Nature strikes back. Government, citizen groups, public opinion are all on her side. And business is often the target. Almost every company planning construction has felt the pressure. So much so that to keep up with the ceaselessly changing regulations, as one executive told us, "You'd need a full-time Vice President of Environment!"

Architects: The Corporate Vice Presidents of Environment

Architects are trained to be just that. We're running this ad because we'd like more of you to know it.

To begin with, the old "lonely genius in an attic" image has to go out the window. When you hire an architect today, you hire a team of specialists headed by an architect—planners, engineers, physical scientists. Because the first questions that have to be answered are hardly architectural:

Have the regional land-use guidelines changed?

Do your emissions and effluents meet present standards? Will they meet future standards?

How will your plant affect the water table? Would water recycling be cheaper in the long run? Will noise generation plague you under future noise standards?

The architect sifts through the maze of governmental agencies set up to protect the environment. He finds out what's on the minds of all the local citizens' groups. When a conflict arises, he serves as mediator.

And through it all, he has a very particular advantage: he speaks the language of the environmentalist.

The whole idea is to recognize possible trouble spots before designing, so they don't become money-draining hassles after construction begins. If you'd like to know more about what architects can do for you, there's an entertaining way to find out. We'll send you a handsome booklet called "TEN BUSINESSMEN TALK ABOUT THEIR ARCHITECTS." No charge—just drop a card to the American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.
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From the Publisher

Connecticut leads all New England in the development of condominium housing. In the twelve years since the Unit Owners­ship Act was passed by the General Assembly, 165 developments, with a total of 25,439 units have been constructed or planned in the state.

While not a unique phenomenon, Connecticut’s “Condominium Boom” has resulted in some architectural and financial triumphs, as well as disasters. It is useless, however, to ignore the fact that the condominium is very much with us, whatever its merits, and that it is having a continuing and a profound effect upon our life style.

Condominiums come in all styles, sizes and price ranges. One can choose from a modestly priced unit for $16,000 in East Haven, or from an individually designed home in the $200,000 range in Greenwich. The selection also varies from the “ranch style”, one-level unit, through the “mid-rise”, traditional apartment arrangement, to the multilevel “town-house” home with three bedrooms, more baths and a built-in, two-car garage. The size of condominium communities range from the largest, Heritage Village, with nearly 2,600 units to one with only six; the environmental impact, from tremendous to nil.

“Variety,” it has been said, “is the spice of life,” but making sense of this smorges­bord of choices has been the moving force behind the establishment of a New Haven firm, Development Research Services, Inc., and of their publication, Connecticut Guide to Condominiums. We asked Mr. John Scott, Director of Technical Services, to provide us with an analysis of the state of the art in condominium development in Connecticut, and he has most graciously obliged. His article begins on page 7, illustrated by several noteworthy projects, both by Connecticut architects and those from elsewhere.

Before proceeding to the meat of the matter, however, we ask that you pause a moment to reac a film review (sic) from our resident wit, Robert Mutchux, AIA. Bob recently retired from active practice with Fletcher-Thompson, and has obviously been catching up on all the movies he has missed. And I quote:

“A new moving picture entitled Last Con­do in Paris is highly recommended to those legions who are not yet aware of the deadly seriousness of the world’s housing crisis. This 90-minute masterpiece in color depicts the tragic impact of the shortage of dwelling space on the lives of a middle-aged widower and a recently-betrothed young girl.”

“While searching separately for a shelter of some sort, they meet on the fifth floor of a Paris apartment building where, to the surprise of the average moviegoer, they do not proceed to fall in love. Rather in mature fashion, they attempt every conceivable arrangement to render their private needs compatible, while underneath they engage in a titanic struggle for ownership, or at least rentalship, of the coveted pied-a-terre.

“Alas, it is a case of musical chairs; one of them must go. The primordial need for shelter is the force majeure that overrides all other considerations. The young girl, though she has developed a certain fondness for the persistent widower, opts to return to her fiancé (as every proper young Parisian girl should, whether in France or in Illinois), and she resolves the poignant dilemma by shooting the wid­ower with her father’s service revolver.”

“The film is directed by the imaginative Bert O’Lucci and acted with touching realism and delicacy of detail by two up­and-coming young actors: Maria Brando and Marlon Schneider. Though it is rated X, this superlative cinematic creation may be viewed by AIA members on presentation of their membership certificates and a modest premium of $3.00. The latter is deductible if accompanied by a client.”

DESIGNING A BANK?

Fast, accurate transfer of information is vital to the modern bank. Voice, video, and data systems speed the flow of information within the bank and with customers hundreds of miles away.

Because of the need for sophisticated communications, hardware preplanning is essential. Whether you’re building a bank, brokerage house or any other building where communications systems are concentrated, you’ll find our BUILDING INDUSTRY CONSULTANT ready to assist you. He knows communications. And he knows how to work with people who build.

Call on the BUILDING INDUSTRY CONSULTANT while your plans are still on the drawing board. You add him to your team without cost or obligation. Just dial 1-800-922-2953, toll free from anywhere in Connecticut.
...from the CSA

From the President

1975 is a year of challenge: challenge to me as newly elected president of the Connecticut Society of Architects to continue the dedicated leadership which has been established by my predecessors; challenge to the CSA to support its membership and sustain its growth; and challenge to the profession of architecture to remain viable. 1975 is a year when we obviously will all be very concerned about the current state of the economy and its impact on our profession. The Janus of Inflation, "that two-faced demon which is locked in mortal combat with our economy, is far too powerful an adversary to simply ignore. The challenge is great, but in every challenge there exists opportunity; and if the challenge is great, then great is the opportunity.

The first opportunity which comes to mind is that of introspection. Traditionally, architects have been called poor businessmen. Good business practices, including efficiency and profitability, are the cornerstones of responsible professional practice. I feel that this time affords us the opportunity to strengthen our business acumen, to sharpen our professional skills so that we can operate in a more highly competitive atmosphere than perhaps we have had to in the past.

Increased consumer activism and the demand for better products afford the architectural profession an opportunity to move into such areas as single family home design which has long suffered from inadequate planning. Architects have traditionally shunned this market because of its assumedly low compensation potential, but the aggregate of the single family home market is substantial. In addition, environmental concern, which in many areas has expressed itself in moratoria, is an opportunity for architects to take a leadership position in a public issue which ultimately will mean expanded markets for our services.

Energy conservation is probably one of the most pressing problems which our planet faces at this time, and the opportunity for architects in the energy conservation field is phenomenal. The retrofitting of buildings to conserve energy and the design of new methods and technologies for energy conservation are completely within the realm of our services. These are but a few of the areas which, if examined carefully, may produce the results of either adding to our market, or allowing us to hang on to a stable share of the decreasing market. I should like to make one other observation: though depressed, the construction industry is still a $100-billion-a-year industry. What we have to do at this time is fight harder to get our fair share of this market.

One of the priorities which the CSA has established for 1975 will be to help our members not only survive the economic slowdown, but also grow and prosper. A major tool which we expect to utilize in this effort will be the continuing education program. We intend to expand upon this highly successful program to include "how-to" directions for many of the opportunities which I discussed earlier.

It is certainly an honor and a privilege for me to serve my professional associates as president of the Connecticut Society of Architects. I accept the challenge of 1975, and look forward to taking advantage of its opportunities.

Robert L. Wilson, AIA

From the Executive Director

The recent “Grass Roots” meeting of the AIA chapters in Washington impressed me that the Institute is very much aware of the depressed conditions in architecture. The AIA is determined to help its members cope with them and to bring about a recovery. CSA President Robert Wilson, Vice President Richard Schoenhardt and I attended the three-day session.

A charrette on the Economic Slowdown was held at the Institute on January 6 and 7, and several programs for positive action emerged:

1. The Institute will attempt to bring together all segments of the construction industry in a unified effort to improve economic conditions;
2. The Institute will distribute to its chapters a document showing how revenue-sharing and community development funds can be used in construction projects to improve the physical environment and the quality of life; and
3. A national advertising campaign will be conducted to convince the private and public sector that present conditions make this an ideal time to have projects designed and built.

The Connecticut Society of Architects also has a role to play:

1. It can appeal to our state government to get projects underway quickly for which funds have been earmarked;
2. The CSA can encourage the state and municipalities to undertake the needed planning, design and development of projects that require architectural services; and
3. The Chapter can unite with other elements in the construction industry to point out to the private sector as well as to government that this is, indeed, an excellent time to get projects designed and built.

The thinking of the people who assembled in Washington from the eastern third of the country was that, although times were bad, there is considerable opportunity for perceptive and energetic firms to develop new opportunities to be of service. It was agreed that architects have or can marshal the expertise in such fields as environmental impact studies, feasibility studies, construction management, joint venturing and development that can be of immediate help to potential clients. The gloom at Grass Roots was not without some gleam.

The CSA has responded to Connecticut’s depressed conditions in several ways:

1. It took a leadership role in forming the Committee for Connecticut’s Construction Industry that includes all segments of the industry. It has met and is currently preparing a legislative program. David LaBau, past president of the Chapter, has been the prime force behind this committee’s formation;
2. The Society conducted a series of educational seminars called SUPER-COURSE, designed to improve skills in financial and personnel management and in marketing professional services; and

3. The Chapter presented two programs on Cost Determination and Control, taught by Robert Keane, comptroller of Fletcher-Thompson and an associate of the CSA.

Donald Baerman, Commissioner of Education for 1975, is planning a program that will continue the effort started in 1974. The first event in the 1975 continuing education program was an evening clinic on Soils and Foundation Design that was attended by 30 people, both architects and engineers.

A one-day seminar on Construction Cost Estimating for the Designer Professional is scheduled for March 17, and a seminar on Cost-Based Compensation is planned, but the date has not been confirmed.

On May 6, a tour of Roosevelt Island and two medium-rise, high density projects by New York's Urban Development Commission will take place.

A Chapter committee, under Edward Jeter, has researched and developed a bill intended to take out of politics the selection of design professionals for state work, thus reforming the politically motivated system traditionally used by this and many other states. Jeter's committee has submitted its proposed bill to a task force composed of landscape architects, land surveyors, planners and engineers. This group has made some changes and has submitted the revised bill to Senator Joseph Lieberman of New Haven, who has shown considerable interest in this effort and has agreed to sponsor a bill.

Members of the Society are urged to follow this bill through the General Assembly and to express support for it to their local representatives and senators.

The Chapter office is adjusting to these lean times by cutting operational expenses while, at the same time, maintaining member services. Thanks to reduced operating costs and a successful continuing education program in 1974, the CSA wiped out a $1650 deficit and ended the year with a slight surplus. The Society is seeking new sources of revenue which, coupled with increased dues income and tight spending controls, will permit the Chapter to spend more money in the areas of public relations and legislative programs.

I will close by appealing to all of our members to pay their regular and supplemental dues as soon as they can. I make this appeal, appreciating fully the difficult times many offices are presently having. Early dues receipts permit us to use most efficiently the Chapter's funds, either by buying more efficiently or by investing surplus money in short term savings accounts. Your cooperation will be appreciated more than ever.

Pricing Professional Services

Flexible Compensation Methods for the Seventies

The Roaring Seventies have swept aside many traditional business practices and prompted vast reorganizations within the financial community.

We know that the average construction project has become technically more complex. We know that clients are demanding more comprehensive architectural services with single-point architectural responsibility for project delivery, from design to construction.

We also know that the effects of double-digit inflation have made clients doubly conscious of project costs. Clearly, swift changes in the economic environment for design services are afoot.

How are design firms responding to these new circumstances? How are professionals minimizing their client's economic uncertainty? First, design firms are developing more flexible pricing formulas for their services. Second, they are offering wider applications of their professional skills by selectively charging on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Consider the complexity of the client's concerns when commissioning a design firm: the financial environment, market timing, approvals, potential site problems, project feasibility, and start-up costs — all of these considerations color his perception of what services he really needs.

Architects are responding to these concerns. They have realized that flexible compensation formulas can shape professional fees to the level of services required.

A basic list of these flexible compensation methods for professional services includes:

- **Percent of Construction**

  The traditional compensation method, well understood and exceedingly simple to use, sets the fee as a percentage of project construction cost. This method aids in computing total project costs by working backward from fixed target budgets. On the negative side, basing professional fees on construction costs has always appeared "loaded" to clients. They see no incentive for the architect to reduce construction costs. This method also presumes there is a direct relationship between man-hours for design and construction costs — clearly, that cannot be true for all types of projects.

- **Hourly Rates**

  This method multiplies direct hourly costs by a factor which includes a portion of overhead, indirect costs and a reasonable profit. The "multiple" concept is well recognized by many professionals and clients. The legal establishment uses this device commonly. Combined with an upset maximum, this is an excellent method for "front-end" services necessary to initiate projects. It can minimize the client's financial exposure in early project phases.

  It can take a complex project fee down into reasonable price increments, step by step. It has the distinct advantage of full client participation in the design process because you're saying "we'll show you our figures".

- **Fixed-Fee, Lump-Sum**

  When the scope of services required can be firmly established, a fixed-price, lump-sum fee can have substantial advantages for both client and professional. The client knows his costs in advance. The professional can more efficiently utilize his staff when the profit target is fixed, and the hours required are clearly identified.

  Establishing a fixed price fee requires accurate information on the cost of professional services. The AIA will soon publish a comprehensive "Cost-Based Compensation Guideline". The cost-based method is a flexible response to commercial competition for design services.

- **Cost Plus**

  The "cost-plus" form of contract adds a fixed management and profit fee to the hourly costs for project design services. This method is commonly used in construction management, research and development contracts, and in defense work. It is well understood and widely accepted by many institutional and commercial clients. The fixed fee portion of this method offers the concept of professional value of services to the client. The "upset limits on the cost portion assures the client that "the top lid is on", since the fixed fee represents both an agreed profit and the more intangible "opportunity costs" for assigning staff to a particular project, the incentives and penalties for performance are crystal clear to both client and professional.

- **Per Diem**

  Many consultants to business and industry charge on a per diem, or daily basis. This method is frequently used in other professions and could have a potentially vast range of applications for architects if they re-focus their services on a daily basis. Clients would welcome the opportunity of viewing facility and site problems with a professional on an ad hoc daily basis.

  The per diem method reflects both costs and the intangible value of professional advice. Finally, as a front wedge of a new

Continued on page 19
by Raymond J. Wisniewski, AIA

Some years ago I took part in a course at the University of Hartford, called "An Introduction to Architectural Design." It was a particularly good opportunity for me to do some basic thinking about architecture, since I was the instructor for this course. As in any exploration of "Architectural Design," our class discussions often led to opinions on what constituted "good" or "bad" design in architecture; and just as inevitably, this led to discussions of specific buildings or groups of buildings or areas of our environment that were felt to be particularly "good" or "bad".

In one such exploration of our community environment, I chose to cite as a particularly bad example of "urban blight" or environmental hodge-podge a main thoroughfare in the Hartford area — Connecticut Boulevard, leading from Hartford across the Connecticut River to East Hartford and in the shape and form of the "linear-neighborhood," which was the style quite a few years ago.

Connecticut Boulevard, at that time, was a blatant example of peripheral-arterial sprawl: the gas station; honky-tonk, run-down houses converted to run-down businesses; empty littered lots; light-strung used car emporiums; cruddy diners; shabby, fourth-rate everything, over-signed in every dimension; parking lots and driveways in every direction off and on the over-trafficked, un-cared-for, tired, encrusted, discarded part of the city — slowly being pushed over the banks of the completely disregarded, and bespoiled Connecticut River.

So this is what I picked on as representing a repository for all kinds of "bad" environmental architecture. But when I cited it by name, one student, a resident of a nearby area, said: "I don't know; I've lived around here for a long time, and I drive back and forth across the river on Connecticut Boulevard all the time, and it seems all right to me. What's wrong with it?"

This is the first article of what, we hope, will become a continuing series on the problems of our urban environment. Contributions and comments from architects and other professionals will be most welcome.

The Editors
I then began to realize the scope of the problem for anyone to try to see for himself what the environment really looked like, having been exposed over a long period of time to the gradual deterioration in a familiar area. Even more difficult than trying to train yourself to see what things really look like is the complex problem of trying to get any kind of remotely universal agreement on what indeed is “good” or “bad” in architecture, whether dealing with an individual building or a collection of buildings and spaces in a given area.

If we as architects are really going to do anything other than simply build one building, to suit one program and one budget, on one site, we have to do more than just understand the needs of one client. We have to come closer to knowing what “moves” the whole area we are involved in — our entire neighborhood, our whole town and city. While that’s a tall and grandiose order, we’ve got to broaden our concerns in each individual project, or we are all taking part in building some other latter-day Connecticut Boulevard all over again.

In many of our cities, we are getting a second chance: We have been allowed to “erase”, in some cases, large portions of cities, and are “redeveloping” these areas into an image that suits us better. Will these patches hold the fabric of our cities and towns together better than the original material? Can we do our planning more thoughtfully to bind together the diverse threads of our society?

In 1976 our nation will be celebrating its 200th year as an independent country. We have come a long way since we started with a raw, untamed land — end-to-end nature. We have succeeded in taming the land, in making it suit our collective purposes. We have moved from building log cabins to building massive sky-poking, 120-story wonders. We have come from the horse and buggy to the manned space ship to the moon, and everything in between.

In the beginning, there were fewer people, and they saw their goals clearly, mostly hinging on survival. Nowadays there are hundreds of millions of people, and the goals are still pretty clear — survival. Initially, survival was in question because in the untamed land there were not enough ways or tools to use the resources. We have since then found the ways and tools. We have found ways to use all the resources, and to overuse them. We are now at “overkill”. We have become a nation of industrious people, busily dreaming up new and ingenious ways of over-using about everything in sight, and are hard at work on the “known reserves”!

But for my part, I must say that I’m glad that as an architect, I have had no part in, or contributed to any of, this problem. I’ve just been busy trying to do buildings the best way I know, but that is where the problem lies. We have all, as architects, as builders, as engineers, as developers, bankers, town officials, et al, been involved in just-one-better-than-average project, and certainly not one that would be incompatible with the general master plan for our community!

So here we are, an entire nation of people, each alone, or in relatively small groups, working on some more or less private goal. We live in communities or cities, where any number of groups are working on separate projects that will most certainly overlap, and each will ultimately affect the other in some minor or major way, but we work independently!

Just as the planning and building efforts in our world are carried out independently to suit the purposes of individuals, companies and specific groups, so it likewise seems with various governmental agencies, regulatory bodies and other special interest groups. The scope of interest, planning efforts and control exercised by each body seem to focus all too often on a narrow and specifically directed band.

Does the Town Plan and Zone Commission know what the State Highway Department is planning that might affect the goals of the Department of Transportation that might alter the Department of Environmental Protection’s goals for Historic Districts as affected by Economic Development Commission activities, in relation to the Department of Public Works projects that might be altered by the Corps of Engineers’ plans for the Connecticut River Watershed? We hope so.

Recently an elaborate system of highways, bridges and interchanges was not only planned, but construction was well under way, with millions of state and federal dollars spent, before massive and ultimately well-organized public outrage and effort caused a halt in the construction through precious reservoir/natural woodland/recreation areas.

A monument to this kind of lack of cooperative planning effort is a massive multi-story, steel-and-concrete interchange that spans I-84 near Hartford, with elaborate, lofty, sky-hung roads crossing each other all in one isolated area of the countryside, and fanning out in all directions, each direction leading to nowhere! But now, at least that part of it is all done; and maybe we can figure out a good use for this unused desecration, er... decoration.

Another thoughtfully located section of gently curving, unused, completed highway points ominously, almost dead-center — but just two-hundred feet short of — the State Capitol building. I’m not at all sure that plans don’t exist to put the Capitol building up on stilts to allow the ubiquitous highway to plow through Bushnell Park, so that it can join the Conlon
Highway leading under the Hartford Public Library, to the river. By an earlier feat of misguided planning, the Public Library building had to be built on the one section of Main Street that crossed the Connecticut Highway, so that multi-story mediocrity had to be built on Veriendel Trusses located above the highway.

The obvious conclusion that is inescapable is that all of us who are involved in any aspect of architecture, engineering, planning, and building simply must look for more ways to work cooperatively toward the common goals. We are all too busy with our own introverted goals. I'm afraid too many of us are too busy trying to become better businessmen to work hard at the role of becoming better planners. Certainly the design and building of an excellent building, particularly if it married well to its site, requires a tremendous amount of application, experience, cooperative work of various consultants, etc., in order to turn out results we can be proud of. But it should be just as obvious that the most cunningly wrought building project won't do a thing to improve an otherwise despoiled and ignored environment.

We simply must work harder to culture a collective sensitivity to all the ramifications of that one project in its place in the community. We simply must work harder to obtain more prior information and parake in cooperative-planning efforts with our State Highway Department, as well as with federal agencies and all other agencies that are working all too autonomously at shaping large parts of our world.

Private and public projects of all kinds are being built with a lot of attention and expense going into exterior design and amenities, while our highway and bridge planners grind out endless clumsy, dull, supposedly efficient structures all around us, with what too often looks like little or no regard for esthetic results. These structures interlacing our world are after all “buildings”, too.

I suppose that too much of what has been discussed here has painted a pessimistic view of almost everything in our environment. Too little recognition has been given to all kinds of islands of excellence that appear in many of our communities. A great deal of good planning and a great many carefully wrought buildings and projects have helped divert our gaze from troubled areas. We certainly need these successes, but we need so much more just to keep up with evolution and deterioration.

Years ago when road systems began to proliferate along with suburbia, and the discovery was made by merchants and developers that shopping areas do not need to be concentrated “downtown” only, all manner of “shopping centers” began to spring up and most were ill-planned, shabby moneymakers. It reminds one a little of the “Cabins-$1.00 per night-running water-mattresses” developments that sprang up as so many “mom and pop” businesses when the auto began to come into general use.

At least there is evidence, shown by better built regional shopping centers and other similar developments, that neither people, developers nor banks care to invest money in shabby, expedient solutions. We are seeing more substantially built and more thoughtfully planned shopping centers, such as Enfield Square, Meriden Square, West Farms Mall in West Hartford/Farmington; The Bazaar in Southbury; The Exchange in Farmington, Glen Lochen in Glastonbury and a great many other creditable projects elsewhere about the state.

As both land and money become scarce, more attention is being given to the development of planned unit developments, and condominiums, and similar developments that use land more efficiently and reserve more free land for open space and recreation.

There are other encouraging signs of cooperative community planning that seem to show an increasing awareness that only through interlocked mass-effort will real progress be made. The well chronicled “Hartford Process” endeavors, and other similar apparently enlightened planning efforts, seem to be steps in the direction of planning with a greater social conscience. Hartford’s “Downtown Council” efforts certainly are aimed at galvanizing and maybe even welding together a variety of would-be-separate planning disciplines within the local business/planning/government community. While it is early in that game, the interest and cooperative work to date are encouraging for our community. Of course, we need a lot more of these beginnings, and a lot more good endings.
The Condominium Boom
Translating the Ownership Concept into a Community Plan That Works

by John T. Sco

The award-winning Lyon Farm, Greenwich, designed by SMS Architects of New Canaan.

Somewhere in the annals of condominium history there was a piece of legislation called the Horizontal Property Ownership Act. The original concept was to permit the subdivision and ownership of real property that was not attached to the ground. It was not exactly a novel idea; the Romans are said to have employed the condominium form of ownership in their cities. They did, of course, give us the name.

Most condominium development in Connecticut does not involve horizontal property ownership as it was originally conceived. In fact, more than 90 per cent of the existing units are "attached" to the ground. The most common application of the concept is to be found in moderate- to low-density variations of two- and three-level units, generally referred to as "townhouses" or "townhomes," Similarly, one-level units are commonly called "ranches" or "garden homes," and a few developers are even marketing "split levels." These terms are popular because they denote the basic appeal of the condominium unit: it is, foremost, a house. It is living space that can be purchased, mortgaged, and sold in the traditional sense of the terms.

So much for tradition. Unlike the owner of a single-family home, the condominium unit owner does not hold exclusive title to the land, building structure, or even the roof over his head. Instead, he shares ownership of these common elements with his fellow unit owners under a principle known as undivided interest. Occasionally, a condominium will involve community property that is leased from another party. Leased property may include land or recreational facilities or both.

To understand the present state of the art, we must go back to the early days — 1963 to be exact. The Connecticut General Assembly, following the lead of several other states and the federal government which set the groundwork in 1961, passed what is known as the Unit Ownership Act. The principal effect of this legislation was to grant legal validity to the condominium title for mortgage purposes.

In the summer of 1967, the first condominium unit in the State was occupied at Heritage Village in Southbury. "The Village," as it is affectionately known by its more than 2,400 current residents and by employees of the sponsoring Heritage Development Group, has had perhaps the most powerful and lasting influence on condominium development in our State. It established locally the fact that cluster home development was extremely marketable and workable under the condominium form of ownership. It also established an architectural style and planning program — largely unfamiliar in this part of the country at the time — that has gone on to influence a wide range of subsequent condominium products.
t often referred to as “California Rustic” and other terms seeking to define its ori-

(n (The principal planner of Heritage Village was the San Francisco firm of Allister and Paine), the style is probably better classified as acceptable contemporar
y acceptable, that is, to tradition-

- oriented New Englanders. It fits in rather well with the popular notion of what New England is or should be.

The earliest Connecticut condominiums generally fell into one of two categories, then they were planned by experienced nd usually out-of-state architecturalrms, or they represented a condominium variation on the tried-and-true gar
nen apartment theme.

Both groups shared similar success initially. The first was built almost entirely on the so-called “adult” market, offering wide range of recreational facilities and shell-built attached homes at moderate rices. The second, more traditional, multi-family group offered low-priced sing space to young couples and families with a minimum of “luxury” facilities, usually in a moderate density environment where bituminous concrete covered most of what the building didn’t. Generally there was little competition and most what was built, which was at least decent, sold.

Unfortunately for most of the imitators of Heritage Village, the “golden age” market (the retired, semi-retired and idowed) didn’t have quite the strength that everyone anticipated. In fact, most developments of this type found that they were in direct competition with the village, which had a widespread reputation and tremendous momentum, among other things. Even its own developers denied this the hard way. In 1971 they opened Heritage Woods in Farmington, only to find that they really couldn’t compete with themselves. (The project was later sold and is now known as Farmington Woods.)

There was a notable exception to this end: Oronoque Village in Stratford, which opened in October of 1971. The principal reason for this success story, aside from its thoroughly professional approach to marketing, was that it had a “new” adult market: “empty nestors.” This group consists primarily of married executives and professionals, somewhere in the early 40’s to late 50’s age group, who are still active in their occupations, have important communi-

ties, and whose children have generally own up and left home (hence the term empty nestors”). Other early recipients of this market demand, in varying de
cs, were Talcott Village in Farmington, Arbor Village in Branford, and Charlton hill in Hamden.

Somewhere along the line, the townhouse was “discovered.” By mid 1971, the appeal of the low-to-moderately priced row-level, attached condominium house to young families was well recognized. And by late 1973 there were more than 10,000 new townhouse units under development to meet this demand.

Unfortunately, some met this demand better than most, and many localities were oversaturated with available and planned units, which made the latter part of 1973 a very difficult time for many condominium developers. Compared with present conditions, however, it must appear to many that this was the greatest period of real estate prosperity in history. Hopefully, some will remember that it takes more than mortgage money to sell condominium units, so that many of the gross planning errors of this period will be avoided in the future.

Over the course of the last eight years, the condominium form has really not changed very much in terms of basic ingredients. The boxy, garden apartment motif may have withered and died in the face of competition with highly stylized attached homes in well landscaped settings, but nothing really startling has happened to improve upon the original Heritage Village concept: well-designed homes clustered to provide generous amounts of usable open space with on-

site facilities designed to meet the recrea-
tional interests and buying power of the resident owners.

What has changed is the quality of mar-

teting and merchandising. Elaborate recreational facilities (suitable or not) are now prevalent in all price ranges of con-

dominium housing. Exhaustive advertising campaigns, expensively decorated models, and all varieties of promotional gimmicks are employed to sell units. One of the reasons for the hard sell is that the market has become fiercely competit-

ive. Another is that professional market planning is rare during the preliminary stages of project planning, and built-in competitive weaknesses in a condominium product must be glossed over after the fact by clever merchandising.

The razzle-dazzle has frequently had an effect contrary to the one intended. Expensive promotional campaigns and elaborate recreational facilities have a way of boosting the housing cost out of proportion. In many developments the unit price may be increased $2,000 to $3,000 by the merchandising package — a price differential which can be fatal in some market areas.

What we are beginning to see is a trend to return to basics. As the cost of condomi-
nium housing approaches the cost of a single family, detached home on a private lot, the condominium concept loses a significant edge. This is probably most true in the young family market. The most successful condominiums to open in the past year have been basic, spacious housing with a minimum of (or no) recrea-
tional facilities, yet with intrinsic qualities that convey an atmosphere of ownership: well-planned living spaces, privacy, front and rear entries, full basements, a degree of exterior differentiation that defines the quantity of house, etc.

At present there are more than 26,800 approved condominium units in the State of Connecticut, located in more than 180 known developments. More than 17,500 of these units are constructed, and approximately 13,000 are sold. Only 58 known developments are completely
“Already many prospective buyers are shunning condominiums because of the many tales of woe that are circulating.”

sold out, leaving a balance of roughly 125 projects engaged in the active marketing of 13,800-plus units.

On the surface it would appear that there isn’t much room for newcomers, but that is not the case. Many areas are grossly oversaturated with units while other prime areas have very few. Even in saturated areas, many of the developments are so ill-suited for the marketplace that the field is virtually wide-open for on-target planning. More than a few of the existing developments will never make it as condominium communities. Many have large segments sold to investors who operate their ownership interest as rental property.

Where is condominium development concentrated? Most of it is in New Haven County (9910 planned units); second in concentration is Fairfield County (7322 units); Hartford (6182 units) is third; Middlesex, Litchfield and New London counties are running a distant fourth and fifth, sixth (1587, 1393 and 252 planned units, respectively).

W

Why do people buy condominium units? One reason should be obvious at this point: homeownership. In the younger, less affluent market, homeownership at an affordable price is the primary motivator. In hundreds of interviews with condominium owners, it has been learned that most of the traditional reasons for home purchase are predominantly active in condominium unit selection: location, setting, design, living area, layout, space, privacy, etc. In the younger market the recreational facilities seem to act primarily as convincers or “closers,” but most won’t make the investment on this basis alone. The maintenance-free living aspect of condominium ownership also appears to have a secondary appeal in this market segment. Some condominium boards of directors have a difficult time keeping a rein on unit owners who want to work outside improving a patio or other privacy areas, or relandscaping an area around their unit. In some communities owners have even been known to utilize their own lawnowers.

As the age and income levels of buyers increase, however, recreational facilities that occupy leisure time and maintenance programs that increase it are principal motivators, especially among those who have previously owned a single-family home. Yet this group is perhaps the most demanding about the homelike qualities and location of units offered. They are generally unwilling to sacrifice the quality of construction or privacy enjoyed in a previous home.

Ultimately, it all comes back to the quality and sanctity of the home. There is a popular caveat in the condominium business that warns: “Condominiums are not apartments for sale.” Similarly, the first rule of condominium marketing is never to use the word “apartment.” The second is to avoid the use of the word “condo” when talking to a prospective buyer. When you walk into someone’s condominium unit, it’s useful to say, “What a lovely home you have,” especially if you expect to stay for dinner.

Admittedly, the evolution of the condominium form as we know it has been one of trial and error. But it doesn’t take any special intelligence to know that after eight years we should be farther along than we are. With roughly one-third of the active projects in serious trouble due to overbuilding, poor marketing strategies, unappealing planning schemes, poor management of the development process and marketing programs, and poor public relations with owners and local communities; and with at least a third of the owner-controlled condominiums in serious difficulties created by latent defects and poor workmanship, unworkable community governments, uncooperative investor-owners and their tenants, and developer-inspired financial instability, we could be doing better — a lot better.

Unfortunately, we may be approaching a crisis in confidence. Already many prospective buyers are shunning condominiums because of the many tales of woe that are circulating. Many owners are finding that the real cost of maintenance is much higher that the brochure implied. Other unit owners are stuck with an extravagant clubhouse and related facilities that are of limited usefulness to them and, at the same time, unbearably expensive to maintain. Most are discovering that reselling their unit is difficult at best. Owning for a few years and then selling at a substantial appreciation to buy a “real” house — the basis on which many units have been sold — is becoming a tragic fiction for some. It has been said that buying a condominium unit on resale is a lot like buying a used car, with the added disadvantage of having to pay a price equal to or greater than the cost of a comparable new unit. The appeal of new units which offer buyers a wide selection of individual options, sold under highly organized sales program can often seriously hamper resale in the same locale, not to mention their effect on resale in the same development.

The true “horror stories” involve situations where developers have declared bankruptcy, leaving sitework and facilities incomplete, or where the construction lender has moved in to foreclose on unsold units. A year or two may go by before the condominium can collect any common income from the new owners of the vacant units. In the meantime, there may be little or no maintenance of the property; liability and property insurance coverage on the condominium may lapse; and spiteful subcontractors may be walking off with community equipment, even toilets and heating plants from the clubhouse.
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How do we solve the problems and combat the proclivities toward irresponsible community planning? Improved legislation will help somewhat by providing better disclosure and methods of insuring developer performance. But it will also hurt. The costs of meeting agency demands and preparing offering statements and supportive documentation will undoubtedly increase the price of condominium housing. It may also seriously limit the flexibility in planning that developers are accustomed to utilize during the marketing program to satisfy recognized buyer preferences. The New York Condominium Statute, for example, is an absolutely Byzantine maze of rules, restrictions and procedures.

Legislation will not solve the number-on-condominium “disease;” poor sales. In the same sense that you cannot legislate good taste, you cannot legislate successful planning. And what condominiums really need is professional planning at all levels: economic, physical, market, merchandising, management and community.

For a condominium planner there are perhaps three principal areas of professional responsibility: to the client, to the prospective individual user, and to the local community. A condominium project that falls on hard times will adversely
"...If the condominium form of ownership and development is going to make it, everyone is going to have to do a lot more homework."

The most important thing to ascertain, for everyone's benefit, is the time element. Almost every feasibility study or appraisal pulled out of a dusty drawer after a project has collapsed lacks this one essential ingredient—a realistic projection regarding the time it should take to complete and sell the project. Without an understanding of the time element, it is impractical to plan a construction phasing program, and more significantly, it is impossible to conduct a true feasibility study.

Some developers, of course, have been quite successful with absolutely no market preparation at all, but the reality is that more have not. Other developers have engaged consultants or architects with backgrounds in successful condominiums and have still failed in the marketplace. The prospects for success are, nevertheless, greatly improved by a team effort, especially when someone is in a position to supply continuity to the various phases of program development.

It is evident that most developers have not generally been receptive to the idea of hiring a marketing consultant themselves. In many cases, therefore, the architect must either perform this function himself or sub it out and include it somewhere in his fee structure.

Because the planning process has the tendency to get somewhat out of control at an early stage, it is advisable to begin doing one's market homework as soon as a commission is received. All to often a project is in the working drawing stage before someone decides to "check things out."

Finally, it is highly recommended that responsibilities regarding unit and site-plan modifications during development be clearly defined at the outset. If an architect is to have no hand in the ongoing marketing/development process, he should get his full fee when the working drawings are delivered to the builder. No continuity means no protection. There are far too many architects out there who own condominium units in declining projects because the developer couldn't make scheduled fee payments.

In the final analysis, if the condominium form of ownership and development is going to make it, everyone is going to have to do a lot more homework.
It would be impossible to talk about the growth of condominiums in Connecticut without including the state’s largest and most successful community, Heritage Village in Southbury. Recipient of the Al First Honor Award for design and land use in 1967, “The Village”, as it has come to be called, represents the standard against which other communities are measured, and after which many have been patterned.

Situated on more than 1,000 rolling acres bordering the Pomperaug River, Heritage Village also has the distinction of being the first major residence community built and sold under the Unit Ownership Act, passed by the Connecticut General Assembly in 1963. The development was largely created by the consolidation of two major land holdings, formerly belonging to comedian-pianist Victor Borg and his neighbor, inventor Alfred P. Krueger.

The Village, designed by the San Francisco architecture firm of Callister and Payne, consists of 2,580 units divided into 24 distinct “condos”. The cluster arrangement of homes, which range in size from the one-bedroom “Carriage House” to the three-bedroom “Berkshire”, has enabled the developer to construct housing of fairly high density without the appearance of crowding. While each cluster shares common driveway and garage facilities, the individual units are sited to

Heritage Village in Southbury is Connecticut’s first, largest, and most successful condominium community.

Photography by Ben Schnall
The Bazaar at Heritage Village is Connecticut’s first multi-level, open-plan shopping area, designed by Callister and Payne.

Exterior photography by David Brooks; interior by Otto Baitz

A townhouse unit at Heritage Sound, Milford.

Two other Connecticut projects are currently being sold by the Heritage Development Group, and both represent “firsts” for the organization. One, Heritage Glen in Simsbury, represents one of HDG’s first attempts at the conversion of a development originally designed as apartments into a condominium community. Located in a suburb of Hartford, The Glen features one- to three-bedroom homes priced...

January-February 1975
from $30,900 to $47,900. Also designed by Callister and Payne, the 121-unit complex includes the usual amenities of a clubhouse and oversized pool, but residents must rely on other facilities in the town for golf, tennis and other sports.

The second project, Heritage Sound in Milford, is the work of Carrel McNulty, Jr. and Robert Steinmetz of SMS Architects. It is the Heritage Group's first project in an urban redevelopment area, and was recently the recipient of a National Home Award for superior project design from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Featuring 175 townhouse and mid-rise condominium units, Heritage Sound — like Heritage Glen — is classified as an "adult" community, although there is no age requirement for owners as at Heritage Village.

Charlton Hill and Lakeridge

The New Haven architecture firm of Meyers and Gravino has been involved with a number of condominium projects in Connecticut. The two displayed here — Charlton Hill in Hamden and Lakeridge in Burrville (a suburb of Torrington) — are representative of two very different extremes in the condominium picture.

The first project, Charlton Hill, is specifically designated "elderly/adult housing" by the architects. "The tenant mix," comments Lauren E. Meyers, Jr., "is approximately 90% elderly. The project was not designed for families with kids, and it doesn't work for them since there are no on-site play areas except the pool. Sales were good, with minimal turnover, and value appreciation has been approximately 10% per year." The project is completely sold out.

The 92 units at Charlton Hill and the community facilities are situated on twelve acres of open field off Hamden's Whitney Avenue, with a wooded ravine and stream creating a country atmosphere in what is essentially a built-up, single-family neighborhood. After analyzing various design concepts, the architects developed a one-floor living solution which provided each dwelling with its own outdoor entry court. The courtyard affords each owner with a slice of land to call his own — an opportunity for self-expression, entry security, and a pleasant view from inside.

In order to price the units at Charlton Hill from $30,000 to $32,000, the architects achieved economy by constructing only one two-bedroom, two-bath floor plan, staggering the units along common walkways to create variety. The landscaping of these common areas includes a series of splashing fountains, so that walking within the site is a pleasant experience. Parking and vehicular traffic are kept at the site perimeter.

A different part of Connecticut's condominium profile is resort housing of the type represented at Lakeridge, another (Above)
 Architects Lauren Meyers and Frank Gravino of New Haven designed the 92 condominium units at Charlton Hill, one of Connecticut's 58 developments which are completely sold out.

Photography by Robert Perron

(Lower)
 Lakeridge, also by Meyers and Gravino, is the State's first "resort" condominium development which features $1.4 million in private recreational areas.
Meyers/Gravino project. The 237 mountain top acres at Lakeridge will be developed with 672 attached and free-standing single-family homes, in addition to an ambitious $1.4 million in private recreational areas: a ski area, two olympic-size pools, indoor and outdoor tennis courts, platform tennis, two clubhouses, riding stables and more. Developed to respond to the demand for second-home resort properties by buyers from the New York metropolitan area, Lakeridge is designed to attract all age groups—singles, young marrieds with children, and older persons. Lakeridge is being built as "villages" or clusters of housing which are scattered over roughly 15% of the site. Given the uneven, rocky nature of the area, the architects' studies indicated pier-and-platform construction rather than continuous foundation walls would be less costly and cause the least environmental damage to the natural surroundings. The houses, sheathed with natural cedar shingles to blend with the forest setting, are built vertically, contributing privacy on each floor and adding a "tree-house" atmosphere to the units. Lakeridge will also have its own commercial center, including a general store, restaurant, post office, sporting goods rental center, small boutiques and other consumer services.

Plymouth Colony

Plymouth Colony is a 71-unit townhouse condominium development on a narrow, ten-acre wooded site in Branford. The site was planned to create small, identifiable clusters of housing units that respond to the sloping wooded character of the land.

All housing groups are approached via a perimeter road which frees the interior of the site for quiet activities and open space. Carports visually separate the road and vehicles from the houses, and form small, private entrance courtyards. A community meeting house and swimming pool are located at the low end of the open space around a pond, creating a visual focus for the development. Paths through the open space connect all units to the facilities and to lookout and sitting areas distributed throughout the site.

Two basic two-story unit designs were developed to form groups of offset houses with distinct entrances off the courtyards and private terraces overlooking the central open space. They were also planned to permit major interior changes after the foundations had been placed. The number of bedrooms and bathrooms, and a variety of finish options were determined during construction in response to the specific demands of prospective buyers.

All units have ample storage space and full basements; many include walkout playrooms, two-story living spaces and one or two fireplaces.
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Books


Packed with specific guidelines, this fully illustrated book presents all the information needed in the planning and design of complete housing programs, including a prototype plan which incorporates a quantitative analysis with its design solution. Brought together in one compact volume are thousands of mandatory and recommended criteria, standards, considerations, codes and rulings for deciding anything from site selection to kitchen arrangements. The Manual is the second product of a collaboration between two men who are active in the urban housing field. De Chiara is a registered architect, and Koppleman is a registered landscape architect who serves as executive director of the Nassau-Suffolk Regional Planning Board and director of the Suffolk County Planning Commission.


An exhaustive study and comprehensive examination of the external conditions that affect and influence life, and of the effect human beings have had on their surroundings, are provided in this generously illustrated volume. The articles, which were garnered from over 200 contributors, are interrelated by means of cross-references and an extensive analytical index, and cover the entire spectrum of environmental science from such diverse fields as meteorology, mining, and conservation. Nearly every article opens with a definition of the subject and closes with a bibliography for further reading.


In his latest work, Munson, a registered engineer and landscape architect, describes in simple and concise language the basic methods, formulas, and shortcuts employed in site improvement work. The first to assemble essential construction design information in a single source, the author provides a basic guide for checking layout and earthwork for bidding and construction calculations. A general overview of the characteristics of utilities and the relationship of utilities to topography and site improvement are also presented in this volume. The former head of a firm practicing landscape architecture, civil engineering, and urban planning, Munson had taught design implementation in the School of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning at Michigan State University, after retiring from private practice.


This practical guide discusses the basic elements of the entire interior decorating process, including color, lighting, built-ins and accessories. The author presents her formula for designing interiors that successfully involve the client in the model complex, and offers suggestions for creating a total, "livable" concept and for setting up budgets and locating reputable sources for furnishings and decorative materials. A prominent decorator-designer of model homes and apartments, Eichen is president of her own firm, and a contributing editor to House and Home magazine.
**AIA Awards Subcontracts**

The AIA Research Corporation (AIA/RC) has subcontracted with eight architectural firms and two schools of architecture to develop housing design concepts incorporating the use of solar heating and heating/cooling systems.

AIA/RC and its subcontractors are assisting the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the National Bureau of Standards in responding to the general objectives of the Solar Heating and Cooling Demonstration Act of 1974. The subcontractors will prepare solar design concepts for single-family, low-rise multi-family, and mobile homes which will be included in a document for use by HUD and other federal agencies, researchers, designers, builders, home owners, and the general public concerned with incorporating solar heating and heating/cooling houses.

The ten subcontractors were chosen from more than 350 firms and 30 schools submitting preliminary proposals: Community Design Associates, Cos Cob, Conn.; Donald Watson, AIA, Guilford, Conn.; Giffels Associates, Detroit, Mich.; Joint Venture, Denver, Colo.; Massdesign, Cambridge, Mass.; RTL, Inc., Paramount, Calif.; The Architects, Taos of Taos, N.M.; and Total Environmental Action, Harrisville, N.H.; and the School of Architecture and Environmental Studies, University of Detroit; and the College of Architecture, Arizona State University.

**ASHRAE Seminar Program**

The American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc. (ASHRAE) has finalized the program of its series of two-day seminars on "How to Save Energy in Existing Buildings."

The schedule is as follows: February 10-11, Stouffer's Atlanta Inn, Atlanta, Georgia; February 27-28, International Hotel, Los Angeles, California; March 10-11, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois; and March 25-26, Du Pont Plaza, Washington, D.C.

This program has been developed to inform engineers responsible for the design, specification, installation, operation and maintenance of HVAC&R systems in existing industrial, commercial, and institutional structures.

The registration fee, payable in advance, is $340 per person, which includes the cost of all sessions, luncheons, and materials. For further information, contact Robert A. Zwerner, Management Concepts International, Inc., 505 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

**Factory Mutual Sponsors Firesafe Design Seminar**

The Factory Mutual System is offering a seminar for architects, builders, specification writers, and contractors on "Designing for Firesafety & Hazard Control." The three-day course will include demonstrations, lectures, and discussions which emphasize the nature of firesafe design and explain how to achieve this design using various construction techniques and materials. In addition, such topics as application of automatic sprinklers, prevention of windstorm and explosion damage, and high rise building protection will be covered.

The three 1975 seminars will be held April 15-17, May 20-22, and August 19-21 at the Factory Mutual Engineering Corporation, 1151 Boston-Providence Turnpike, Norwood, Massachusetts 02062. Applications and further information can be obtained from Paul Lasky, Education Department.

Factory Mutual is an industrial and commercial insurance group, which is active in loss prevention engineering and research.

**Lawrence Associates Design Health Care Center**

Construction has started for the new headquarters building for the Connecticut Association of Extended Health Care Facilities on land straddling the Manchester and Vernon, Connecticut town lines.

The administrative and educational structure, designed by The Lawrence Associates, Architects/Planners of Manchester, will be completed in the spring of 1975. The one-story, 11,000 square foot building will feature heavily textured exterior walls, utilizing ribbed hexagonal profile concrete masonry units, and a 300-seat auditorium. Contrasting fascia panels of anodized aluminum will be installed over the deeply recessed perimeter openings.

The new complex will house the association's staff offices, and meeting rooms, serving as the focal point for the many planning sessions, conferences, and educational seminars that bring administrators together from Connecticut's nursing homes, convalescent homes and extended health-care facilities.

Structural consultant for the project is Frederick A. Clinton, P.E., of Glastonbury, with Jacob Koton, P.E., of Bloomfield, as mechanical and electrical consultant. Camera Construction, Inc. from West Hartford is the general contractor.

A rendering of Connecticut's Health Care Headquarters, designed by Lawrence Associates.
Award for Architectural Drawings

The Architectural League of New York announces the forty-ninth annual competition and exhibition of the Birch Burdette Long Memorial Award for architectural drawings. Architects, illustrators and renderers are invited to submit their drawings for an exhibition which will take place at the renovated Cooper Union, 50 Astor Place, New York City, from May 1st to May 16th.

A professional jury will consider award submissions in any medium which clearly illustrates the appearance and communicates the spirit of a building, as well as sketches and other types of graphic representation of existing buildings and/or architectural concepts. This year’s jury will be composed of: Henry Cobb, Architect (Chairman), I.M. Pei & Partners, New York; Milton Glaser, Graphic Designer, New York; Richard Haas, Artist and Educator, Bennington College, Vermont; Michael McKinnell, Architect, Kallmann & McKinnell, Boston; and Lella Vignelli, Architect and Designer, Vignelli Associates, New York.

Deadline for submission is April 16th, 1975. For further information and applications contact The Architectural League of New York, 41 East 65th Street, New York, New York 10021.

Helikon Acquires Historic Plant

The Ponemah Mills in Taftville was purchased by Helikon Furniture Co.

The acquisition of an historic New England mill structure in Taftville, Connecticut, and its subsequent conversion to a full-scale furniture manufacturing facility, have been announced by Helikon Furniture Co., Inc., currently of Norwich. Known as The Ponemah Mills, the initial foundations were laid in cement in 1866, and actual mill operations began five years later. Historically ranked as among the first fabric mills in New England, The Ponemah Mills were once considered one of the leading textile mills in the country.

A master plan for the layout of Helikon Furniture’s operations, incorporating all of the woodworking, upholstery, design and related facilities has been finalized, with the actual move-in scheduled for early 1975.
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Fyler Replaces Flores-Jenkins

The West Hartford Toastmaster International Club installed its newly elected officers at the January meeting. Waddy Fyler, a land developer from West Simsbury, succeeds Hannibal Flores-Jenkins, AIA, as president. Architect Flores-Jenkins, a professional staff member of Hartford’s Department of Public Works, has been chosen area governor of Toastmaster International. Engineer Raymond Miller was installed as secretary of the West Hartford chapter.

Pollution Control Firm Founded

The formation of Connecticut Anti-Pollution Systems, Inc. of Danbury, Connecticut, has been announced here by its president, Stanley J. Weissman of Ridgefield.

The company, located in Mill Plain Park, specializes in design fabrication and installation of dust control, pneumatic conveying and solid waste disposal systems for industry, private operations and municipalities.

Prepare for Equivalency Exam

Architectural License Seminars, the organization which has provided study aids nationally for the architectural license examinations since 1968, announces its program in preparation for the Equivalency Examination to be held in June 1975.

The program includes home study courses, handbooks, and the popular, intensive one-day crash seminars, all of which are directly related to the Equivalency Examination. The seminars will be held in May, 1975, in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York.

Further information may be obtained by writing to Architectural License Seminars, P. O. Box 64188, Los Angeles, California 90064.

Moriarty & Associates Expand

Daniel Moriarty & Associates, New England-New York area roofing and moisture protection consultants, with offices at 351 Main Street, Saybrook, has expanded its services to include architectural designing of moisture protection systems.

According to Daniel Moriarty, founder of the company, the firm now combines the skills of the architectural profession with the expertise of the moisture protection industry, thereby offering its clients such services as moisture-problem analysis, design of corrective or preventive construction, and planning and design of maintenance programs.

In connection with the expansion of services, Moriarty also announced that Kenneth Gelband, AIA, a registered architect with extensive experience in roof design and construction and moisture protection technology, has joined the organization as a principal. Gelband is a graduate of the City College of New York, who earned his degree in Architecture at Columbia University.

The services of Daniel Moriarty & Associates are available to architects, engineers, building owners, property management firms, insurance companies, public officials and others concerned with the construction, restoration, and maintenance of major structures.

Greco Joins Geotech

Edward M. Greco of Madison, Connecticut has been named District Manager of the New Haven, Connecticut office of Geotech, Inc., a soils and foundation engineering company from Pennsauken, New Jersey. Geotech, Inc., will provide complete geotechnical engineering services, including subsurface exploration services, with its own modern test boring equipment, laboratory testing of soil samples, soils and foundation analysis, engineering reports, and soils engineering services during construction. Greco is a professional engineer registered in Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Missouri, and a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and Chi Epsilon.

Letters

To the Editor

The “CSA Management Supercourse” provided an unlimited wealth of guidance and information in a most organized and direct system. If all of us architects and engineers better managed ourselves, and our offices, maybe we would be on the other side of the supply and demand pendulum like doctors or lawyers, providing necessary professional, objective solutions for our clients. Instead, well-organized package dealers are exploiting our weaknesses by being good managers.

I sincerely hope the course is offered annually and that all the people in our profession are made aware of how important it is that someone in their office should regularly take such a course. I am impatiently waiting now until I can send my associates to such a course, and realize from now on that 54 hours a year is a minimum price to pay to keep up-to-date on all aspects of one’s own professional interests.

I applaud Mike Buckley, Mike Hough and Peter Borgemeister for pulling together such a stimulating, if not shocking, course.

Bruce Porter Arneill, AIA

Errors of Omission

Through an editorial oversight, credits for photography on two CSA/AIA Honor Award projects were omitted from the November-December issue. Robert Perron was the photographer on the Oak Lane Country Club (page 19), and Ezra Stoller provided the cover and the photography for the Kent Memorial Library (page 11).
New Products and Services

New Floodlighting Company

An outdoor floodlighting company has been formed by SEPCO Division of Connecticut International Corporation, known as the leading manufacturer of airport guidance lighting systems. The new SEPCO Floodlighting Division is the first step in a planned expansion and diversification program.

Fixtures are now available for lighting of airport apron and maintenance facilities, parking areas, malls, security areas, decorative facade lighting, sports lighting (tennis courts, golf courses, ski trails), highway and sign lighting.

Catalog data and photometric information is available from Edward Slater, National Sales Manager, SEPCO Floodlighting Division, 9 Britton Road, Bloomfield, Ct. 06002.

Minges Opens Laboratory

The Minges Associates, Inc., consulting engineers of Farmington, has established a new division which will be known as the Minges Environmental Laboratory, according to James S. Minges, president.

The laboratory is staffed with qualified chemists, engineers, and biologist and equipped with modern instruments and support apparatus to serve industrial, municipal, water utility, and private clients throughout Connecticut and New England. It was originally set up in 1966 to support the parent firm’s environmental engineering projects.

Charles A. Jaworski, a professional engineer licensed in Connecticut, has been named laboratory director. He holds a B.S. degree in civil engineering from the University of Connecticut and an M.S. in sanitary engineering from Harvard University.

Among the specific services offered by the Minges Environmental Laboratory are the following: analytical examinations of water, wastewater, streams, wells; bacteriological and microscopic tests; laboratory and field scale pilot testing; stack sampling; and NPDES monitoring.

For further information on the capabilities of the laboratory, contact Charles A. Jaworski, The Minges Environmental Laboratory, The Exchange, Farmington, CT.
Shemitz Develops Lighting System

A Connecticut firm of lighting consultants and designers has developed a new lighting system for offices, which introduces a variety of user benefits, while producing savings as high as 30 percent of the energy requirements of an office building.

Designed and utilizing principles patented by Sylvan R. Shemitz & Associates, Inc., of West Haven, the system was first created to meet the special needs of a small, New Haven real estate company and is finding its first, large-scale applications in the offices of three major corporations in New York and Philadelphia.

Called Lite-A-Part (registered), the new technique eliminates lighting equipment in the ceiling by using special fixtures mounted directly on partitions.

Describing the savings obtainable through this task-oriented lighting, Shemitz explains that a rule of thumb for office building electrical requirements assigns five watts per square foot to lighting, five watts to air conditioning and two for other building services and convenience outlets, totaling 12 watts per square foot.

Lite-A-Part reduces the electrical power consumption for lighting to less than 2.5 watts per square foot. Since half of the air-conditioning load is represented by heat generated by the lights, a 50 percent reduction in light load produces a 25 percent reduction in air-conditioning load, thereby saving (in addition to the reduced cost of the system itself) another 1.25 watts per square foot. The total saving, then, is 3.75 watts per square foot, or more than 30 percent.

The Lite-A-Part system, developed by Sylvan R. Shemitz & Associates of West Haven, has been applied successfully in the offices of Joseph E. Seagram & Sons of New York.
**M. Frank Higgins & Co., Inc.**

Resilient Flooring & Carpet Specialists

780 NORTH MOUNTAIN ROAD
NEWINGTON, CT. 06111
PHONE: 249-6826

---

**Ware Industries**

33 HULL STREET, SHELTON, CONNECTICUT 06484 (203) 763-0250

---

**Kessler Equipment Sales**

Automotive and Petroleum Equipment
Carbon Monoxide Systems
Welding Exhaust Systems
Automotive Lifts
Lubrication Systems
Air Compressors

CALL — Hartford (203) 236-0833

---

**Office Signs**

WALL & DOOR SIGNS
EVERY TYPE
FOR SCHOOLS, CHURCHES, HOSPITALS, OFFICES, FACTORIES, BANKS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS

SETON NAME PLATE CORP.
New Haven, Conn. 06505 • (203) 772-2520

---

**Koenig's Four Arts!!**

ART NEEDS FOR —

1. FINE ARTS...
   Custom Frames — etc...
2. COMMERCIAL...
   Advertising & Illustrating...
3. TECHNICAL...
   Architects-Engineers — etc...
4. REPROGRAPHIC...
   Photostats — Blueprints —
   Cameras — Drafting

---

**Rely on Galvanized Construction**

Specialties Designed for
Solid Building & Durability

STEEL STUDS
JOIST SUPPORTS
STEEL WALL TIES
DRY WALL CORNER BEAD
J-TRIM
FRAMING ANCHORS
METAL CROSS BRIDGING
FURRING STRIPS
Z-CHANNEL
RESILIENT CHANNEL

---

**Ware Industries**

33 HULL STREET, SHELTON, CONNECTICUT 06484 (203) 763-0250

---

**Koenig's Four Arts**

SERVING THE ARTS SINCE 1933

is on the corner at
59 Farmington Ave.
Hartford

1 block north
of 84-91

Phone 728-3406

---

**Office Signs**

WALL & DOOR SIGNS
EVERY TYPE
FOR SCHOOLS, CHURCHES, HOSPITALS, OFFICES, FACTORIES, BANKS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS

SETON NAME PLATE CORP.
New Haven, Conn. 06505 • (203) 772-2520
Lindquist has what's new

Read about it in the architect and builders magazines — then come see it at Lindquist. We make it a policy to handle what's new, what's better in builders hardware just as fast as it comes out. Baldwin, Schlage, Yale, Stanley, Von Duprin and other quality lines make up the largest contract builders hardware inventory in Connecticut — to serve you better. Visit our new sample room. Our architectural hardware consultants are at your service.

LINDQUIST SUPPLY COMPANY
Builders Hardware • Since 1919
383 Fairfield Ave., Bridgeport, Conn. 06604
Phone: 366-4361

COMMUNICONN publications, inc.
CATALOGS
BROCHURES
ANNUAL REPORTS
SALES PROMOTION
GRAPHIC DESIGN
publishers of CONNECTICUT ARCHITECT
BUSHNELL PLAZA • ONE GOLD STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103
(203) 249-7634

NUSTAIR
PRECAST STAIRS AND LANDINGS

Nustone Industries, Inc., Connecticut's leading producer of precast steps and entryways, presents NUSTAIR: a stair and landing system for commercial and industrial interior or exterior installations. NUSTAIR is available in standard sizes or can be cast to meet specific requirements. It is strong, attractive and engineered for safety and long life.

Nustone offers many other precast products:
NUSTEP — for residential and commercial use,
PermEntry — outside basement entrances, patio decks, and other decorative and functional concrete products.

Call or write for free brochures and specifications.

NUSTONE INDUSTRIES, INC.
355 Sackett Point Road
North Haven, Connecticut 06473
Telephone (203) 288-7481

An important name in concrete since 1886.
Call this Connecticut number now if you're facing the need for a new plant or facility within the next 18 months.

Call this Connecticut number now if you'd like to take advantage of a "buyer's market" for building—a highly competent construction industry that's looking for additional work.

Call this Connecticut number now if you'd like attractive long-term financing at rates still well below prime.

Call this Connecticut number now. Ask for Richard M. Stewart, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Commerce. Or, if you prefer, write him, in confidence, at: Room 206, 210 Washington Street, Hartford, CT 06106

January-February 1975
Will Your Clients Have the Energy?

For assurance that they will have the energy, specify heating plants which burn fuel oil. For assurance of heating plants of high efficiency, feel free to ask our opinion.

Our business is supplying fuel oil for New England and in fostering its economical use. Allow us to assist you.

CONNECTICUT
Call 203-787-2175

MASSACHUSETTS
Call 413-732-6207

FUEL OIL FOR NEW ENGLAND