, the row housing is 8 to 10.

*By Mr. Adamson:*

Q. So the density in the Wildwood which I presume is the zig-zag streets and that sort of thing, is approximately half of the row houses which in turn