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Architect's Calendar
September 1986

MONDAY 1
Architecture of Housing, SCI-ARC 1986
Through September 6. Santa Barbara Contemporary Arts Forum, 7 West De la Guerra St. Call (805) 966-5333.

MONDAY 8
Tuesdays's Lecture
Architecture of L.A. Department of Parks and Recreation

MONDAY 15

MONDAY 22
LA-AIA Ex Com Meeting
Chapter Board Room, 3:30 p.m.

MONDAY 29
Gardens of Eden: The Designs of Florence Knoll
Lecture by Professor James Wachs. SCI-ARC Suite 259, 7:30 p.m. $2.50 members, $7.50 non-members, or $12 for series of four lectures. Send check and SAE to SCI-ARC Conferences, 849 S. Broadway, Suite 222, Los Angeles, CA 90014. Call (213) 625-2489.

TUESDAY 2
Chapter Delegates in CCAIA
Chapter Board Room, 2 p.m.

TUESDAY 9
Tuesdays's Lecture
Architecture of Architecture

TUESDAY 16
Southern California Historical Landscape: A Designer's Resource Lecture by Douglas and Regula Campbell, sponsored by LA Conservancy. PDC Suite 259, 7:30 p.m. $2.50 members, $7.50 non-members, or $12 for series of four lectures. Send check and SAE to LA Conservancy, 849 S. Broadway, Suite M22, Los Angeles, CA 90014. Call (213) 625-2489.

TUESDAY 23
LA-AIA Ex Com Meeting
Chapter Board Room, 3:30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY 3
Tuesdays's Lecture
Architecture of L.A. Department of Parks and Recreation

WEDNESDAY 10
Tuesdays's Lecture
Architecture of Architecture

WEDNESDAY 17
Government Relations Committee
Chapter Board Room, 3:30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY 24
Five Annual LA-AIA Conference: Perspectives: Professional Practice/Planning
See page 1 for details.

THURSDAY 4
Tuesdays's Lecture
Architecture of Architecture

THURSDAY 11
Tuesdays's Lecture
Architecture of Architecture

FRIDAY 5
FRIDAY 12
WEEKEND
FRIDAY 19
WEEKEND
FRIDAY 26
WEEKEND

Sundays, September 21
Interfaith Street Walk, sponsored by AIA Los Angeles. Meet at 11 a.m. at Los Angeles City Hall, 200 N. Spring St., Los Angeles. Contact: Bruce F. Thomas, AIA, SCI-ARC. Phone: (213) 569-0263.

Sundays, September 22
Four Days of Open Houses at the homes of architects, sponsored by AIA Los Angeles. Meet at 11 a.m. at Los Angeles City Hall, 200 N. Spring St., Los Angeles. Contact: Bruce F. Thomas, AIA, SCI-ARC. Phone: (213) 569-0263.

Sundays, September 27
LA-AIA Design Awards Reception and Presentation
See page 1 for details.

Sundays, September 21
LA-AIA Design Awards Reception and Presentation
See page 1 for further details.

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND

WEEKEND
Announcement
The Department of Transportation of the State of California (Caltrans) is soliciting expressions of interest from licensed architectural firms that will lead to proposals for the preparation of plans, specifications and estimates (PS&E) for design development, construction documents, and construction support for a new public school facility to consist of new construction, to house classrooms and support facilities, together with the relocation of portable classrooms. The project is located in the City of Inglewood, County of Los Angeles.

The basis for selection of the successful firm shall include the professional excellence, demonstrated competence and specialized experience of the firm, the education and experience of key personnel, the staff capability, workload, and ability to meet schedules, principals to be assigned, the national excellence, demonstrated competence and specialized experience of the firm, in addition to an active and acceptable affirmative action plan aimed at eliminating discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and demonstrated compliance with affirmative action plans on previous projects.

Any contract to be awarded as a result of this solicitation will be awarded without discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

Expressions of interest for this project will be received until 5:00 p.m., Monday, September 29, 1986, and should be directed to: Department of Transportation, Bids and Contracts, 120 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012, Telephone: (213) 620-3850

All interested architectural firms will be provided with a written Request for Qualifications setting forth the particulars of the requirements.

think... MASONRY!

Masonry Institute of America
2550 Beverly Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90057
(213) 388-0472
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SOLAR TECHNOLOGY
11889 Pico Blvd.
W. Los Angeles, CA 90064
License 424269

- MEETING THE GROWING DEMAND FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY
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gere kavanaugh designs 213 687 8270

SophSystems
Gregory E. Morden, Ph.D.

AUTOCAD

The Architecture of Richard Morris Hunt
Edited by Susan Stein.
The University of Chicago Press, 198 pages. $39.95.

Richard Morris Hunt helped to found the AIA and he was one of its first presidents. He was the first American to study architecture at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris, and among the most influential architects in the United States during his lifetime. When he died in 1895 he was known as the Dean of American Architects. Although his contemporary critics were "quick to acknowledge his fame, honors and professional commitment... most expressed reservations about the quality of his architecture." To some extent this attitude continues today. The volume of essays accompanies an exhibition of drawings by Hunt at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. One gets the feeling that the exhibit and this volume were intended to revive these critical attitudes.

The essays which make up this volume are diverse and touch on many aspects of Hunt's long career: Paul R. Baker provides an overview of Hunt's practice, Richard Chaffee examines the years in Paris at the École. David Van Zanten writes about the Lenox Library. Lewis Sharp looks at Hunt's designs of monumental sculpture, including the base of the Statue of Liberty. Unfortunately, most of the authors only survey the topic of the discussion whether it be Hunt's domestic architecture or his course work at the École. In this respect the book is disappointing.

Susan Stein's essay, "Role and Reputation: The Architecture of Richard Morris Hunt," directly addresses the issue of re-evaluating his work. She argues that Hunt's reputation was based on a few works and that the variety and complexity of his work have been overlooked. The recent availability of his drawings "has made possible a reassessment of his overall achievement based upon a critical analysis of his surviving records." The chapter, though brief, examines his student work and professional practice by relating the work to the complete). The section dealing with Hunt's realizations in the Central City is to offer a new idea. My interest in presenting the "Alvarado Parkway" as a bypass for the Central City is to offer a new idea. An idea which may incite discussion and debate and possibly lead the way toward a much needed update of the Central City Master Plan of 1972. Mr. John Kaliski has taken my paper apart, phrase by phrase, as any good opponent should. His perception of the quality of the environment differs considerably from what I see when traversing the route. I see much of it as obsolete in building stock and urban form. I see large neighborhoods which cannot meet new standards without major surgery. I am fully aware of some wonderful neighborhoods in the vicinity of Echo Park and am very interested in MacArthur Park, Otis Art Institute and other important landmarks. These all must be enhanced and saved from the creeping trash which is engulfing them.

From my experiences as an architect, I know that nothing happens until one "draws the first line" and nothing will happen to this important area of the city until we extend the Community Redevelopment Agency out and beyond its present borders. We need an updated Central City Plan and we must correct the flaws in the Harbor Freeway to eliminate the gridlock.

Perhaps other architects would like to offer their ideas.

Albert C. Martin, FAIA
To the Editor
Despite our differences, clearly stated in both of our articles in the July issue of LA Architect, I agree with Mr. Martin that architects and other interested professionals should be encouraged to scrutinize this issue in all its complexities and express their findings.

I trust, in regard to the Alvarado Street bypass, that the AIA will continue to provide a balanced forum for various points of view surrounding this difficult subject until the Los Angeles Chapter is able to define its official position.

John Kaliski
**NEW MEMBERS**

**AAIA, Philip H. Prince, Phil Prince Enterprises**, Danville Edward Ubvich, The Construction People. 113 West 73rd St, New York, NY 10023. 212-245-2215


Gary D. Bardovi, Matlin and Dovecky Architects; Robert B. St. German-Inc., St. German-Inc. Consulting Ltd.; Kevin Michael Ary, Davidson and Lindsey, Architects; Brian James Marziale, Smith & Allen; Rinaldo Veselica, Gensler & Associates Architects.


**Association Transfers**, Ellen W. Herrett Miller, Gruen Associates, from East Bay; Tina Wada, Warsley Software Consulting, from San Mateo.

**Student**, Manfred Schlosser, Mitra Nezam, Jamie Gregory, Arum K. Gholkar, Mila Huntington, Roykore Software Consulting, from San Mateo.

**R. Warren Co. for design of the Kaiser Steel Fontana Plant.** After he was made Member Emeritus in 1985, he took up watercolors and was one of the original 10 members of Valley Watercolor Society. He has won many ribbons and prizes.

**Terminations**


In accordance with Institute by-laws, these persons have forfeited all their ownership to either the Institute or any of its components, including the right to print or otherwise use the seal or insignia of the Institute or any abbreviation thereof or the initials AIA or any title which the Institute has established. Readmission procedures can be obtained through the Chapter Office.

(Note: the status of the above was confirmed by our National Office as of July 18, 1986.)

*Did You Know*?

**Architect and Artichitectological Review** magazines will be merged this October to create "the most complete magazine in the field."

Prior to the passage of AB 3074, state law required the examinations of California candidates to be graded by Board Commissioners. The Commissioners are California-registered architects who have been in practice as architects in California for at least five years. In grading the architectural registration examination, which is privately developed, these Commissioners are charged with ensuring that candidates for registration are sufficiently familiar with California codes, statutes and conditions—such as seismic safety, energy and handicapped access—to practice in California.

**Licensing Bill**

California Governor George Deukmejian recently signed into law AB 3074 (Frazee), which allows the California Board of Architectural Examiners (CBAE) to delegate grading authority for the architectural registration examination to the licensees of the examination who meets CBAE-adopted guidelines. These guidelines will ensure that the exam occurs in the CBAE in the proper development, content and administration of the licensing examination. Effective with the bill's passage, the CBAE has already adopted these guidelines.

The bill, sponsored by the California Council, The American Institute of Architects (CIA), passed the legislature without a dissenting vote and was signed into law on June 27.

Prior to the passage of AB 3074, state law required the examinations of California candidates to be graded by Board Commissioners. The Commissioners are California-registered architects who have been in practice as architects in California for at least five years. In grading the architectural registration examination, which is privately developed, these Commissioners are charged with ensuring that candidates for registration are sufficiently familiar with California codes, statutes and conditions—such as seismic safety, energy and handicapped access—to practice in California.

**Mediation**

The American Arbitration Association is offering mediation services as an alternative in construction disputes as part of an early settlement conference or as an adjunct procedure to a pending lawsuit.

Mediation is a voluntary process under which the parties refer their dispute to an impartial person, a mediator, who assists them in reaching a mutual agreement, without a court's settlement of their differences. The purpose of mediation is to facilitate a mutual agreement by analyzing the parties' interests. Unlike an arbitrator, a mediator does not impose a settlement on the parties or make a binding decision. He can, however, help the parties to reach their own agreement.

A mediator does not hold evidentiary hearings as in arbitration, and conducts informal meetings or separate (caucus) meetings with the parties to understand the issues, facts and positions of the parties. The mediator's role is not to evaluate the parties' positions and make a decision. The mediator will not be involved in any dispute unless the parties specifically agree to his involvement.

Mediation can be costly, time-consuming and destructive of the business relationship between the parties. Mediation offers an effective alternative in a mutually agreeable process. It provides an alternative to construction disputes involving owners, architects, engineers, contractors, subcontractors and suppliers. The AIA offers trained and knowledgeable mediators; fast, economical and confidential sessions; and an effective method to explore viable alternative solutions. As more parties in the construction industry become familiar with the process, mediation will become a serious choice for resolving disputes.

To receive copies of the AIA's Construction Industry Mediation Rules and a practical guide to mediation, write to the American Arbitration Association, At Regional Director, P.O. Box 57994, Los Angeles, CA 90057.

**Architectural and Architectotechnological Review** magazines will be merged this October to create "the most complete magazine in the field."

"The Architecture of Frank Gehry" will be on exhibit at the Walker Art Museum in Minneapolis, September 21–November 16, 1986.
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The following text is a summary of the June 1986 LA/AIA Board of Director's meeting minutes. The full text is available through the Chapter Office.

Discussion of Selection of Professionals by City of Los Angeles. Cyril Chern introduced guest Ralph Iredale who had come before the Board in 1985 to discuss the manner in which the City of Los Angeles selects architects. In fact, nothing has happened since March 1985 and he wished to know whether, in fact, this was an issue with the Board which was concerned.

Chern introduced guest Ralph Iredale and stated that he had just received a communication on this issue that he intended to share with the Board members at this meeting.

Widom reported that he had received Executive Directive #16 on the 20th of May and that he had carefully reviewed it. There were two issues that concerned him and after raising these issues the City has agreed: (1) to request qualifications; and (2) that the wording of the directive will provide that the services of an architect or engineer "shall" be selected through a review process of their qualifications.

After some discussion Iredale suggested that the Board become involved in the process in these reviews.

Moved Chern/Second, the following: that the Long Range Planning Committee review the feasibility of the Board being involved in the City Selection Process and under which terms that would be: Carried.

Shop Drawings Seminars Report. Juarez reported that the seminars on shop drawings were well attended and Engineers were extremely well received. About $5,000.00 was spent advertising, but they made about $6,000.00.

The engineers are very interested in holding a joint meeting with the AIA, preferably a dinner meeting. President Axon suggested that representatives from the engineering group and the AIA get together and discuss the program before the Board approves the meeting.

Discussion on Chapter Headquarters. Chern reported that he was investigating a parking space that the Chapter might consider for its new headquarters. It is located on the corner of Fifth and Shatto in Los Angeles.

President's Report. It appears that Los Angeles has been chosen to host the 1994 AIA Convention.

The City of Los Angeles is considering adopting plans which would prohibit doing business with any company that has interests in South Africa. The LA/AIA has been invited to attend a meeting at which this will be discussed. Since many of the Ex-Com will be at Convention, Janice Axon suggested that a letter be sent.

Widom suggested that the Board not take a position on this issue. Chern remarked that the City is only asking "Will we come to a meeting to discuss the financial impact?" We are not being asked to take a stand. After further discussion it was:

Moved Robbins/Second Reed, the following: that the Board not answer the invitation. Motion Defeated.

President Axon will draft a response to the invitation.

Los Angeles College is planning a training program to teach experienced mechanical architectural drafters to produce working drawings on a micro-computer system using an AUTOCAD system. The College will be soliciting funds for this program. They are asking the AIA to write a letter stating that they approve the concept and that they believe the program will be beneficial to the profession.

Since other colleges are offering the same program, if the Chapter endorses one it would have to endorse them all. It was agreed that the Chapter would not write the request for endorsement.

The Chapter received an announcement from Betty Dougherty regarding the CAA/IA election of officers.

Widom stated that he would like to nominate Don Axon for Regional Director from California. Mark Hall seconded the nomination which was carried by unanimous vote.

Axon reported that he had received three responses to his letter regarding the City Sign Ordinance. He had received a letter regarding an RTD meeting on the Metro Rail. Gary Russell had reported that the LA/AIA was opposed to the idea of an RTD road train along Wilshire Blvd. The comment was that if the LA architects were opposed to the plan there was a good reason for the objection.

Executive Director's Report. Janice Axon reported that Richard Creadick. AIA requested that the Chapter purchase the video "Pride of Place." He feels that there are colleges and universities that may want to use it and we can recoup the cost by renting it out. The cost of the video is $500.00.

After some discussion it was:

Moved Chern/Second Juarez, the following: that the Chapter purchase the video and make it available free to all of the college districts.

Cyril Chern amended the motion to provide that whether to charge or not be made discretionary. As amended, the Motion Carried.

The following text is a summary of the July 1986 LA/AIA Board of Director's meeting minutes. The full text is available through the Chapter Office.

Report on Chapter Headquarters. Cyril Chern stated that he met with the owner regarding the property on 5th and Shatto. He has developed other buildings in that area during the last twenty years and likes the idea of developing a quality building with us. He wishes to remain a partner in the building for ten years. We would be responsible for the design, he would be the Managing General Partner and would be our partner for ten years, after which time we would buy out his interest. Chern will send the owner a letter confirming their discussion and will report on his decision. In response to an inquiry, Chern stated that he would also provide a complete financial report.

Harris stated that he was looking forward to the possibility of having an extra opportunity for this Chapter. Chern stated that the Chapter space would be approximately 12,000 square feet.

President's Report. President Axon reported that he had met with the Fellowship Nominating Committee on the 24th of June and expressed the concerns of the Board. The Committee is comprised of Carl Maston, Ray Kappe, Dan Dworsky. Morris Verger and Hank Silverstil. Axon has still not gotten a response from Harry Harmon, but will keep after him. The Committee agreed that you have to be very careful who you nominate. They intend to take our suggestions and, the entire Committee will be looking at each submittal before it goes out.

On Thursday, July 3rd, Don and Janice Axon with Fernando Juarez will meet Congressman Roybal and senators of Hispanic Architects. There will be a report at the next Board meeting.

Executive Director's Report. At the moment, we have 250 entries for the LA Prize, which is about 700 shy of what we would like to receive. However, the Chapter Office is getting requests for further information or actual entries daily.

Associates Report. R.D. McDonnell reported that the Seminars have not been as well attended this year as they were last year. However, the one-day Mock Exam still had 150 people.

Don Axon reported that Ted Pappas is the new AIA Vice-President/Past-President: Bob Odermatt reported that he had met with the LA/AIA Graphics Committee.

Newell was 36 at the time of his death.

Motions; Carried.

Moving Appell/Second Chern, the following:

(1) The Chapter establishes a tradition of making a new gavel for each incoming President: and, (2) that the Chapter develop a "Rogue's Gallery" of Past Presidents. Both Motions Carried.

Gregory S. Newell, AIA, was born in Miami, Florida on December 14, 1948, and died June 14 at the age of 39 after a lengthy battle with cancer. Newell graduated from the Rhode Island School of Design in 1972 and then from UCLA in 1974. Prior to Newell's death, he served a chair of the LA/AIA Graphics Committee.

Newell's death was the subject of an obituary published in the Los Angeles Times on June 16, 1986.

LA Architect
September 1986

LA Architect
Visscher Boyd

Visscher Boyd, AIA, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on October 9, 1923, and died at Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Center, Woodland Hills, July 4, 1986. A memorial service was held for family and friends on July 12, 1986 at Saint Martin-In-The Fields Episcopal Church, Canoga Park, California.

Visscher obtained his degree in Architecture from University of Pennsylvania in 1942. He received the Talbert Fellowship with Frank Lloyd Wright, 1932 through 1933, Spring Green, Wisconsin. He was a member of many boards and committees, including Urban Planning and Building Codes, for both Southern and Northern Chapters of American Institute of Architects, and Chairman in 1970 of Building Codes Committee, Northern Chapter.

During his 48 years professional career, Visscher had been associated with Daniel Mann, Johnson and Mendelhall, where he served as chief designer.

The firm has previously been associated with Ashkenazy Enterprises and Gruen Associates. Sharp's career was oriented toward retail/commercial and, more recently, hotel design projects. His largest assignment over the past year was the design of a resort hotel in Monterey.

Fellowship Nominating Committee.

La Jolla, May 1986. He had previously been

the Taliesin Fellowship with Frank Lloyd Wright.

M. Stan Sharp

M. Stan Sharp, an AIA member and occasional contributor to LA Architect who worked with Sharp at Gruen Associates from 1980 to 1983.

M. Stan Sharp

M. Stan Sharp, an AIA member and frequent contributor to LA Architect, died June 14, 1986 at the age of 39 after a year-long bout with acquired immune deficiency syndrome. Sharp had held a number of architectural design positions with Hirsch/Bedner and Associates, Santa Monica, since May 1984. He had previously been associated with Ashkenazy Enterprises and Gruen Associates. Sharp's career was oriented toward retail/commercial and, more recently, hotel design projects. His largest assignment over the past year was the design of a resort hotel in Monterey.
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When I arrived in the San Fernando Valley, I followed my usual procedure for getting to know an area. I simply asked a few cops, politicians and professor-types to show me around a little, as they wished. Thus did I wind up in an office in the central tower of California State University at Northridge, where Warren Campbell pulled a report off his desk and declared, "This is typical." The report was "Oranges & Lemons," the American Planning Association's commentary on Los Angeles-area architecture and planning. Campbell's remark was inspired by his mentions of the Valley. His home territory had, to put it mildly, taken its lumps. The report awarded 43 "oranges" for the best achievements in architecture and planning. The Valley got none. But the Valley did find its way into the section on "lemons," awarded for sour achievements. Indeed, the area's whole way of life was under suspicion there. One lemon went simply to "San Fernando Valley residential sprawl," defined as neighborhoods that "generally are indistinguishable and repetitious, giving little clue as to which community they are in." That took care of how people live. Then there was a lemon for Van Nuys Boulevard, which in many ways is typical of the Valley's commercial identity. It was cited for "a lack of architectural unity, monotonous repetition of blocks." Campbell, a CSUN political science professor who once served on the city's Board of Zoning Appeals, is no mindless booster of the area—he can think I got a sense of his own problem, the pollution and the sprawl with the best of them. But he thought he ought to have something good to say about the Valley. To him, it was just another reminder of the jump-on-the-Valley-attitude that seems prevalent around Los Angeles. It didn't take me long to find out what he meant. I have come to the area to help start up a new daily edition of the Los Angeles Times, the Valley Edition, produced from a new $100 million plant in Chatsworth. People in the Valley would get the same LA Times as everyone else, but with some additional pages tacked on to a few sections—Metro, Sports, Business and View—to provide extra local news and give Valley-area advertisers a way to target local readers without having to pay for the Times' entire huge circulation area. There also was one slight addition to the front page: the words "Valley Edition" in modest-sized type above the Los Angeles Times masthead. And it was this last detail that bothered a few of our readers. "I can't believe the wrong paper," the female voice said when I answered the phone on the city desk about 9:30 a.m. on the first day the edition hit the Valley's driveways and newstands. The woman explained that she wanted to get the same paper she had always received, and asked that I arrange that immediately. I dutifully explained that she was getting the same news as everyone else—and more. She was not convinced, however, and actually demanded her old newspaper, giving me her address to pass on to the circulation department. Then she hung up. It took one look at the map to understand the woman's problem. Her address was well up in the hills of Sherman Oaks. It was a good guess that she simply did not want a publication in her house that said Valley Edition, something that linked her residence to the world of flats below, the real Valley—the place of fast food joints, cruising Chevys without mufflers, post-WWII tract homes whose grounds are not maintained by gardeners... that whole crude middle-class scene. This was not a unique complaint. I heard later that an official of a journalists' association had lamented: "I want the real LA Times upon moving to the area, assuming that something dubbed the Valley Edition would omit some of the real news. The Valley, it seems, is not taken very seriously. The Sherman Oaks lady had implied it was one part of the phenomenon, the layers of this game. Just as the entire Valley might be the subject of jokes within the more chic communities over the mountains, so is there an image hierarchy archly within itself—the image of wealthier folks in the hills South of the Boulevard (Ventura) looking to the Valley for "the nutsy"—a scuba diving shop and an Army Surplus store; and "the Valley reborn in the image of Melrose Avenue"—a pastel flower shop, the Reseda Country Club (an former disco that now stages boxing matches) and a counter-culture record store where weekly poetry readings are held. "Like everything else in the Valley, it gives no sense of coordinated public design, but does suggest some kind of emerging psychic unity. Maybe there's hope," he concludes.

In the end, though, I suppose the Valley is doomed to be a residential middle ground between two more interesting environments, those marked by the two ends of its life-line, Ventura Boulevard. The boulevard starts near the glitter and sin of the city—the Hollywood Bowl and a strip of adult motels, to be exact—then winds up more than 15 miles west at the edge of horse country, the True West area of canyon vistas and rugged individualism.

It was at this western edge of the Valley that Lori and I chose to live ourselves, renting a home in Woodland Hills, south of the boulevard. We learned only after moving in that the hillside behind us had slid into the house some years back, but that seemed of little concern. The novelty of the physical environment was a draw to us, along with the proximity to the horses (for Lori), the beach routes (ditto) and Cowboy Country (which appeals to both the Western-native woman and me, a native of the Bronx).

We have recently begun house hunting, and may well stay in the Valley, despite the hilly duplicities in certain circles. As with many non-tycoons, our target area is limited simply by the price-tag factor. That will try to stay on the hills—why move to LA and not enjoy a look far out in the Valley?—although closer to town this time: indeed, we may wind up in the center of the can't-miss subscription lady.

One regret is that there is not much that is distinctive about the houses of the area, nothing equivalent to the Spanish-stucco look of the Hollywood Hills or the individualistic open-to-the-ocean homes of some beach communities. There is a pattern of new subdivision, I'm sad to say, in which developers cram a 5,000-square-foot gingerbread Victorian on one small lot, and a French Provincial on the adjoining parcel. We're staying as far away from those as possible. With proclaiming our wealth not an issue, we'll settle for something that works well with the hills.

I've noticed that my own newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, is phasing out the stigma that carries architecture of the area, often takes the "what's next to this" approach. It may be a piece about the house that looks like a flying saucer that's for sale... or the new office building that is a copy of a 196-year-old French chateau. Of course, we have written about some of trends: the vanishing last remnants of agriculture; the proliferation of mid-rise office development along Ventura Boulevard, and corresponding concern over the impact on traffic; the rash of two-story high-tech offices in the remaining open spaces of the West Valley; and all those mini-malls replacing corner gas stations.

We also document the ongoing debates over development in outlying areas such as the Santa Clarita Valley and eastern Ventura County. In these places, the developers' plans are on the tables and local councils debate ordinances to limit growth. The issues are, in effect, "How far will the sprawl sprawl?" and "Will we be like the other counties that something they don't want to be."

In a sense, then, the Valley finds itself in the middle of unfriendly neighbors. It faces little differently in the eyes of the country communities beyond than in the more sophisticated city eyes over the mountains. The orange groves may have vanished, but to neighbors on both sides it is a land of citrus, lemons.
A complex of office towers will total more than two million square feet and be set in a 25-acre park with fountains, gardens, and outdoor restaurants. Shopping facilities already include Topanga Plaza and the Woodland Hills Promenade. The new 17-story Marriott Hotel (Erickson, 1986) opened in time to host numerous high school proms and June weddings. Also nearby is the newly-opened 212-bed acute care Kaiser-Permanente Medical Center (Langdon, Wilson, Mumper, 1986).

Another major new development in Warner Center is known as Trillium (Landau, 1986), an eight-acre, three-phase commercial project under construction on Canoga Avenue. When completed the project will include twin 17-story office towers and a Hilton Hotel connected by 20,000 square feet of retail space. The existing Warner Center Health and Fitness Club is to be incorporated as a key amenity, and covered parking will be provided for 2600 cars.

Officially designated by the City Council to be an "urban center" for the Valley, Warner Center is intended to function as a complete urban development. The relocation there of major corporations such as Blue Cross, Kodak, Prudential, Century 21, and Price-Waterhouse has provided 35,000 of a projected 55,000 jobs, with housing to be provided for nearly the same number. Still proposed is the Valley Cultural Center which will house a 650-seat theater and a 1200-seat concert hall, including studios and rehearsal halls. Warner Center will function not only as its own combined urban core and suburb, but as a regional center for all of the West Valley.

Is this new facet of the Valley a form of urban architecture, or is it familiar suburban design grown large? In fact it is the architecture of a planned response to uncontrolled urban growth: urban architecture made to fit the suburban context. These urban forms, many designed by the same architects as have designed other large buildings in the Valley, here block no views, create no traffic jams. The tightly spaced housing units, elsewhere the disrupter of neighborhoods, here displace no houses, cause no parking shortage. Warner Center illustrates the ability of careful planning to accommodate the urban forms currently in demand within the suburban environment.

Is there Valley Architecture? To return to our original question, does the architecture of the San Fernando Valley have a character of its own? We have seen that the character known and sought by the residents is what will permit their continued enjoyment of a suburban lifestyle, while making available the benefits of urban growth. We have also seen that this is achievable in the setting of a building, that it lies in the careful relating of an entire project to its surroundings. In this way, buildings can continue to be whatever their builders wish them to be. As for architecture, we have actually observed that all architecture is Valley Architecture, for that is the nature of the Valley.

Lawrence A. Robbins, AIA
Mark L. Smith, AIA
Mr. Robbins and Mr. Smith are President and Treasurer respectively of the San Fernando Valley Section of the LA/AIA. This article was prepared in association with their Board of Directors.
distant meadow," he wrote. "In the midst of an empty landscape, barren and forlorn, to make a retreat for myself, my books, and my collection of modern art..." The house was one of Neutra's most celebrated, and in later years was purchased by Ayn Rand. Then in 1971, before many Valley residents had become concerned about conservation, a developer bought and quickly demolished the house to make room for condominiums. (See: Thomas S. Hines, Richard Neutra: The Search for Modern Architecture, 1982). Such rapid change was the story of the Valley as it grew in a few short decades from an "empty landscape" to a landscape saturated with development.

Challenge

If you could repeat today your earlier drive along Ventura Boulevard, you would find what the residents have called with pride or dismay "another Wilshire Boulevard." Your drive would almost surely be slow enough to ensure a close look at the passing scene. Traveling west you would see dozens of tall office buildings designed by most of the city's major architectural offices stretching from Sherman Oaks through Encino to Tarzana. You would see the commercial vitality and exciting new buildings that make this boulevard the place to be. You would also know that there have been consequences. If you looked behind the buildings to your left you would see the homes whose owners' views of the Valley are blocked by the high-rises. In the permanent shadow of the buildings on your right, you would find the homes of those whose only outlet from the pocket created by the freeway to the North is onto an increasingly congested Ventura Blvd. If you could have a bird's-eye view of the area at rush hour, you would observe the cars inching their way out of the office buildings, filling the main streets and freeway entrances, and flowing out across the Valley to their homes, some not stopping until they reached such outlying areas as Simi, Thousand Oaks, Canyon Country, or Newhall.

You would have noticed the endangered status of early Valley landmarks. Where S. Charles Lee first surveyed his La Reina Theater, standing nearly alone amid the wheat and corn fields, you would see today that the theater has been closed and all the surrounding buildings demolished to make way for a block-long shopping complex. A local resident could tell you that the neon-lit marquee is now scheduled to be saved, restored, and incorporated into the new development as a result of homeowners' objections to its demolition. It might occur to you that the community you have been observing is not only a crowded, denser suburb, but also an emerging urban center with suburbs of its own. Some have said that they like the increasingly urban atmosphere: the growing number of sidewalk cafes and ethnic restaurants, the nightlife, the greater availability of services, overall upgrading of residential areas, and strength of property values. Yet for the past decade homeowners groups have fought what they see as the over-building of the Valley. They say that the unrestrained freedom to build what one pleases threatens the suburban way of life they sought here. City government has responded with Specific Plans, height restrictions, and increased parking requirements as major development continues. Finally, it is development such as this which has prompted the city-wide referendum on density reduction scheduled for the fall election. And so you continue your drive down Ventura Boulevard through Tarzana and into Woodland Hills. From beyond the freeway to the north your eye is caught by a cluster of buildings taller than any you have just passed, and you turn off to investigate. You find high-rise commercial buildings in a park-like setting, surrounded by low-density shopping, recreational, and residential developments, all without a crush of traffic. Is this still the San Fernando Valley?

New Directions

Yes, this too is the San Fernando Valley. Just when you thought you knew the face of the Valley, you have discovered Warner Center, where much of the Valley's largest development is taking place. Like Valencia to the north and Calabasas to the west, it is to be a new, planned community. Unique to Warner Center is its location in the heart of the Valley. During the Thirties, movie mogul Harry Warner assembled a ranch of 1100 acres near Fallbrook and Victory Boulevards. Large parcels were sold to Litton Industries and Rocketdyne in the Fifties. The remaining 630 acres were bought in 1968 by Aetna Life and Casualty, which then commissioned A.C. Martin and Associates to prepare a master plan. A partnership was formed with the Kaiser Foundation, known as Aetna Kaiser, to develop the infrastructure and market the improvements.

Today Warner Center is a city in a park. Ranged around a high-rise commercial core are mid-rise offices and apartments, condominium townhouses and low-rise shopping and recreational facilities, all on wide tree-lined streets. The proposed cluster of office towers is presently anchored by the 20-story Warner Center Plaza Phase I building (Ware and Malcolm, 1982). Ultimately, the
They faced each other across a busy, well-landscaped plaza (under expansion today for Dworsky's Municipal Court Building).

Higher education also enjoyed a major advancement. The earlier Valley College and Pierce College, both junior colleges, were joined by San Fernando Valley State, a four-year state college, later to become Cal State Northridge. The large campus had as one of its first structures the Fine Arts Building (Neutra and Alexander, 1959-61) which established a simple, modern aesthetic for the subsequent buildings.

Van Nuys was the business and professional center of the Valley. Here a local institution built the Valley's first mid-rise office building, the Valley Federal Savings headquarters (Ferguson and Hutchison, 1962), with what was also probably the first office building parking structure. Valley boosters could finally claim that the Valley was second to none as a residential environment. It had fine homes and all the commercial and civic amenities. This growth was accomplished in a rapid but easily accommodated process of immigration and construction. Architecturally, it was the place where you could build what you pleased without detracting from anyone else's enjoyment of the Valley lifestyle. Except for the traffic encountered each day on the freeway going to and from work in the city, it was an ideal place to live.

Saturation

And then seemingly all at once both the residents and business people hit upon the same idea: If the Valley was such a fine place to live, why should it not be a place to work as well?

Prior to this, those enterprises which considered the Valley a fitting location were primarily industrial. These included manufacturing plants along the railroad tracks in the center of the Valley, wartime aircraft industries in Burbank on the eastern edge of the Valley, and later high-tech companies like Rocketdyne and Litton in the far western Valley. Now it became apparent that the true commercial value of the communities which had arisen in the Valley was their ability to support white-collar businesses.

In the mid-Sixties, when business and professional people began to think of moving their offices out of a deteriorating downtown nearer their homes in the Valley, demand for prime office space was created. The demand was not for space in Van Nuys, on the opposite side of the city from their homes in Sherman Oaks and Encino, but rather on Ventura Boulevard near the recent crossing of the Ventura and San Diego Freeways. Pioneering developers had already started to redevelop commercial properties along the Boulevard. Among the first new office buildings were those for Union Bank (Gruen, 1967) at Ventura and Sepulveda, Travelers Insurance (Lane, 1966) to the West, and AVAL (later, Certified Life) to the East (Montgomery, 1967).

The success of these enterprises drew others. Slowly at first, and then with increasing frequency, banks and savings institutions, insurance companies, and speculative developers filled in commercial sites on Ventura Boulevard with tall office buildings.

Through the Seventies, cycles of expansion gripped all sectors of the Valley's economy. Fuelled by ever-increasing demand, alternating recession and recovery, skyrocketing real estate values and inflation, construction surged ahead. Commercial development stretched from the new buildings of Universal City (SOM, 1970-) to the western terminus of Ventura Blvd. An oversimplified view would find larger new residential and commercial projects replacing older ones, and offices, hospitals, religious centers, schools, shopping centers, and housing expanding to the limits of their sites to accommodate increased demand.

Once again, new forms of development appeared in the Valley. Changes in family structure created a need for more and smaller units of housing. Single family houses and garden apartments gave way to the new phenomenon of condominium townhouses or to whole blocks of three- and four-story apartment buildings over one or two levels of subterranean parking. Many gas stations switched to self service and added "mini markets" to supplement their income, or the land was converted for use as a "neighborhood convenience center." New movie theaters had multiple screens or multiple buildings.

A new type of shopping center arose with the Sherman Oaks Gallery (Kober, Martin, 1980). Here department stores, three floors of shops and restaurants, an atrium, a four-screen movie theater, an office building, and a parking structure were fitted into a tight urban package. Former recreational land in the Sepulveda Dam Basin was used as the site for a much-needed sewage treatment facility. The Tillman Plant (DMJM, 1984), an elegant high-tech complex surrounded by a formal Japanese garden, is proof of the Valley's continued growth and need for services. By the Eighties, the intersection of the Ventura and San Diego Freeways, midway between the Gallery and Tillman Plant, had achieved the official distinction of "world's busiest."

Typical of the Valley's pattern of growth is the story of the house in Northridge designed by Richard Neutra for director Josef von Sternberg in 1934. During the Depression von Sternberg was one of many in the flourishing motion picture industry who came to live in the still pastoral Valley. "I selected a
The Fifties and Sixties brought an explosion of development. Construction filled in, spread out, and climbed into the hills. As the population grew, demand for services increased, and the availability of services and affordable housing drew more residents. This growth was seen in every type of construction until the Valley was covered by a carpet of residential tracts sprinkled with shopping areas, schools, hospitals, offices, libraries, houses of worship, banks, and government services.

Besides physical growth, there was a change in quality and scale. As settlement expanded west and north away from established areas, inducements were needed to attract new settlers. At first the growing freeway system or low prices were sufficient. Later the quality of the project itself became a competitive factor. Tracts of inviting, contemporary homes were designed in the Si.Klies for Granada Hills (Jones and Emmons) and for Northridge (Fickett), which set new standards for residential development.

Sherman Oaks attracted Bullock’s Fashion Square (Burke, Kober, Nicolas and Archuleta, 1962), which presented a large department store integrated with rows of shops on a mall, a first for the Valley. In Woodland Hills, Topanga Plaza (Gruen, 1964) was designed as the first indoor shopping center. With major department stores, an ice-skating rink, and dozens of shops and restaurants connected by two stories of indoor mall, it was in the forefront of a new American building type.

The increased magnitude of services required of public agencies made possible a dramatic step in the creation of a Van Nuys civic center. Adjacent to the City Municipal Building, a pedestrian mall replaced one block of Erwin Street and was anchored on its east end by the first new buildings. There were three main works of modern civic architecture, the Police Building (Larson, Kahn, Farrel, DMJM, 1962), the Superior Court Building (Jordan, Edgar, 1963), and the Regional Public Library (Arbogast, 1964).
Is there Valley Architecture? Does the architecture of the San Fernando Valley have a character of its own?

Those who thought they knew the environment of the Valley are surprised by recent changes. While some are pleased by what they see, many are outraged by hulking new structures and increasing congestion. A clash has developed between those who want to preserve and continue the suburban character of the Valley, and those who see it as a new and emerging urban center.

Caught in this conflict is the architect, who gives tangible form to both of these ways of life.

What is the character of the Valley? What has it been, and what is it becoming?

Post-War Boom

If you had visited the Valley in 1950, you would have seen a vast and spreading new suburbia. Between the original town centers such as Van Nuys, North Hollywood, or Reseda, the filling in of former farmland with residential subdivisions and small commercial strips. Those who are now old-timers in the Valley settled here after World War II to capture for themselves and their families a piece of the American Dream. They came to a place where they could afford a new house of their own in a pleasant neighborhood, not too far from their work in the city. The climate made possible an atmosphere of relaxed outdoor living known for swim parties, barbecues, and backyard wedding receptions.

Architecturally, there was the freedom to do as one pleased, yet within the constraints of the time. Almost any project was the first to be built on its site. Density was low and "contextualism" not an issue because it was easily achieved through the common goals of building simply, cheaply, and at a small scale. At first, the postwar rationing of materials and the great number of homes financed under the restrictions of federal and state loan programs acted to standardize the scale of housing. Most structures were designed by the owners or builders themselves, without the help of an architect. Occasionally the ethic of doing as one pleased meant hiring an architect to produce an individualized work. Yet the impact of such self-assertive works was minimized by their relative infrequency and by the overall low density.

Visiting any of the residential areas you would have found a sea of tract houses, duplexes, and garden apartments generously spread across the landscape. You would have seen groups of ranch-style houses, "contemporary" stucco houses and apartments, or neo-colonial apartment groupings. Then from time to time you would spot a work by one of the local modern masters: Neutra in Northridge, Schindler in Encino and Studio City, Ain in North Hollywood, Soriano and Harris in Universal City, Lautner in Sherman Oaks, Lloyd Wright in Van Nuys.

The atmosphere of small, simple structures punctuated by an occasional landmark characterized the commercial areas as well. On a drive down Ventura Boulevard, you might have seen a grocery store on one side, a hardware store and barber shop opposite, farther along a drive-in restaurant, a gas station and used car lot, a dentist's office followed by a bungalow court and coffee shop. You would certainly have noticed the moderne marquees of S. Charles Lee's La Reina Theater, named by Lee himself to be "Queen of the Valley," and in 1938 the Valley's first movie house. Here and there you would have seen a row of houses still fronting on Ventura Blvd. Most of all you would have observed that the commercial establishments you passed were geared to serve the local residents. So far there was no pressure to increase the return on properties beyond that generated by neighborhood-oriented businesses.

Prominence out of proportion to demand was reserved for public buildings, often designed with an eye on the future. Van Nuys was assured of its place as the administrative center of the Valley with its ziggurat moderne Valley Municipal Building (Schabarum, 1932). North Hollywood was given a grand Regional Public Library (Weston and Weston, 1929) in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Burbank built its own monumental W.P.A. moderne City Hall (Allen and Lutzi, 1941). In each case, the design respected the surrounding neighborhood with stepped massing, appropriate setbacks, and landscaping. These and other Depression-era civic projects met the needs of the Valley until after the first wave of postwar construction.

The Valley of the early postwar years was a collection of small towns marked by a small number of public and commercial buildings, and surrounded by a growing fabric of suburban residential areas. In this Valley there was room for all comers, and whatever they wished to build.
land use and transportation plans to provide for new and emerging centers, and to develop new mechanisms to guide future growth. In itself, it does not provide a guiding vision of the city. The initiative process may not be the most desirable method to address detailed technical planning; still, the Urban Design Committee strongly endorses the right of an informed populace to make law for its own behalf, as being a part of our political check-and-balance system.

Subsequent developments are moving in the direction of a comprehensive continuation of the City Community Plans of the city. The Appendix ordinance alternatives represent a Center Concept by exempting specific centers and/or planning areas from the provisions of the initiative. The Center Concept public workshop which would precede passage of the NPCI ordinance points the direction of increased public participation in the planning process.

Codes—Planning Committee View

In November, an important decision will be made concerning the future of our city. The voters will be given an opportunity to voice their opinions on how to handle some of our urban problems. The so-called "yes" or "no" to limit building development in commercial and industrial zones in Los Angeles. Called by its supporters the "Initiative to Control Growth," this initiative would amend our city codes to read: "The total floor area allowed of 1,000 square feet by lot. . . ." This means a commercial or industrial property owner with a lot size of 10,000 square feet would be allowed to build only up to 10,000 square feet, instead of the 30,000 now allowed.

The Wilshire Chamber of Commerce, BOMA, LA County Federation of Labor, Councilman David Brudie's Committee, other City Council members, as well as many other organizations and individuals oppose the measure. Many people feel it is a "meat-ax" approach to planning and sends out a signal that we are a no-growth city. Supporters of the initiative feel our city planning process does not work and that there is only one solution to the problems of urban growth: stop development and limit people's choices of where to live, work, and play.

The planning and building of cities is not a simple process: we cannot not and should not be done using simplistic one-dimensional solutions. Los Angeles has a process that works if citizens want it to work. The city has proven its ability to solve the complex problems of urban growth through a community planning process. Groups of neighbors, citizens, organizations, people, environmentalists and builders) have met to develop community plans to guide and control the future of their neighborhoods. These plans have attempted and addressed the concerns of all the community towards work, housing, traffic, parks, stores, and others.

The initiative would make decisions concerning the future of our city. The voters will be given an opportunity to voice their opinions. The initiative would amend our city codes to read: "The total floor area allowed of 1,000 square feet by lot. . . ." This means a commercial or industrial property owner with a lot size of 10,000 square feet would be allowed to build only up to 10,000 square feet, instead of the 30,000 now allowed.

Cine Center Competition

The LA/IAIA Associates are sponsoring a national competition for a conceptual skyscraper on a site in Hollywood, intended to be the centerpiece of the planned redevelopment and revitalization. The program includes office space for film industry world headquarters, luxury hotel, premiere movie theatre in the grand tradition and a live theatre. The Applications will be mailed on October 15th, with judging to take place in mid-December. Prizes will be awarded for first, second and third places of $500.00, $250.00, and $250.00 respectively. All entries will be exhibited at the Museum of Science and Industry in the spring of 1987.

Nominations

The Associates of the Los Angeles Chapter are currently seeking nominations for the 1987 Board of Directors.

This is an opportunity for members to voice their opinions and ideas to the members of the planning process. Positions are available for Associates, Students, and Professional Affiliates to enhance this committee and professional growth by contributing to new and ongoing programs and activities.

Assoicate Board Meetings will be held on September 10 and October 8. Nominations will be accepted at that time. For more information please call Allen York, Vice President-Elect at (818) 247-9020.

Sandcastle Competition—A Huge Success

Huge is the proper word to describe both the success of the Chapter's annual Sandcastle competition and the size of the projects winning top honors, one of which encompassed a site almost 40' wide by 50' deep!

Nine teams representing various LA/IAIA firms competed for prizes cheered on by their colleagues and dozens of "walk-in" spectators. Organized and implemented by R.D. McDonnell, president of the LA/IAIA Associates, ably assisted by Kathleen Birgen, Bob Patchin and Alan York, the event featured elegant plaques for top winners. T-shirts and free sodas for the contestants and a raffle, with prizes galore. Judges were Don Axon, AIA, Chapter President, Cyril Chern, AIA, Vice-President, Elect and Janice Axon, Executive Director. Winning the highest honors were: Best Sandcastle: Skidmore Owings and Merrill, and Best Sculpture: The Jerde Partnership. Honorable Mentions were: Sandcastle: Stan Brent & Associates, Sculpture: Maxwell Starkman & Associates. Prizes also were given to: Suzanne & Michael Morales: Most Technical; Jeanne Burkholder: Most Original, Rochlin & Baran: Best Use of Natural Materials, Wodin/Wein: Best Effect, Best Environmental Management Support. Sun-and-windburned, with aching muscles, the tired but happy contestants vowed to repeat their efforts next year.

Continued from page two

Another contributor to this neglect is the phrase itself, "collection of datasets," which is now applied to a different drum, and depersonalized. It can hardly be the appropriate term for the insight into what must be a highly personalized and sensitive act of communication between architect and client. It can hardly imply empathy, empathy. Such a lovely word: to "climb into the skin," to "live in the skin" of another!

But perhaps this is too difficult? Is the ego normally too strong in the introverted world of architects? Unquestionably so, it would be thought at first glance. Recall LeCorbusier's ringing phrase about living in a skin: "I live in the skin of a student!" But his own skin of course. There room for empathy it would seem. Room only for that ultimate student we all know—that student of magnificent plastic forms. Little room left for that unique client. But stop—those forms—why did they so powerfully affect a whole generation and more of our time? Was Corbu's a different sort of empathy—one not for the uniqueness of a single client but, instead, for all of humanity's archetypes, its archaic memories? Yes, of course. A great ego marching to a different drummer, but empathy no less, however distant from the kind directed toward an individual. So, happily enough, it would now seem that neither kind of empathy should require suppression of the ego. On the contrary, the kind we would seem to require a certain cultivation of the ego. "Climbing into another's skin!" No, perhaps better: "climbing out of one's own constraining skin!" Oh yes, and better yet. "Living in the skin of a student." Corbu said it the evening he was awarded the AIA Gold Medal.

Paul Sterling Hoag, FAIA
In November, citizens of Los Angeles will be asked to vote on a number of critical planning issues, including the Braude/Yaroslavsky initiative which will appear as a proposition on the ballot. The LA/AIA Board of Directors asked the Urban Design Committee and Codes & Planning Committee to prepare the following papers explaining the ramifications of these ballot measures.

Enclosed in this issue of LA Architect is a ballot soliciting your views on the issues. Please fill it in and return it to the Chapter office.

Urban Design Committee View

There is currently a series of programs and proposals which could have a far-reaching effect on the future development of Los Angeles. Each contributes to what has become a renaissance of interest in the city's plan. These include: the "Initiative for Reasonable Limits on Commercial Buildings and Traffic Growth" which recently qualified for the November ballot; three alternative density-reduction/centers-protection ordinances (Appendices A, B, C) under consideration by the City Planning Commission; weekly meetings of the Concept LA Citizens Advisory Committee; and the imminent referral of a proposed Neighborhood Protection/Centers Implementation ordinance draft, prepared by the Department of City Planning.

The above studies, programs and ordinances indicate renewed interest in the planning for the future of Los Angeles. Themes common to the majority of them include a re-evaluation of goals, reduced as-of-right density assumptions, and increased public decision-making in the planning process.

The Urban Design Committee recommends that the AIA become publicly involved in these crucial issues, so that the profession can be a full participant in informing the public, and in determining the future of Los Angeles. The following is a response to the LA/AIA Board request for and evaluation of the initiative, augmented with discussion of subsequent events.

Braude Yaroslavsky Initiative

Although "Height District 1" is the subject of the Braude-Yaroslavsky Initiative, it does not limit building height only. The maximum "Floor Area Ratio (FAR)" in commercial and industrial zones within Height District 1 would be limited to 1.5 times the site area, while the other three versions accommodate either 1.25 or 1.5 times the site area. The 3.0:1 FAR allows for commercial or industrial property which are incorporated by reference to a "passenger car" form of land use. Each contributes to what has been called a "no-growth" measure. The pros and cons of the measure as perceived by the Urban Design Committee include the following:

- The initiative will limit density most in areas of intense development pressure, despite the large building potential remaining.
- Traffic generated on these sites will be lessened over dense alternatives.
- The initiative will limit the impact from adjacent strip commercial uses on low-density residential areas.
- Limiting large-scale commercial development outside of centers encourages the Centers Concept for Los Angeles.
- Limiting commercial density outside of centers might result in revitalization of existing neighborhood-scale retail and services, and encourage dispersal of neighborhood scale retail and services throughout the city.
- A given project will require an increased site area which can result in difficulties of land assemblage.
- Land values on specific sites will be affected negatively.
- Some areas of centers are within Height District 1 to the extent that their present 3.0 FAR is required to implement land use programs within centers, the intent of community plans may be frustrated by the broad-brush approach of the initiative.
- Subsequent rezoning may be required.

Proposed Density Ordinance

On request of the City Council Planning and Environment Committee (CPC 86-370 CA) planning staff recently drafted three ordinances which reduce FAR from 3.0:1 to 1.5:1 in commercial and industrial zones in Height District 1. The three ordinance drafts are known as Appendices A, Appendix B and Appendix C.

Appendix A was prepared as instructed in a Council motion of the Chairman of the Planning and Environment Committee and would reduce the intensity of development permitted on C or M zoned lots from 3 to 1.5 times the buildable area of the lot. Specifically exempted from this 50 percent reduction would be property within a community redevelopment project area, an "enterprise zone," geographically specific plan, or shown on an adopted community plan as "Rezone Potential." Also exempted is the "Urban Commercial," "High Intensity Commercial" or as further designated as "Center" by city council or Council resolution pursuant to the "Neighborhood Protection/Centers Implementation (NPC) Program." Also exempted would be any lot which was the subject of a discretionary approves which occurred between May 21, 1980 and the effective date of the subject ordinance, in which specific approval involved a change of zone, height district change, exception from a geographically specific plan, conditional use variance, tract map, parcel map, coastal development permit, or a decision rendered by the City Planning Commission pursuant to "additional authority of the Commission" in the "Zoning-General Plan Consistency Ordinance." Appendix B is identical to Appendices A and B except that it applies to all industrially zoned property in any height district; and exempts from the 1.5 to 1.2 FAR area reduction any additional commercial or industrial property which is identified as a "Center" on a series of 11 maps entitled "Neighborhood Protection/Centers Implementation and Location Maps," which are incorporated by reference in the ordinance. This would bring to 42 the number of designated centers throughout the city.

All three versions accommodate a degree of mixed-use development by allowing a 3.0 FAR; however, the 1.5 FAR does not exceed 1.5, and an additional 1.5 FAR may be residential uses. Appendix D is an alternative recommendation and is the most far reaching. It gives priority to new and existing centers, and duplicates the density cut of the initiative. It goes further by limiting the FAR for any industrial land in any Height District 1.5 times the buildable lot area if otherwise desired.

Passage of Appendix C would make the initiative redundant. If the initiative is believed to be necessary, Appendix C would probably require redefinition to protect its provisions from the effects of the initiative. In any case, the initiative does not compromise the basic right of the City to enact measures which are incorporated by reference in the ordinance. This would bring to 42 the number of designated centers throughout the city.
Editor's Note:
The Laurelwood Apartments, designed by R.M. Schindler in 1948, have been threatened with demolition for the last five years. The Cultural Heritage Commission is running a 180-day stay of demolition on the building, but it is due to expire in the middle of this month. This can be renewed if the commission can make a finding that no opposition is possible. Mark Hall and Cyril Chern are working on this determination. In addition, the Department of Building and Safety has been advised by the City Attorney that a full Environmental Impact Report is necessary. These delays alone cannot save the building, however. The central need is to locate a developer who wants to undertake the restoration of the building and can work out a satisfactory financial arrangement with the present owner. For further information, contact Ruthann Lehrer at the LA Conservancy (213) 623-2489.

The Santa Monica Mountains. Mulholland Drive, like a snake slicing over the mountain's crest, moving west. The foothills, falling southward into Hollywood, fell northward into Ventura Boulevard and the Valley beyond. When Hollywood spread across the Santa Monica Mountains in the twenties the Valley swelled like a squid of rabbits: the wheat fields and orchards were pulled up, and everyone planted houses. In the forties there was no Ventura Freeway, nor the Los Angeles River, nor the Santa Monica Mountains. I've been told by long-time LA residents that the route was passing through Cahena Pass to Whittier. The area's tallest building was the La Reina theater because of its spire, surmounting the real estate offices and little shops that ran the length of the boulevard. On weekends they held carnivals in dusty lots between the shops.

During the forties, R.M. Schindler designed six houses, a block of shops, a medical arts building, and an apartment complex in Studio City. The area was good to Schindler, and that decade. Towards its end, he returned the favor: in 1948 he built the Laurelwood Apartments, two buildings, a block in the Santa Monica Mountains. The apartments fit between the many eucalyptus and pine, and were alive like the trees. Our life is its image," Schindler had written, regarding architecture. He had come to believe in an architecture just like life, an architecture of movement and pause, yearning and found satisfactions. He sought a sense of breaking free, of twitching sensuality stored then unleashed, of going from known to unknowns, of wandering, arriving, discovering. He was influenced by his birthplace, Vienna, where Otto Wagner dishonored the past for the good of the future and Gustav Klimt fascinated everyone with his vision of the haunt and bliss of sex. From Holland, Schindler drew from Theo van Doesburg's de Stijl theories of capturing space with plane-bounded volumes, and from Russia came El Lissitzky's conception of the pronun—a word for the spirit of making architecture where space was the exalted master, construction was the proud servant, vitality was celebrated, and cerebral severity was shunned. And then there was America's own Frank Lloyd Wright, years earlier Schindler's employer, and the original, simultaneous father of these modern ideas. Schindler gleamed from these bright lights to create his own brilliance, and the ideas of luminaries from all over the world converged, like rays of the sun in a magnifying glass to burn a spot of greatness onto that knoll in the Santa Monica Mountains. The pair of buildings stretched up the side of the hill from the access street, Laurelwood Drive, to the highest point of the bluff. The garages were just off Laurelwood, so tenants parked, then walked through passageways in the cement flaster-finished walls, past hedgerows trimmed to form tall and long free-standing partitions, up a central concrete footpath to their apartments. There were great lines of the work. The great lines of the work have weakened, like sagging, aged skin on the bones. When I go there, the delight from structure and form is dampened by broken plaster and peeling paint. I stand there, feeling a little miffed, asking: why has this swan become an ugly duck by neglect?

The answer: The current owner favors the wrecking ball over preservation, and the LA Conservancy together with the Cultural Heritage Commission seeks to replace him with an owner preferring preservation. Laurelwood Apartments are an official Cultural Historic Monument of the City of Los Angeles. So the buildings sit there, awaiting a fate of either new ownership or demolition. Either a new owner buys the structures, intending to restore them, or, in the next few weeks, the apartments will be leveled to the knoll. I would like to see the ugly duck become a swan again, but this will not happen by fairy tale's magic—what is needed is a preservationist with adequate money, directed at bringing back Schindler's creation to its once-felt greatness. Plaster patches, paint, new roofs: this will make the swan.

Greg Kindy
Mr. Kindy, an LA/AIA Associate, works in the office of John Lautner.

The Swan of Studio City
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A SMART USE OF SPACE.

Files piling up? Your office is too expensive for storing old projects. Solve that space problem with Best Storage. Store it, lock it, and get it when you need it from your own private self storage space. Office facilities, telephone and photocopy machine are available. No in and out fees. We'll even arrange for delivery. Best Storage is fully sprinklered and protected by a 24-hour armed response security system. CALL US NOW at 489-1223 and compare our costs. Prices are the best news yet.

LUMBER ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
We have available to you:
- Design information
- Technical assistance
- Literature including:
  - Grading rule books
  - Western Woods Use Book
  - National Design Specifications
  - Span Tables

WOOD - The only renewable natural resource
If we can be of help to you, call or come by
17890 Castleton St., Ste. 240 City of Industry, CA 91748
(818) 965-4344

Urban Design Associate

Emphasizes urban design and design and development guidelines. Participates in inter-disciplinary project team efforts for preparation of land use and development policies and design and development guidelines in the Central Business District. 2-4 years related experience required, more preferred, preferably in preparation of design guidelines for large scale downtown development. Strong graphic, verbal, analytical skills required, as is working knowledge of socio-economic and behavioral considerations affecting design decisions. Valid California driver's license and insurability. Salary range: $2,868 - $3,565/Mo. Send resume to:

Urban Design Associate Position
Human Resources Department
Community Redevelopment Agency
of the City of Los Angeles
264 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, California 90013

Frances, lasting as it was, was not the only example of enlightenment but programming as it has been studied exhaustively as a methodology and as such has been polished by some to an eleventh lustre. Impressively so. Architect friends loaned us some outstanding examples of their programming methods to help in the preparation of these observations. We were especially impressed, for example, with a program by Deasy and Bolling because of its precise methodology for making a clear distinction between behavioral data and physical data. Observing and interviewing future users he was assembling social and psychological (behavioral) data from which he could create images of the uniqueness of the needs of these individual persons, needs not ordinarily revealed in physical, quantitative data. It was a rational and at the same time intuitive methodology for avoiding our triple pitfalls: preconceptions, inadequate options and infatuation.

Deas', outstanding as it was, was the only example of enlightenment but programming as it has been taught would seem to have been too strong in the area of application of data (the final step necessary to translation into the forms and spaces of buildings). This is an understandable weakness given that the creation of form and space is the core motivation for architects—we simply want "to get on with it!" But unfortunately this impatience is devastating when the critically important first step, the collection of data, has been neglected. Continued on page five
Three internationally-renowned personalities—the director of the Getty Center and architects from New York City and Japan—will judge this year’s Design Awards competition sponsored by the LA Chapter. The judges are Dr. Kurt W. Forster, director of the Getty Center, Santa Monica; Fumihiko Maki of Tokyo; and Arthur May, AIA, partner in Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates PC, New York City.

More than 200 entries from LA Chapter architects are expected in the 1986 Design Awards competition. The awards will be presented on Saturday, Sept. 27, at a cocktail buffet in the Pacific Design Center. Ceremonies will start at 6:30 p.m. Cost of the cocktail buffet is $10 per person. Advance reservations are required by Monday, September 22 at the LA Chapter office.

Forster has been director of the Getty Center since 1984. He is responsible for day-to-day operations of the center as well as long-range planning goals, including the new Getty Center complex in Brentwood. Forster oversees Getty’s three major departments—the Photo Archives, the Archives of the History of Art and the Library.

Fumihiko Maki, now in his third decade as an architectural designer, is one of Japan’s five original Metabolists. He is world-renowned for his designs of complex urban environments.

Arthur May, AIA, partner in Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates, has 22 years of experience in architecture. He was responsible for the Hercules Inc. headquarters office building in Wilmington, Del., which won a distinguished design award from the New York Chapter/AIA in 1984 and an AIJ Journal award in 1985. In addition to the Saturday evening cocktail buffet, when the awards will be announced, there will also be a Design Awards Jury Introduction featuring Forster, Maki and May. This will be held from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., beginning with a reception Friday, September 26, in the PDC Conference Center as part of the conference.

Winners of the Design Awards Competition, their clients and their contractors will be honored at a special recognition dinner on Saturday, Oct. 11, at the Mulholland Tennis Club in Los Angeles. Additional information is available at the LA Chapter office.

"Focus: Professional Practice & Planning," a four-day conference that culminates with the presentations of the 1986 Design Awards, will take place Thursday through Sunday, Sept. 25-28, at the Pacific Design Center in Los Angeles. Sponsors of the LA Chapter, the conference will cost $15 for Chapter members and $25 for nonmembers for the entire four-day event. Pre-registration is requested at the LA Chapter office by Monday, September 22 for the Monday conference and the Design Awards Reception.

Thursday, Sept. 25: "Building Intensity Initiative," panel discussion with moderator to be selected, 6-7 p.m.; PDC Conference Center; Organizer: Urban Design Committee.


"Quick and Effective Presentation Techniques," with Brian Graham of Gensler and Associates, 11 a.m.-12:30 p.m.; PDC Conference Center; Organizer: Professional Development Committee.

"Seismic Retrofit," with a panel of five experts, 10 a.m.-11:30 a.m.; PDC Westinghouse Showroom. Organizer: Historic Preservation Committee.


"Effective Management for Architects," with Dr. Glen Strasberg, California State University, Hayward. 2-3 p.m.; PDC Conference Center. Organizer: Professional Development Committee.


Design Awards Jury Introduction, with Dr. Kurt Forster, the Getty Center, and architects Fumihiko Maki; and Arthur May, AIA, 6-8 p.m., starting with reception PDC Conference Center; Organizer: Design Awards Committee.

Saturday, Sept. 27: "Liability Insurance: Does It Have to Be So Expensive," with Bernard Engles, Design Professionals Insurance Co.; Larry Mills, Crowell Insurance Co.; Gerald Weisbach, Naitkin and Weisbach Attorneys; and Herbert Weidolf, AIA, O'Leary, Terawasa, Takahashi & Dechells, 9 a.m.-noon; PDC Conference Center. Organizer: Professional Practice Committee.


The following Nominations have been submitted for 1987 Chapter Officers and Chapter Delegates to the California AIA: President/President-Elect: Robert Reed, AIA; Treasurer: Two-Year Term: William Landworth, AIA; Directors: Two-Year Term: Four Positions Open: Ronald A. Alton, AIA, William H. Fain, AIA, David S. Froelich, AIA, Joseph D. Vaccaro, AIA; Chapter Delegates to CCA: Two-Year Term: Three Positions Open: Ronald A. Alton, AIA, Donald C. Ask, AIA, Raymond Gaio, AIA, William Kri sel, AIA, Paul J. McCarty, AIA.

In accordance with Chapter bylaws, elections to the office of Vice President/President-Elect or Treasurer also constitute election as AIA Chapter delegate to CCA for a two-year term. Currently, the Chapter is allocated seven delegates, two of whom will be completing the second year of their term of office in 1987. Following this publication of nominations to date,Chapter architect members-in-good-standing have the opportunity to submit additional nominations, in accordance with the nominations procedure sent to each member on June 30, 1986. Such additional nominations must be received at the Chapter Office no later than 2:00 p.m., Friday, September 26, 1986. Nominations will then be closed and election ballots prepared for mailing. Ballots will be tabulated and the results announced at our regular chapter meeting on Tuesday, November 18, 1986.