

# EXISTING SPACE

## THE ENTIRE SPACE CONTINUUM OF WHICH LEE BELONGS

SPACE (like other natural, manmade or cultural elements) has meaning for Lee throughout many different scales: from grand geographic size "Megalopolis space," to regional "Berkshire space," to "whole downtown Lee space," to local intimate size "sub-downtown area-pattern space", to personal "sub-articulations" of Lee space. Space is a necessary component of "place", and therefore of all the places within places that compose the Lee-relevant landscape continuum. We can meaningfully conceptualize the "BERKSHIRE/LEE SPACE-CONTINUUM" from large to small scale as "enclosures within enclosures" (as one of many interpretations linguistically knitted) as follows:

"Lee is:

within the grand Eastern Seaboard/Appalachian Meg. corridor-plane space;

within that, it is in a spatially profound sense deep within the Berkshire valley space;

within that, the downtown is spatially a single perched bowl, immediately enclosed by local forested landform east, north and westward; (with views penetrating the enclosures, and open on the south to distant landform;

Within that, the six spatial (node/corridor/planal volume) compositional areas (the overall pattern layout of structures/landform/plants, such as the double-node/corridor of Main Street and its n/s ends) of downtown;

within which are spatial articulations (specific pockets, alleys, courts, walking and driving areas, and their sub-articulations (eg jogs of stairs, recessions, individual trees, bench nooks etc)".

IE: At the large continental scale, the Appalachian landform and waterbodies are the gross enclosures of space; then at the regional scale are Berkshire landforms and plants as enclosures. ((These are either geomorphic & biomorphic formed by natural geology, plant communities, & waterbodies, or are rectilinear spaces (eg fields, grided regions) that are manmade)). Then are town whole scale and sub-town scale local landform, plants, buildings and other structural enclosures— predominantly manmade rectilinear and secondarily circular— or poor design with negative or residual form. (((NOTE: A gestaltist would observe that space at all scales is necessarily interpretable (and evaluated for coherency) in terms of good euclidian archtypes of point, node, corridor and planal shaped volumes, their edges and interrelations. (See diagram; see also supplementary enriched archtypes of Condon, Thiel, Alexander and Lynch). \* Regarding the interrelationship between all the different scales of space, we can conceive of space, among many other ways, as either a "gradient" or "hierarchical" continuum: space connects, yet divides throughout into a series of different scales— in the Berkshire/Lee case, space is a series of "enclosures within enclosures". (This statement begs interesting questions of "left brain" vs "right brain" methodology, and "rational" vs "emotive/intuitive" spatial interpretation— which proposals may address))).

All of this space becomes cumulatively real in multi-sequential experience as more than a perceptual script, for tourists, general travelers, and residents as they forever comb the region. From a person's first travel on, the continuum of space unfolds in ways dynamic as well as subtle; this scenario becomes inscribed in memory, enforced and cross-enforced with more time spent, as an emotive and sensual medium/context/backdrop to all they subsequently do: a deep structured & layered, qualitative memory (or is some at least an unconscious sense) of enclosures within enclosures. This repetition of concentric enclosures— "spaces within spaces"— can be translated in different ways: for tourists it may ultimately become an unexplainable protective-layered "cozyness", where Lee is felt as the region's spatial "cozy-enclosed heart". For residents it is especially place-making, giving Lee identity that metaphorically may even be part of their own human heart (inner-soul space). The identity is specially defined and modulated by spatial sequence in movement to/from Lee, and feeling protected by the womb of mutiple enclosures. One spatial example of sequential travel route: The long wide fast turnpike, the unwinding of space at the Lee rotary, the tight rural roadway to downtown, the opening arrival of the downtown spatial bowl, the locking into the subspaces of Oval Park Node/ Main Street Corridor/ Northend node (as the larger downtown spatial bowl perceptually oscilates, and with views that reach out to feel the distant regional space), and the departing of town through the perpendicular corridor space of Lower Center Street, over the bridge (feeling the again perpendicular river corridor, that echoes the Main Street corridor) and then turning to exit downtown space, to continue on the rural ribbon roadway, through woods, fields, within the mountain valley spaces of Upper Berkshires northward, ultimately to highway and perhaps suburbia NY space.

((For a Lee analysis, it is unusually important and challenging to imagine how space feels, and to comprehend it in-itself, at all scales— with full deliberate focus that is not distracted by the (albeit important in its own right) seductive enclosing materials of the Lee continuum (for example the beautiful and also materially signifigant Berkshire mountains). This understanding will allow designers to propose relevant connective spaces within downtown. We should respect that even the simplest strong form of pure space has unending potential for giving rich experience; and the combination of spaces-within-spaces can positively compound the experience, or negatively, confuse it. Moreover, it is important to appreciate that within and throughout Lee space-continuum, are different type/speed transportation systems that allow humans to experience the spatial continuum in multifarious ways of parts and as whole (ie airplane, train, turnpike, rural roadway and general downtown traffic, pedestrian). The human movement, activities, and sensational experiences of space are essential constitutions of people's "life continuum". So in a profound sense, the designing of space in downtown Lee is the creating and sustaining of a life-continuum— an existential habitat for physical and phenomenological engagement: Our life begins and continues with the unfolding of spaces. In this spirit, designers should consider the overall choreography of people encountering the Berkshire spatial totality, and the plurality of spatial zones, the town of Lee as a whole spatial-compostion, and within each spatial part of downtown Lee. Proposals of even smallest change in downtown would in effect be tapping into the whole space continuum— and should be seen ultimately that context for the different people who move through it at different times, speeds, sequence, at different times, with different mindsets and purpose.

---

\* A survey of the different scales the Lee Space Continuum, with understanding they too must ultimately be interpreted as a whole, is as follows:

#### A) CONTINENTAL EASTERN SEABOARD SPACE:

The eastern seaboard, of which Lee belongs, is planal-corridor definitively enclosed westward and variously north-southly by the Appalachian Mountains, and is bordered (open) eastward by the ocean. This overall space is generally articulated within by forests, city and suburban patterns, and by roadway systems that alter and/or selectively reveal the space. People come to gradually know such space by air/train/vehicular/foot travel, enforced by photo or map images. (It is debatable how many people and to what degree have a mindset (vs a diagrammatic image or material-concept) of the spatiality of this grand scale area in terms of pure space and "space sensation". But whatever degree the space is consciously felt, the identity of place (with terrain, plant and built patterns) and people's experience is totally wrapped up with space; and the spatial quality (even as image) is so character-giving and important as distinct from other parts of the world where, for example where it is flat and open (Egypt) or pluralistic (Greece), or compartmentalized into tight exterior rooms (Rome), or complex-crowded (rainforest). Within the continental region itself is a range of spatial extremes— of open, wooded, bay, field/swamp, suburban, rural, urban— that in general constitute extraregional character distinct from elsewhere in world. We should appreciate that as being unique, ((while also understanding that within that context, on a smaller scale, the Berkshire Area's space is relatively much different— more powerful (in beauty and sublimity, in refugal appeal and natural age) than most places of the continental megalopolis)).

---

**B) CONTEXTUAL BERKSHIRE COUNTY SPACE:** Berkshire space is dictated primarily by varied topography (mountain, local hills, valley, terraces, banks, gorges), and secondarily by vegetation that coats it (the fields and different succession-stage plants and forests), and thirdly by the towns and cities within it (eg buildings, roads, walls, parks). This overall makes for a rich diversity of "Berkshire space" that unifies as a regional spatial-pluality: at once has an overall space character as a single Berkshire place (with the spatial theme of Berkshire hill/valley), while also stroked by inherent spatial variations. This includes: the 'corridor space' of rivers, roadways, paths through the woods; the 'planal space' and the node space of open valley and field; other special space: the dense and ethereal canopies of different woodlands, the small wooded/partially-open yards, and the spatial compositions of great estates (eg Naumkeg); the wide open volume space, with dome sky above and terrain below, that is experienced especially from hill tops, and often hinted through valley tree tops. It is a significant issue whether these archtypes are repeated or contrasted at the small scale within the downtown proposals. Euclidian archtypes of node/corridor and planeal volumes in most of Berkshire region have the biomorphic and geomorphic forms of nature (which many roads follow) while the towns and cities engage the recatlineal as well. The experiences of space available in vehicles and on foot are infinite in variety: some major routes of spatial experience are shared by all, while others are personal and unique. An example of a major experience are travelers to Lee from Boston who encounter a beautiful symphonic spatial sequence: the wide corridor space of the straight turnpike, the unwinding node space of the pike interchange at Lee, the biomorphic ribbon of rural roadway corridor that cuts through the region, giving experience of the rectalinear field and forest space, and vistas to the big valley, other towns. Then one meets downtown Lee as a whole bowl space, with spatial subpatterns within it (ie the six subspace areas, described below). In all, space may really be what people enjoy most about the Berkshires— more than they can know or say in our "object-oriented" culture of perception and language. They feel it positively, (though sometimes may only think of it only as the inverse of the enclosing materials). Space is the positive ominous medium that allows activity and always gives sensation; it makes a psychological force that brings good sensation proportional to its positive form and varying qualitatively due to slightest change in form and size. And if (in the words of Becket) "all life is but field and ground"— then space presents itself as lightfilled silent omnipresent background for life to carve itself out against. Space is seldom as rich— be it in psychological, aesthetic, scientific "mystical" or indescribable other ways— as in the Berkshires.

---

C) DOWNTOWN LEE SPACE AS WHOLE: is interpretable as a "spatial bowl", "perched upon descending terraces". It is enclosed by forested landform that is both immediately near (the north and west cross river upland, and the looming east hill) and distant (the regional hills seen southward). ((The forest surface upon the defining land mass is ethereal, translucent and varies its appearance and compounds the sense of spatial change with a viewer's proximity)). What is fascinating— sometimes subtle other times dramatic— for a person, moving about downtown effects a changing feeling of this bowl so the experience is quite different at different locations, seasons and hours of light: While entering or leaving downtown, one gets the strongest sensation of Lee is intrinsically within this single bowl of space— this bowl seems to have originally determined and now preserves Lee boundries and scale, its general mood, and is its identity for all time. Dynamic changes occur in apparant size, shape, emotively as being powerful or timid with every motion and turn. For example, the space can be felt powerfully from the top of Main Street, where one can increasingly forget the foreground local corridor space, and instead see to distant hills; and from the Eaton/Chopper/RR area, one sees the enclosing east and distant south hills; Or instead, sometimes the bowl is a "silently-felt" backdrop that is then overshadowed when people become concentrate within the immediate subspaces formed by close structures and areas within downtown bowl. (Layers of close and distant spatial enclosures are endlessly juxtaposed and moving in different synchronity that regulates endless spatial variations). The dynamic sense of this spatial bowl (ie the downtown space whole) is therefore omnipresent, be it fully or semiconsciously— always contributing a unifying spatial experience behind all activity and physical subspaces and areas that otherwise fracture the town within. For humanity, this bowl of space is ultimately the sum of all its phenomena... a sum that should be celebrated in a revitalization.

---

#### D) SUBDOWNTOWN SPACE

The pattern of space within downtown can be cross-interpreted in several ways: as a gross area "field/ground image"; as comprising the "six landuse areas"; as entailing "eight space types"; as special archtypes by Theil, Condon, Newman/Greenbee; conjunction of soft/hard & dominate/subordinate space; (see also the pedestrian/vehicle analysis). (Total study area is approx 137 acres). In this analysis it is important to comprehend Lee's downtown space for its powerful as well as subtle attributes— to feel the town character as experienced (on foot or vehicular) purely in terms of spatial sensation and how space accomodates human activities— to experience a single space, the relationships as we move through different combinations of spaces (to feel their similarities and contrasts), and ultimately the whole downtown spatial composition. Lee's space varies in enclosure (form/size & degree) by buildings or vegetation, differing in static or dynamic strength, clear or obscured by ground pattern use (eg vehicular chaos); spaces are (potentially) inner or outward directed in feeling or views; There are articulations by building groups, such as alleys, open lots, converges, breaks, twists— and within the individual buildings, by recessions, protrusions, cornices, and awnings (see photos). All this space is sensually-effected by our orientation, speed and sequence of movement. In summary: there is tremendous merit in downtown Lee's existing space as cross-experienced from part to whole in many ways. But there is also spatial incompleteness, confusion, and weakness in the fundamentally great existing order. To properly strengthen this existing space, as well as take opportunities for some dramatic new space, is necessary for full town reviatlization. As follows, (to supplement our diagrams), is an inventory of enlightening spatial cross-interpretations:

(1) FIELD/GROUND MAP: In the celebrated spirit of Camelio Sitte's drawings of European urban space— downtown Lee reveals valuable field/ground imagery to consider before proposing to protect or alter Lee's space. In general, it suggests in Lee there is now a comfortable balance between space and buildings— such that in a desirable way space predominates moderately (3.5 x) in area, and (behind the chaos of vehicular surfaces and motion) many positive spatial forms exist, to be reclaimed and enhanced. (In turn, downtwon as a whole is desirably dense witin its context of open Berksire rurality). The buildings define positive rectalineal space in the terms of roadways and grid, with resultant lots, yards, and quads (albeit fractured, incomplete in many places). At the perimeter of downtown are biomorphic forms of river and upper forested hills that serve as defining edges to geometric town layout. This map gives indication that space should be preserved in places for continuity and pattern oharmony— that translates into pleasing and useful safe space for all pedestrian and vehicular town activity; and it suggests where buildings could or shoudln't be added, and where present spatial forms can be strengthened or changed; ((Many of the spaces— the infrastructural space formed by buildings in downtown— could be kept (strengthened, or articulated, or sub-spaced) in present form)). It also shows large areas unformed and unclaimed eg along the entire river corridor.

---

(2) THE DOWNTOWN SIX SPATIAL AREAS: Downtown Lee ((approx 137 acres; 3000' long n-s X 2000' wide e-w) can be interpreted as a composite of six general "Spatial Areas" that should be respectfully strengthened in proposals. These spaces correspond to the six designated "Landuse Areas" of downtown referred to throughout this study as: Oval Park (node), Main Street (corridor), North End (node), Eaton/backside/RR (plane); Residential Hill (plane) and the river (corridor) areas. These areas are distinguished by their distinct spatial character (as well as individual environmental activities, materials). Although incompletely formed and unclearly related, they each have valuable entrenched historical physical/behavioral qualities, and outstanding spatial attributes existing and potential— these six are the most valid way to interpret and propose basic downtown spatial patterning. Each of the areas has a roughly euclidian spatial-character and diversity of enclosing materials (in partial success), with subspaces and articulations within. These areas are formed by the basic infrastructure of town buildings, and sometimes trees, forming spatial volumes shaped roughly as corridors, planes and nodes upon the street grid. In general, although the areas need strengthening, they already suggest a very positive spatial composition: each of the six areas are experienced individually, as well and in what we call "hierarchical perceptual packaging" of combinations. (I.e. spaces seem to conjoin or contrast with each other in a perceptually oscillating way: dualistic & triastic compounds, and the whole of all patterns interlock in harmony— riddled with a synergy of contrasts, similarities, complements, reciprocities. The plurality of these six area-spaces is experienced in multifarious shifting ways that gives Lee a most powerful experiential quality. Depending where one stands and how one moves through Lee (with the continuously breathing changes of the human mindset) is a complexity-within-unity that is phenomenally significant. Designers are encouraged (ie challenged) to enhance these spatial attributes.

((DESIGNER'S NOTE: The sum of all these spatial interpretations— the feeling of simple spaces in an interrelated number of ways— reflects the type of complex lattice logic that Alexander attributes to carefully evolved towns. This commits us to appreciating much of Lee's present space in ways desirably dynamic and elusive, in addition to having potentially powerful static-euclidean sensation. Proposals should be careful not to neglect such good spatial qualities characteristics, and indeed take opportunity to enhance them further. \*((It is indescribable here how special the on-site spatial experience is within any one Lee's six areas— how a person actually feels each space's special individual character as a gestalt SPATIAL UNITY, with various sub-vantages. Moreover, how from the perspective of any of these spatial areas, one can really feel numerous explicit and implicit spatial relationships with the other five spatial areas beyond— (as well as the town "bowl" and Berkshire Valley, as previously discussed). We perceptually and cognitively reach out from a given space to freely feel it participating in a combination of many subpatterns: As part of a SPATIAL-DUALITY— (Eg from within the south node we sense or recall similarities and differences of the north node, that enhances the sense of theme and variation of both spaces— the two flush out each other's spatial differences and magnify their similarities. Eg, Main Street is spatially sensed as a straightened echo of the winding river corridor— both belonging to the valley/terrace lineal motif. The Eaton Backside area is sensible as a spatial plane, felt in complement to the checkered residential plane of the same overall size)— perhaps echoing the agricultural field-spaces of the Berkshires. And as SPATIAL-TRIADS: (eg the double-node/corridor of Main Street and its n/s ends— the three single themselves out as one total space... ringing with compositional attributes. Or we can feel a space as being part of a SPATIAL CLUSTER: the six areas as an even group of adjacent spaces. (There are many possible "venn-diagramable" relationships of these town areas that could be spatially felt even more significantly, if proposals clarified enclosure and relationships in existing incomplete six area-spaces— that already suggest the right forms, sizes, numbers, and location realtions))). The six area-spaces, in detail, are as follows:

(a) OVAL PARK SPACE: is potentially the town's most interesting and profound space— capable of incredible strength to connect the town to the big region, and in an intimate, humane, comfortably enclosed way. Unfortunately this space is now destroyed or hidden behind disruptive parking and driving clutter. The space is now felt mostly as chaotic, fractured, alien in ways repulsive. (In contrast, old photos portray a desirable wombish spatial quality, supporting meaningful Rockwellian social activity and happily embraced by cherished buildings and trees— all this is now diminished, but reclaimable, reinterpretable for new use). Oval Park, if revealed properly, would actually be a wonderfully subtle yet dynamic "double space" (ie a space within space, defined by near and far enclosures). The first space: is the moderate size spatial quad, actually a subtle trapezoid (between buildings is 2.5 acres; 350' long n-s (to across park street) and 300' wide at center; the trapezoid grows to 375' wide at the Cong. Church end, and decreases to 325' wide at the southern end)). This space, now hidden, has beautiful proportions, stately formed 3d volume that makes its dynamicism one of symmetrical balance (potentially interpreted by people as stable, permanent, assuring, commanding). This form could create a favorable perspectivization of spatial-sensation for viewers in n-s/s-n directions, and interesting cross distortion e-w/w-e. The first layer of enclosed space (in the foreground) is defined (in the foreground) by high ratio height of the church, courthouse and the parks tall trees... and the (now obscured) lower Main Street/ Park street buildings. ((This is modulated by the varying tree canopy above, and peripheral sub-space articulation: the church enclave (.16 acre; 70 X 100') and the rear chrch diagonl alley are superb spaces in shape, scale, and dynamic sequential senation vis the oval quad; the Price Chpper entryspace and alleys breath space between the eaton area; the residential yards east of common, building overhangs, steps, door recessions along all buildings, and the interiors with windows are articulations to the main quad to reveal as edges. Behind the church is ((.6 acre; 275' X 100' empty lot and courthouse alleys)). The second layer of major Oval Park space: is formed by the distant regional hills, (especially of South Lee)— which feels like it encloses and is part of the Oval Park space. This remarkable phenomna of "borrowed landscape space" shall remain only barely evident until Lee removes the distraction of parking lot and moving automobile clutter. Removing poor organized traffic/parking will instantly return both the impeccable trapezoid-quad space and the distant Berkshire contextual space— and deliver an engaging spatial sensation that different people could interpret in host of different ways. (Proposals could encourage within the existing quad structure such human feelings as: pleasant, relaxing, comtemplative, austere, friendly, intriguing, exciting, beautiful, sublime, or "approaching the overwhelming". Very few towns have dualistic quality space like this.

(b) MAIN STREET SPACE: is downtown's busiest, oldest, and largest continuous open space— a varying rectilinear corridor ((between buildings is 6 acres to feel; 2500' long x 90' ave (75-100') wide; 3X that including buildings and lots; empty lots vary 1/4 - 2 acres)) defined by aligned buildings, some trees, and some areas non-defined. Within this larger street-space order are various subspaces between buildings and in their facade articulations. ((At present, space is well-defined by continuous building blocks at the south segment (first third of Main Street); the elsewhere (two thirds of Main Street) space varies in degree of enclosure and form, in desirable and undesirable ways: a mixture of loose buildings with empty lots, forming instances of enclosed or totally open areas— but overall fractured. (The Mid-upper third Main Street east side has interesting space— with downtown's largest canopy of trees, and secondary spaces of residential yards, and open lots. The upper westside of Main Street/north lot space leaks away, is unused, confusing— but has potential great spatial power to reap. In conclusion, there is excellent overall Main Street space that is now obscured, and potentially to be more clearly and completely defined by enclosures both "LATERALLY" (E-W cross-section of street, walks, facades/or open alleys, lots, vista corridors to river or beyond the residential hill) and "LONGITUDINALLY" (the southend, northend, mid street variations), and through the corridor as a WHOLE. In proposals, there is opportunity to capture a diversity of space— both subtle and in terms of a strong overall pattern. There is a begging for subdivision of the space and laterally to delineate different pedestrian vs vehicular use, and longitudinally to differentiate pub/private use. In this is a need to incorporate comprehensive great tree planting for basic infrastructure of the corridor, subspaces, and intimate articulation. Landform and structures in conjunction with existing building lines holds additional space-making possibilities, especially in northend/upper west Main Street where are mixed building density, no trees, and empty lots. ((Note: It is fascinating and pleasing that Main Street's space sensation dynamically varies (and potentially much more so) with longitudinal and lateral movement: this is due to changes of buildings as walls, the rising of hill and changing views. When viewing distant hills Main Street feels like a "cozy subspace". When viewing within downtown (from anywhere) it feels like the "commanding main space". Also interesting is that the southend has extroverted behavior but more enclosed space; the north/mid Main Street has more introverted behavior and more outward (yet intimate) space. From Main Street one can feel a valuable longitudinal spatial tension of the mid street tension and s/n nodes; And, one can feel lateral tension of varying walls, trees and breaks-- this can be enhanced. Beside improving Main Street space, one wishes to establish stronger spatial-view corridors link to the other five town areas, and beyond.



(c) **NORTH END SPACE:** analogous to the south end, there is now in the northend a potential feeling of positive dualistic space— a smaller scale (primary) node and a larger scale distant (secondary) landscape space (interpretable as concentric rings of enclosure)— to be enhanced in proposals. ((Unlike Oval Park, the foreground nodal infrastructure is entirely ill-defined, and the secondary outer landscape is closer than in the south end— so the overall relationship is doubly confused, with no clear sense of the two spaces— the near and far enclosures cancel out each other's spatial statement)). The primary immediate node is amorphously shaped, incompletely defined, partly enclosed by buildings on the north side of Center Street (Joes, mill etc) and the east side of Main Street; it is open at the intersection of Center & Main streets and the entire west corner vacant lot (which in turn is sensed as an enclosing ridge from lower Center Street below). Spatial sensation is ambiguous and enclosure weakly formed— space seems to deflate, escape. The secondary space (enclosed by distant surrounding hills & river and far landform landscape) is interesting in irregular ambigious form, and angles and distance of enclosing land surface. It is felt as wild and untamed in powerful (but fleeting) ways, variously sensed from select spots of the node and with a person's movement— as one steps away from any enclosing buildings and closer land the larger landscape space becomes more evident. Spatial sublimity at its best is possible here. In the entire north end, being the highest end of main street, the rise and fall of overcast sky— in contrast to the falling river valley below— dramatically effects spatial sensation: this aesthetically powerful attribute can be taken advantage of in proposals. The **vacant corner lot (2 acres)** especially holds endless spatial opportunity— but it presently seems to leak and drain away. Mysteriously, the river space, even if only partly seen is strongly sensed from the whole northend— but in a spatially unrelating way. While most of this space begs to be bettered ordered as a prospective stronghold for the offsite wilder view, there is debate as to how to better reveal the offsite space seen from the northend— the wild openness, sublime, restless, anarchic spaces that shift in the moods of time and human mindsets. The **mill** abounds with a completely diverse collection of spaces that connect to the river, as part of the main street north end node— but are now isolated. Lower Center Street is moderately enclosed on its north side, flanked by opening northward; while open pockets entail the south side, KFC an bridge area that visually link to the river corridor below, the rr area, or to Main Street above— providing wonderful array of sensation and orientation that is unfortunately confused by the roadway's spatial confusion in foreground view. In all, the swirling vistas within and from the entire northend provide a multitude of spatial sensations — that shift about, terminating briefly in ways near and far— buildings, river, near and distant trees and hills. This existing space can be enhanced for those good effects-- and the overall strength and interrelationship of the near (prime nodal) and secondary (distant) spatial sensation could be enhanced in a clever proposal.

(d) EATON/BACKSIDE/ RR-CANAL STREET SPACE: is the town's largest planal area—the west half of all downtown—with gross space located between the west of Main Street and the river (40 acres; 2500' x 700' including some overlap with river territory). This overall "half-pie shaped" space is now perceivable as a spatial unit, due to the positive enclosing strength of the Main Street spine and its lifted topography— but begs for a greater sense of unity. Within this area, space is roughly defined by buildings and lots along streets (Park, Eaton, Main, RR, Elm, Canal), but there is need for stronger overall and sub space definition— (with clearer spatial forms, size, enclosures and relations) for varied spatial sensation and use. Also, tree coverage varies throughout from full to sparse to non-existent— with need for great-tree definition of edges and canopy to spatially link into throughout all downtown. Since this area is seen from all along Main Street and above town, the spatial coherency & legibility is important visually as well as when moving about from within. This (area d) landscape subdivides into three spatial areas that seem to have similar as well as very different suggestive spatial characters to enhance in distinction, while embracing area (d) as a whole. The three areas are:

(1) THE EATON/ PRICE-CHOPPER/ BACKSIDE LOT (south of the Arobi Building): is the largest "open" expanse in town (11 acres; 775' x 450') and the most important part of the three sub-areas; however it is relatively wasted, undesigned space, a residually formed void of semi-paved parking expanse and left over flatland westward of the whole Main Street edge. (Also, trees are sadly lacking except at the river edge). This area is itself subdivided by Eaton Street into a north and a south half. The NORTH HALF: Eaton St (N) to Arobi area (3 acres; 300' x 450') is rectangular on all but its north edge, where it is modulated by the angle of Arobi buildings in a dynamic way (comprising an additional 2+ acres). (Shadow-line angles compound a perceptual interest, but call for more dominant space to play against). And the SOUTH HALF: Eaton Street (S) to Park Street square (5.7 acres; 500' x 500'), modulated into four spatial zones by the mass of the Price Chopper block that become evident with one's proximity to the building; away from the building, one can instead feel the space in whole, with Price Chopper as a centered mass in the space. (The bisecting line of Eaton Street buildings, especially the Post Office, have no individual sub-spatial articulation, but gives off interesting zonal sensations as one approaches them, and changes to a filtered spatial border when viewed from the distance). In addition to these two general rectangular areas, along the east perimeter we have the wonderful yet undiscovered diversity of partially formed nooks, alleys and potential subspaces defining the entire west BACKSIDE of lower Main Street buildings. Also, the 100' wide Price Chopper entrance space at Main Street (Morgan House southside) has potentially powerful spatial linkage to Oval Park, with options for entry, parking, walking, or appending as a courtyard to the Morgan House. These Backside and Eaton Street buildings, and Chopper entry are individual locations that hold special opportunity as places that provide different size/form subspaces, for spatial sensation, protective climate extension, private to public defensible transition linking buildings to the larger Eaton-Chopper Area/ River/ and to the Oval Park-Main Street area. At this time (and more so in a good proposal), depending where one stands, one can happily sense the whole area as a single space, or as the two halves, or with spatial zones, or backside subspaces; moreover, this area's space is interestingly "double" in that it provides a refugal prospect of the distant landform enclosures of peripheral downtown and the southern hills. In conclusion, the spatial definition of this whole LOT area, its two major subspaces, and potential backside nooks/alleys— and their interrelationship both within, and outward to the Berkshire context is crude and confused— but has the most reusable acreage and existing partial frame to create valuable town space. There is wonderful opportunity for Lee to transform this tremendous amount of wasted proximate area-- to take advantage of present good definition of buildings and the river, and create valuable new multi-season space for human rich sensation and human use so important for revitalization. ((It should be cautioned that it is vital that this area must remain OPEN to reciprocate the denser parts of the remaining downtown, and to relieve the vehicular

(e) RIVER SPACE: The river area— long abandoned and completely ignored— currently has the largest unused, most diverse and most confused space in town— but has the most aesthetically (and potentially recreationally) powerful spatial forces to harness. (You can feel both the longitudinal and lateral spatial forces). It is essentially an ambiguously defined and inaccessible biomorphic corridor— (with mixed virtue and vice in its definition). The corridor is special in that it hooks around the mill area— (so is really a rare "inverted-L" shaped biomorphic corridor) naturally formed by the topographic-divide carved out by the continuously moving river— it is in good and bad ways irregularly and incompletely enclosed by various landform and vegetation of ever-changing edges and canopy. (Note too that Main Street offers an outer sense of enclosure to the river, as faintly does the east hill and distant landforms evident from there). Within the primary space of the corridor is a now ill-defined hierarchy of promising secondary space, that includes: moderate to large open areas (of odd stretches of nodes and strips of 1 to 5 acres apiece on either side (eg near the Eaton Area) including the (600 x 127'; 1.74 acre) island, and the wooded areas (canopy spaces) on flatland as well as the whole west slope; the river banks, bridges, the water surface (50-150', average 110' wide) and the channel ground (spatially sensed unseen); and there are countless particular small nooks and crannies. Many of each of these categories of space (some interestingly, others distractingly) are now ambiguous or unevident in form (for better & worse). The good acreage of the river area can be shaped, made accessible for different sequences of sensation and uses, in conjunction with a wholistic town open-space system within the Berkshirean spatial context. (The width of the river and adjacent riverland varies from 200-700' wide, and is nearly one mile long in the downtown locale (3000' plus mill area hook 2000'). Open and bosque space, in conjunction with existing forest here offers interesting spatial opportunity.

SUGGESTIVE AESTHETIC-METAPHORIC READINGS OF EXISTING RIVER SPACE:

\* In the river area, more than elsewhere— because its space is so ambiguous yet ringing with suggestive attributes open for aesthetic interpretation— spatial analysis is an active creative part of the design process. (Seeing what exists is itself a selective, imaginative act... lending to the metaphorical, anthropomorphic, multi-relational etc). Designers must here make super-sensible interpretations— to express with empathetic feeling the existing spaces and how they seem to or "want to" relate to the town and Berkshires (or vice versa)— to extrapolate/interpolate (within the interpreted concept) how space should be improved to fulfill an authentic proposal for different townspeople & visitors.

+ In relation to the town, the river corridor space is synergistically important as part of the six area-composition: for example, it counter-echoes the straight-Main Street corridor (or vice versa); and it complements the Eaton and Residential Hill planes that overlook it; and it feels a tendency to reach out to the north and south nodes for its in-town punctuation.

+ in regard to the greater Berkshire region, interpreting the river space is an especially imaginative process in the analysis phase: eg the river corridor can be interpreted as a spatial "defining edge" for town's western boundary , or as a "dividing"

edge (or instead a "transitional" edge, or a "protective" edge, or a "forbidden air-thick wall") against Lee's peripheral landscape context; or perhaps instead the river space is understood longitudinally as "flowing through town", or "slicing" or "piercing" or "massaging" the town space, or, "feeding" the town (ie bringing in spatiality from the wilds afar. Or as a "symbolic presence" of the larger Berkshire— or as "the whole Berkshire valley itself". Or as a "concentric ribbon" of space generated outward from the heart of Oval park. Or as metaphor for "history", or the carrier of "spirituality, change, beauty/sublimity, or other forces" (that use space as a medium). Whatever, many interpretive poetic notions are valid (but many are irrelevant and to be avoided) to project as powerful generating ideas that lead to the most desirable spatial proposal. These abstract interpretive-concepts have great "gestalt strength" to relate the river space inwardly and outwardly— indeed they could forge ideas down to the functional details in a proposal. Therefore, designers should pick up on whatever narrative they elect as most meaningful, if not most true.

RIVER SPACE ISSUES randomly discussed during the analysis are as follows: \* What is the appropriate strength and type forms of space, the scale (many vs bigger spaces), the desired degree of enclosure vs openness (introverted or extroverted feeling and spatial focus), and the optional degrees of river contact (one point vs continuous)?; What is the desired sense of intimacy vs publicness of space— and how that would correlate with local oriented or visitor oriented users, re proxemics and distemics, defensibility, safety; legibility vs mystery; Excitement vs relaxation? Should the spatial character appear "natural" vs "manmade", sublime or beautiful; active or passive recreational? How simultaneously should proposals address the ecological factors, and an historical (eg settlement, agricultural, industrial and future spatial theme? What relevance would be modernist vs romantic vs naturalist styles: eg the rectilinear (as town-relating) vs the biomorphic (as Berkshire-relating) or circular (both). The simultaneous uses and time-scales of experiencing the river space as a lateral contact (e-w) and a longitudinal sequence (s-n) through town (walking or boat)? How might buildings and adjacent town spaces relate to the river space? What are notions of layers of space vs nodal, planal series, or subcorridors? What are proper concerns of spatial perceptual change during different times of the day and seasons, due to light, weather, and vegetational change? Use of hard vs soft spatial elements? Flooding potential (though minimal) and effects of water movement on changing spatial sensation (is significant). What is the important potential play of allusion and illusion in this space? Should space be a continuity with town space or a transition, juxtaposition, departure... and how should the river space in Lee relate to that of other Houstonian towns?

(f) RESIDENTIAL HILL SPACE: This area occupies the east half of downtown (1700' ns x 530'ew; 20.68 acres)— it is an elongated, rectilinear (slightly trapezoidal) shaped space, defined between Main Street's east buildings and the rising landform east of High Street. The existing structure of space within Lee's Residential Hill is dualistic, with primary and secondary space that is pleasing in ways that should be preserved & strengthened to support a private neighborhood— and thirdly it views distant space. (However, due to its current fractures, the unity of the primary space is much subdued, and the diversity of the secondary space is often ill-distinguishable). To describe: The PRIMARY SPACE covers the whole area— producing an overall spatial feeling as a neighborhood house/yard spatial 'fabric'— which is now (and potentially more so) felt as a somewhat unified (corridor/quadrant-thematic) "totality". And underlyingly, there is SECONDARY SPACE (ie the parts that compose the diverse spatial composition) that is subtle, intimate, truly minimalist in good ways (that are improvable too) including: the seven different residential street corridors (with sometimes inconsistent, sometimes weak tree definition) and the four different street quadrants and their interior articulations (of inner quads and house-lots). ((Specifically, the side streets (Franklin, Academy, Ferncliff, School, Center) make six lateral residential corridors, and the High Street longitudinal corridor (which is as long the sidestreets combined). Mid-upper Main Street doubles as a residential street, when sensed 'block by block' between Franklin and School streets. This irregular grid produces is what the four very important rectilinear spatial quadrants, each with different central inner quads, within which are different private front and side lot space, (defined by different size buildings, variously lining the streets)— all in proportions that create an important rhythmic spatial/visual//social play. (On all streets, buildings vary from in separation to wider building sizes, and side lots vary) .The residential streets are closely fronted by mostly residential structures, excepting the commercial tenants, library, and the victorean residences of Main Street border which are larger size and spaced). The four quadrants (outlined by buildings along streets) have additional buildings within them, except for Fencliff/Academy, which is preciously open. Spatially this hill area can be improved in the primary, secondary, and external-relational senses by strengthening that existing fabric (eg) with a system great trees— and leaving existing open areas open. (There is possibility for some new buildings, but they must cautiously added— but only along the streets in selected open streetside lots— in the logical gaps remaining; but a preliminary consensus shows that most sidelots and definitely the inner quads, should remain as open space... viewable, penetratable, while feeling defined. Bosques and individual ornamental plants (for personal spatial sub-treatment) can be done without violating the potential overall great romantic feeling of primary spatial systems of street corridor & quadrant space by great trees. (Note the word "quadrant" refers to gross area between streets; "quad" refers to central space defined within the buildings along the street quadrants). Specific quadrant descriptions follow:

# The Center/School Quadrant: (350' n-s x 575' e-w measured between streets): Buildings are small residences, plus larger commercial buildings on Main Street, all tightly spaced (of urban feeling) except for 2 open lots on the ends of School Street (which feed views and celebrate the mid-street buildings there; additional structures could be placed in these end lots, but open space is felt as more important). The inner central quad is pleasingly bisected by rows of buildings into 3 medium size spaces that are also pleasing and should not be built upon.

# The School/Ferncliff (narrow) Quadrant: (550' x 175') Buildings vary from large (the oil co Main Street buildings) to smaller elsewhere; they are close on Academy st, have 3 larger side lots on Franklin Street that reach importantly to the narrow sliver of a central quad. (Additional structures could be placed there but open space is felt as more important; the quad must remain open).

# The Ferncliff/Academy (largest) Quadrant: (530' x 525') Has smaller size buildings spaced closely on Ferncliff & High streets, and moderate size buildings generously spaced on Main Street (the Victorean lots) & Academy Street. This quadrant has the largest open space on the hill— an inner cross-quadrant (300 x 300)— the only untouched and fortunately still open quad— and it should remain open. (There is opportunity for good tree definition, and with a better communal sense of space or semi-private or private uses).

# The Academy/Franklin Quadrant: (525 x 500') Has fewer but larger buildings and larger side spaces. (Includes the abutting library and large corner space/ frontage along Franklin Street that feels like a nice common. The is the second largest overall quadrant, punctuated by large centered building, which produces four ordinate sub-quadrants spaces of fine proportion, with alternating orientations to the different streets (n/s/w/e/)— the spaces flow around the building to preserve the overall sense of the quadrant. Bosque/open tree thematic variations are a consideration here.

(## The Oval Park area, and the east Mill area harmonize as a fifth and sixth quadrant— but not part of the (f) Residential Hill domain).

((SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE: + The Residential Hill Area's space is unique in the downtown: as a primary whole it is more unified as a kind of "textual field" in complement to (or as neutral background to) the public n & s nodes, and the Main Street & river corridors; and this field or plane is appropriately opposite in spatial character form the Eaton open-plane. The continuity of the hill area's gentle slope, and the vague but omnipresent sense of continuous (but gently uneven) building & open lot densities and tree canopy, is what helps give it its unity— an overall harmonious continuous texturous spatial character vis a vis the remaining composite of town areas. The underlying secondary spatial diversity within the hill is due to the rhythmic mathematical series of street proportions (the compositional irregularity of an asymmetrically-balanced grid), and the gentle varying of the size/spacing/types of buildings & lots that line those streets: they produce variations in the overall spatial "corridor & quadrant" theme. This divides (or knits) a neighborhood spatial structure of profound human value— with good spatial and

(private to public) complexity at a local scale, unlike that of typical town grids. Appropriately, the area's strong underlying spatial diversity is not pretentious, and is only quietly felt when one is within the area, and disguised when one views from other parts of town.

++ Proposals should respect how in the hill one feels the primary composition, and secondary spaces (ie the moderate central quad space and other smaller articulations of the smaller enclosures about the residential fabric)-- and through them the viewed feeling of distant off-site space. These make a total of spatial view sensations, of multiple juxtapositions and interpenetrations of spaces in all directions within and without-- experientially a pleasing kaledoscope of complex secondary space, yet felt primarily unified in the hill a whole-- while providing prospective-refugal views outward to the more public town and "wilder" region. ((In other words, there exists now (to strengthen) good hierarchy of spaces providing a transition from the private homes and backyards, to the semi-private front yards and side lots, and the sensed community space within the center of private-owned quads, to the public street/sidewalk corridor (separated or combined); and beyond, to the prospect-refuge type views through the area to the surrounding space: eg viewing across the partially open quadrants (n-s) to the Northend and Oval Park nodes, and the distant landform; and viewing through the e/w streets, passing laterally through the Main Street corridor (with spatial tension at the intersection)... through Eaton/ RR area, to the river space-- and to feel the distant space of peripheral landform that surrounds the town in interestingly disjunctive ways. With these spatial forces in all directions, the hill sensationally, formally, "breathes" with the larger downtown and Berkshires-- this can be still be enhanced). All this is so important to those who live or visit the residential area (or imagine it from below)). Positively, the existing residential spatial fabric encourages a social fabric, a private web. This web, this spatial pattern should be enforced to maintain its private neighborhood use-- while feeling/viewing the river space-- safe from the contrasting large public/vehicular space of the other areas of town.

(f)-SUMMARY OF THE SIX SPATIAL AREAS OF DOWNTOWN "\*\*\*\*\*" : the "enclosures within enclosures within enclosures" that comprise the Lee-relevant grand continuum-- from Appalachian to Berkshire to downtown and subdowntown space are most relative to any good proposal for Lee. Within downtown the singular and composite pattern of these existing six area spaces-- already holding so many good attributes-- can be enforced and articulated indefinitely better, for valuable human space-sensation and pedestrian/vehicular/and specific cbd-oriented activity appropriate for revitalizing Lee as a milltown or tourist-town. The shapes and sizes and general location of these six areas already is basically more than valid, and is loaded with potential spatial power-- and already point to what is ideal for any proposal. To cash in on that (now barely evident) value, proposals need to give these areas better definition of space and edges, (including a great-tree system, possible edge buildings and different hard/soft pedestrian surfaces) with more explicit interrelationship as an overall composition (with subspace-articulation within, and relations to the Berkshires region without). This is relatively simple to achieve: there is a wonderful latent synergy in the existing "sixal-composition" of whole downtown to be revealed. And designers can tap into this existing spatial six- pattern in very different possible ways to bring their unique proposal to its greatest success.

---