MARCH

Monday 5
Pursuing the Dynamics of Modern American Design

Wednesday 7
Executive Committee Meeting
Board of Directors Meeting
Board of Directors Conference room, 5:30 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Monday 12
Historic Preservation Committee
Chapter office conference room, 6 pm. Call (213) 380-4393.

Tuesday 13
Association Board Meeting
Chapter office conference room, 6:30 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Wednesday 14
The Impossibility of Theory
Lecture by Jeffrey Kripal, SCS-ARC Main Space, 8 pm. Call (213) 829-3482.

Wednesday 15
Minority and Women’s Resources Committee
Lecture by Larry Berenson, Kazer Financial and Green Street. Pat Bell, voice on working with non-government agencies. AIA/ARC chapter office, 6-7 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Wednesday 21
Jeremy Gilbert-Rolle
SCS-ARC lecture series. SCS-ARC Main Space. 8 pm. Call (213) 829-3482.

Thursday 22
Los Angeles AutoCad User Group Meeting
At 208 P.E. Avenue, Burbank. Call (818) 782-9606.

Friday 23

April 2
USC Architectural Guild Dinner
Blazing Albert C. Martin, SIAA, Times-Davis. 6 pm. Call (213) 745-4147.

April 3
USC Architectural Guild Dinner
Blazing Albert C. Martin, SIAA, Times-Davis. 6 pm. Call (213) 745-4147.

Indoor Air Quality
Dinner and lecture by Milton Mueller, Los Angeles Times Restaurant, 7 pm. Call (213) 524-3888.

Executive Committee Meeting
Chapter office, 4:30 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Board of Directors Meeting
Board of Directors Conference room, 5:30 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Tuesday 27
Executive Committee Meeting
Chapter office, 4:30 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Wednesday 28
Simon Unger
SCS-ARC lecture series, SCS-ARC Main Space. 8 pm. Call (213) 829-3482.

Traditional/Transitional Arts
“Art in the Life of LA” lecture series. Pacific Design Center, 6-9 pm. Call (213) 677-6080.

Historic Preservation
Association study seminar, 7-10 pm, 101 Harris Hall, USC. Call (213) 380-4995.

Thursday 29
Gutz Stocken
SCS-ARC lecture series, SCS-ARC Main Space. 8 pm. Call (213) 829-3482.

Housing Committee Meeting
Chapter office conference room. 6 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Friday 30
Conversations
Architecture and the Modernization of Japan
Exhibit continues through March 23 at UTL, Library Hall. Call (213) 821-3791.

Architectural and Art Calendars
Exhibit continues through April 5 at South Hope Street Gallery. Call (213) 627-2286.

Government Relations Committee
Chapter office conference room, 5 pm. Call (213) 380-4995.

Saturday 31
Broadway Theaters
LA Conservatory walking tour, 10 am. Call (213) 623-627.

L.A. ARCHITECTURE
REVIEWING CONSTRUCTION INSURANCE

Unfortunately accidents causing severe property damage, personal injury or death on a construction site could easily bring economic ruin to those who are financially responsible. It is customary to fund this awesome liability by means of insurance. Owners and contractors alike are expected to enter into construction contracts owe each other the mutual obligation of providing insurance to cover certain specified risks.

Insurance is an extremely important element of the construction contract, so it is not surprising that over ten percent of the text of the AIA General Conditions is devoted to this complex and inscrutable subject.

The AIA General Conditions of the Contract for Construction, Document A201, Fourteenth Edition was extensively revised in 1987. The insurance portions were considered, written and edited by construction industry legal and insurance experts in consultation with architects outstanding in the field of construction administration and documentation. Generally architects are not expected to be insurance experts, but they need to know how to cope with the insurance aspects of construction contracts and their administration.

The AIA General Conditions specify the insurance requirements in broad general terms, while the Supplementary Conditions written by the architect must specify the specific insurance coverage required for the project, the interests to be insured, the policy limits, the perils to be insured, the insurance contract term and the deductible amount. It is a very risky practice for architects to provide insurance advice to their clients.

Many professional liability insurance policies carried by architects specifically exclude coverage for the furnishing of insurance advice. The architect should decline to answer any insurance questions. Should an owner rely on an architect's erroneous insurance or surety advice to its detriment, the architect would likely be held liable for the resultant damages.

The AIA Owner-Architect Agreement, Document B141, also revised in 1987, provides in paragraph 4.8 that the owner will furnish all legal, accounting and insurance services as may be necessary at any time for the project. Therefore, the architect should obtain the insurance requirements directly from the owner. Owners are not usually insurance experts either, so they will have to confer with their own legal and insurance advisors. There is a convenient form devised by the AIA entitled Owner's Instructions for Bonds and Insurance, Document G610, which architects can present to their clients. It is in the format of a four page questionnaire which the owner's insurance advisor can use to instruct the architect in respect to the owner's insurance and bond requirements.

The architect can rely on these instructions when writing the insurance specification in the Supplementary Conditions. Evidence of insurance specified to be carried by owner and contractor must be provided as proof of its existence. Certificates of insurance are commonly issued free of charge by insurance carriers, agents and brokers when requested by their insureds. Certificates of the contractor's insurance should be addressed to the owner, while certificates of the owner's insurance should be addressed to the contractor. In the interest of promoting uniformity in construction industry documentation and administration, the AIA has issued a standard form of Certificate of Insurance, Document G705, which many construction insurers have adopted. Also of the most important aspects of the certificate is the statement that the insurance will not be cancelled or allowed to expire unless 30 days' written notice has been given to the addressee of the certificate.

According to the AIA General Conditions, subparagraph 4.2.4, all communications between owner and contractor shall be through the architect. Consequently, the insurance certificates from each party will flow through the architect's administration to the opposite party. When the architect transmits insurance certificates or surety bonds, the covering letter should merely inventory the enclosures, but should not comment on the sufficiency of the carrier or surety nor the adequacy or conditions of the coverage. The architect should advise the owner to seek legal or insurance advice in appraising the insurance coverages underlying the certificates.

All specified insurance and bonds must be in force before any construction is undertaken at the job site. Insurance companies and sureties are reluctant to issue insurance coverage or bonds once construction operations are under way.

Arthur F. O'Leary, FAIA
Mr. O'Leary is a partner in O'Leary Terasawa Partners.

Services Offered

(213) 829-2738.

Architectural Secretary, experienced, skilled, with narrative and organizational strengths, seeks part-time work by day, week, or project. Judy Nelson: (213) 660-5056.

Custom Address Plaques. The perfect detail to finish off that "special" project: cast bronze, brass, aluminum and lead; sand carved marble and granite; exceptional design and craftsmanship; your architectural significance. We are currently conducting interviews with architects interested in part-time work by day, week, or project. Judy Nelson: (213) 660-5056.

Jobs Offered

Archetype, a construction management concern, is building residential projects of national architectural significance. We are currently conducting interviews with architects interested in becoming involved in the construction management arena. Compensation packages range from 42-60K with additional opportunities for performance bonuses. Call Susan for details (213) 306-9048.

West LA architectural firm seeks highly motivated individual with CAD and highrise commercial experience in both design and technical capability. Send resume to: WZMH Housden Barnard Company, Inc., 2566 Overland Avenue, Suite 500, Los Angeles 90064.

Space Available

Earl Rubensta Architect, small West Los Angeles office, interested in sharing existing space with another architect. Excellent location, parking, 11111 W. Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90064. Call (213) 479-0971.


Studio space to share. Light, high ceilings. Ideal for architect, designer, graphic artist. Located near SCI-ARC. $450 includes conference room. 828-2212 or 435-2258.

West Hollywood Sunset Boulevard, private office, with shared conference room, reception area, parking. $800/month (213) 650-4226 or (213) 650-7183.

L A ARCHITECT
It was a late afternoon in October, 1946, when Lewis Mumford opened the door and asked me into his small house behind Baker Library at Dartmouth. We sat surrounded by books and had tea as he described the avenues I might take and the professors I could seek out to lay some foundation for a career. He spoke about regions and about his recent books. He gave me a copy of a 1927 plan for the state of New York. He told me to really look closely at the overpowering Orozco murals in the library reference level, and he urged me to read on as if my life depended on it. That fall I read The Culture of Cities and was fascinated by his skill at reading a culture from its built environment.

He gave a limited number of evening lectures, usually in Sanborn Hall, the art building, close to his house. At the podium he would be totally in command. His lectures were beautifully composed, like all his writing. He was a large man with a deep, resonant voice that could effortlessly fill a hall. He spoke in measured cadences and, one by one, would fix each person in the room with a penetrating gaze.

One afternoon the next spring I looked out a window in the library stacks to see him below me walking up the street past the Dean’s house. I recall he had a somewhat jaunty stride, and I saw him stop three or four times to breathe in the scent of lilacs out a window in the library stacks to see him below me walking up the street past the Dean’s house. I recall he had a somewhat jaunty stride, and I saw him stop three or four times to breathe in the scent of lilacs.

In 1950, I met him twice more. Once and spoke about the cultural responsibilities and especially to all of us engaged in architecture and urban planning. Over the years he has been a vital inspiration for me, as I’m sure he has been for many others. I view him not so much as a lone voice, but rather as representative of many other voices, a spokesperson for our evolving human family and, especially, our American culture. He provided a precious bridge.

He was a large man with a deep, resonant voice that could effortlessly fill a hall. He spoke in measured cadences and, one by one, would fix each person in the room with a penetrating gaze.

from the 19th century Americans like Melville, Emerson, Thoreau, Henry Adams, and Whitman. He was one of the first to recognize the vitality of the work by Richardson, Root, Sullivan, and Frank Lloyd Wright. He was a key participant in the regional planning movement of the twenties and thirties with Clarence Stein, Henry Wright and Benton MacKaye. From World War II through the seventies he continued to write with passion about the urban condition and about the mounting threat to our survival as a society.

In 1982, I wrote to thank him for giving us his autobiography and for the kindnesses he had shown me years before. In his reply he wrote, “The full story of my life and work cannot be adequately told until many people are dead—if indeed there are any surviving evidences of human life on this planet a century hence!” The final evidences of my life depend on what may survive and miraculously thrive—if anything does. Only God knows the answer.”

Frank E. Holzhauser, AIA, AICP Mr. Holzhauser, former director of regional planning for SCAG, is a senior consultant for the Planning Center in Newport Beach.

I find myself wishing he were still with us, in full intellectual vigor, and that we could have time to really explore and debate the phenomenon of Southern California in 1990 and the remarkable challenges and opportunities we have. It is clear he was appalled by dominance of the automobile in our environment, was strongly opposed to the idea of a spreading megalopolis, and was deeply concerned with our pollution of the natural environment. Could he nonetheless possibly see in our decentralized, multi-centered growth any semblance of the garden cities and greenbelt cities he advocated? Could he see the possibilities of new urban forms unlike any we have ever known? Could he see in the dramatic demographic shifts the potential for a new cultural flowering, a new springtime for our nation in the coming Pacific century?

Assuredly, he would be thrilled by the shift toward democracy around the world. He was deeply concerned with achieving peace, and deeply worried about the possibility of nuclear annihilation.

In 1962, I wrote to thank him for giving us his autobiography and for the kindnesses he had shown me years before. In his reply he wrote, “The full story of my life and work cannot be adequately told until many people are dead—if indeed there are any surviving evidences of human life on this planet a century hence!” The final evidences of my life depend on what may survive and miraculously thrive—if anything does. Only God knows the answer.”

Frank E. Holzhauser, AIA, AICP Mr. Holzhauser, former director of regional planning for SCAG, is a senior consultant for the Planning Center in Newport Beach.
On January 19, UCLA Extension's Public Policy Program held its fourth annual Land Use Law and Planning conference. For those whose daily bread is gained in pitched battle over land use in court and legislative chamber, this conference could be subtitled "reports from the front." Presented yearly in cooperation with the American Bar Association, the State Bar of California and the American Planning Association, these conferences offer a selection of updates on land use law aimed mainly at attorneys. This year's topics ranged from wetlands regulation to affordable housing.

The region's land use warriors girded for battle by listening intently to a day-long series of technical presentations devoted mainly to legislative updates and case law. Two panels offered in-depth assessments of land use regulatory issues: one on CEQA implementation, the other on affordable housing strategies.

One highlight of the CEQA panel was a comment made by Ron Bass, president of the California Chapter of the American Planning Association, that despite the millions of dollars expended since 1970 on preparing thousands of EIRs, there is as yet no comprehensive evaluation of the cost and effectiveness of CEQA.

The day's keynote speaker was Assemblyman Richard Katz, who argued the case for his Traffic Relief and Spending Limitation Act of 1990, a proposal that would raise gasoline taxes to create a five billion dollar kitty for strategies to manage congestion, and would create a statewide plan to set and maintain levels of service on both highways and local roads according to intensity of development. Cities that failed to adopt local traffic management would lose their eligibility for state funds.

Attorney Michael Berger, who preceded Katz at the lectern, gave an update on Fifth Amendment cases, at the heart of which is the Nollan case. Nollan vs. California Coastal Commission is the Supreme Court's decision imposing limits on the degree to which government regulates land use before those regulations constitute a "taking" and are prohibited under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

In response to the court's 1987 decision, the California legislature passed AB 1600, requiring that before public agencies can impose a development fee, they must first demonstrate "a reasonable relationship (nexus) between the need for (a) public facility and the type of development project on which (a) fee is imposed." Berger offered a timely discussion of the conditions imposed by AB 1600, since a nexus study for a proposed linkage fee will soon be under way in Los Angeles. In fact, the Council's Community Redevelopment and Housing Committee recently considered a notice and credit ordinance for the linkage fee and sent it to Council for action. The linkage fee generated tremendous opposition in the development community and many of its main opponents were among the land use attorneys in the conference audience.

The "takings" issue was a good lead-in for the afternoon's affordable housing panel, with panelists addressing the issues of linkage fees, inclusionary housing requirements, resale price and rent controls, all the subject of fierce battles over government's regulatory powers.

The role of a linkage fee in addressing the city's affordable housing crisis was addressed by Gary Squier, former director of the Los Angeles Housing Authority and now head of the Los Angeles Affordable Housing Partnership. Squier said the city's affordable housing crisis was addressed by Gary Squier, former director of the Los Angeles Housing Authority and now head of the Los Angeles Affordable Housing Partnership, summarized the effect of the city's critical shortage of affordable housing on its lowest income households. In addition to the city's 35,000 homeless, the most visible part of the housing crisis, thousands of low-income households now double up, live in garages or pay more than half their wages in rent, said Squier, and every year the situation gets worse. A linkage fee could generate between $25 and $50 million annually, funds that would be used to create permanently affordable non-profit housing developments.

Housing panelists discussed a number of additional regulatory devices for increasing housing affordability. David Laughlin, Housing Program Manager for Santa Cruz County, talked about his county's inclusionary housing program which requires developers of more than five new housing units to make 15% of their units affordable to low or moderate income households. In order to ensure the continued affordability of these units, strict resale price controls are imposed.

Karin Pally Ms. Pally served as the editor of the LA Blue Ribbon Committee report on Affordable Housing.
On February 13, 1990, attorney Carlyle W. Hall, Jr. was confirmed as the newest member of the Community Redevelopment Agency Board. Hall and his partner John Phillips, founders of the Center for Law in the Public Interest, have successfully litigated cases like the AB 283 lawsuit which required the City of Los Angeles to rezone 200,000 parcels to bring them into consistency with the City’s General Plan. LA Architect talks with Carlyle Hall about CRA policies and goals.

Why did Mayor Bradley appoint you to serve on the CRA Board?

Probably you should ask him that. The obvious reason is that I’ve been involved in redevelopment. But the more important reason is because the Mayor is responding to the need to change the direction of the Agency and the way it functions. My relationship with the LA Redevelopment Agency was in 1976 when a blue ribbon committee was appointed by the City Council and the Mayor to suggest a proposal that there be a redevelopment area in the central business district. We recommended certain conditions, including a requirement that a percentage of money be spent on affordable housing, and that a citizens’ advisory council give ongoing public input and guidance.

Over the years, there have been problems. The Agency has spent the required money on housing, but many people have said the housing wasn’t geared toward the people most in need, and that the money hasn’t been spent efficiently. The citizens’ advisory committee has fallen by the wayside. The City Council has never been particularly involved in Agency matters, and on the occasions when they tried to be, the Agency wasn’t particularly responsive. Now they need to raise the $750 million cap to continue redevelopment of downtown, and problems that were ignored because the Agency had no accountability to the electorate have become very real in people’s minds.

I worked with the Mayor’s office a couple of years ago when the cap issue first came up. The Mayor had proposed to raise the cap to $5 billion, and to devote half of that money to affordable housing and homelessness services. The other half to resolving downtown transportation problems, developing open space downtown, and possibly subsidizing market rate housing in the South Park area.

The County was opposed to the plan because those tax dollars would be diverted, costing them a lot of money. The other group that didn’t rally around the proposal was the homeless service providers, the affordable housing groups, and the legal services groups, the very people who, in theory, should be subject of the benefits. Largely, their protest related to the fact that the CRA was going to administer the money. I was involved in trying to build a consensus for the plan, and I think the Mayor put me on the board to demonstrate the Agency’s good faith, and the importance to him of these issues.

Why did you accept the appointment, and what do you feel you can accomplish by serving on the board?

I took the appointment for two reasons. One is, I am an activist, and the Redevelopment Agency is the wing of government that goes out and makes things happen, and has the money to make them happen. The second reason I took it, was because I saw the opportunity to help build consensus for the Agency to make necessary changes. I want to participate very actively in developing the affordable housing program, designing a program that will have the co-operation and support of the non-profit sector, the for-profit builders who are interested in doing it, and will be aimed in the direction of the most needy. Until now, in building housing, the tendency on the part of all concerned is to come as close to the market as possible. The more you target housing to the most poor, and ultimately to the homeless, the deeper the subsidy that is required, and the more difficult it is to bring together the deals and to make the projects work. It is a far more challenging problem, but it is clearly where the greatest need is, and the greatest attention needs to be.

The other thing that I will be spending time on is trying to pull together consensus to raise the cap, and develop a vision for the future of downtown. The original vision of the Agency was mainly put together for the downtown area in the early seventies, before there was a homelessness problem, so it is seriously dated.

Much of what was perceived to be the Agency’s original mission is now accomplished. The west side of downtown is largely built out. But there is an unfinished agenda downtown; basically everything east of Hill Street is in serious need of attention, ranging from the stores on Broadway, to Main Street which is in terrible shape, to Spring Street which has wonderful historic buildings that are largely unoccupied, to Los Angeles Street and the Skid Row area.

What are the prospects for lifting the cap?

The negotiations with the County are coming to a close, so I would say it will definitely be done in this year, 1990. It needs to be done this year, because I think the projection is that they run out of money in 1992, and if that’s going to happen, they need to know by 1991 to wind things down. It would still be one of the biggest redevelopment agencies in the state, but it would have a different mission and complexion.

How should affordable housing projects be developed?

It is a good idea when you are doing a project with an affordable housing component to include a market rate component. You end up with people living in harmony in well-managed projects. When you are doing a project that is strictly affordable housing, you tend to have great community opposition from the beginning, and it is difficult to put the deal together.

We just don’t have enough affordable housing anywhere. At some point, the lower income people displace the very low, who displace the very low, and suddenly the very, very low become homeless. That’s the trickle-down effect of homelessness. The solution to much of that is just to build more affordable housing.

The development of South Park seems like a long, slow process. What’s needed?

Well, it depends on what your goals are. If South Park were to be allowed to develop commercially, it would probably just happen in the course of events. The lines of commercial development are moving in that direction. What is happening is the public agencies have a policy that South Park should be an area for housing, particularly affordable housing. That is difficult to achieve, because you not only need subsidies on the affordable side, to some extent you also need subsidies on the market rate side. Also property owner expectations are unrealistic; property values are lowered because you can’t get a comparable return on land that is not going to be commercially developed.

South Park is a place where poor people have lived historically, and there is no reason that, as part of the recycling process, opportunities shouldn’t be provided for them to continue to live there, along with people in market rate housing. There are various ways that the Agency can help make market rate housing happen, by providing incentives for infill use—grocery stores, parks, schools.

I think creative use could be made of the TFAR process, by allowing property owners to build housing without counting it against allowable density. The property owners could then transfer their density to other downtown projects. Perhaps the Agency could also say to people, you can build commercial structures if you link them with buildings of market rate housing.

Are we nearing the limit on developer exactions?

There is very little in the way of exactions downtown. The Redevelopment Agency sells density, and requires as a part of the negotiated agreement that the developer do certain things, which is not quite the same thing as exactions.

In Central City West, some very aggressive exactions are being proposed voluntarily by the developers. They see a big market there with a lot of money to be made, and if the price of that is some steep exactions, they are more than willing to do it. In places where the market is perceived to be very slim, you have greater difficulty imposing higher levels of exactions. In the right place, there is room for vastly higher exactions than the City of Los Angeles has traditionally imposed.

Is it possible to preserve the historic fabric of buildings on Seventh Street and also revitalize downtown’s main shopping street?

The bottom line on retail is that retailers will go where there are people. If there is a market, retailers want to be there. Therefore, what you need is people, and one of the best ways to get people is to increase residential uses. The Pacific Atlas project is one of those situations where you have competing concerns. Bringing in new people who might shop is useful, but I would have a great deal of difficulty with transferring density to that site. I helped write the TFAR ordinance. TFAR transfers of density are designed to preserve historic buildings by utilizing unused density on another site. I don’t see how the Pacific Atlas project can be viewed as doing anything other than the opposite, so I think that specific project is a real problem.

Recently, there has been concern about corporate logos on historic buildings downtown, notably on First Interstate World Tower. Should the CRA reconsider its signage policy?

The controversy over the signage on First Interstate tower gives one the occasion to do so. It is hard to look at the logos the way they have been affixed without some amusement at best. They don’t fit the building at all. Clearly, the issue needs some rethinking.

How do you feel about the City Council’s increased interest in overseeing the CRA’s activities?

I don’t have any problem with the City Council being actively involved in the Agency’s programming. I think the reason that there has been friction between the Council and the Agency is that we are in a period of adjustment to the fact that there is oversight where there wasn’t before. As part of the oversight committee, Zev Yaroslavsky and Gloria Molina are probably more critical than other councilmembers, since it is their job to supervise the Agency. If the Agency needs to go through a period of adjustment to become accountable, that is fine.

Carlyle Hall Joins the CRA
Currently nearing completion on Beverly Boulevard, the Los Angeles Free Clinic's new building is attracting its share of attention, including a front page article in the LA Times View section, without so much as a mention of the project's architect, the Community Design Center. Having recently celebrated their twentieth anniversary, the Design Center might reasonably expect some recognition. Without much ado, however, Los Angeles' best kept secret continues to turn out quality projects.

Housing Los Angeles:

The Community Design Center Turns 20

A non-profit architecture, planning, and housing development firm, the Community Design Center provides low-income community groups with a wide range of services, including architectural design, financial packaging, and technical assistance. Just a few of the recent projects include Villa Parke, nine units of low-income housing in Pasadena completed in December 1989; the rehabilitation of the Pasadena YMCA; a 144-unit single room occupancy building the Center purchased in September; and Pico Union Family Housing, 16 low-income units designed and developed on scattered sites in the Pico Union area, in cooperation with El Pueblo Community Development Corporation. In addition, the Center also owns and manages five housing projects. "They pay for themselves, but they don't actually support the rest of the organization. We keep them because we want them to be affordable forever. One of the reasons the city and other investors donated money in the first place was because they knew we were going to continue to manage them as affordable housing," comments Ann Sewill, the Community Design Center's executive director.

The groups the Design Center works with often require more attention than a typical firm's clients. Sewill describes how a project might evolve. "Faithful Central Missionary Baptist Church came to us recently, and they wanted to start a non-profit organization to do housing and other kinds of development in their neighborhood near 61st and Hoover. We went out with them and found a site that can be developed for housing, and we are currently in escrow on it. We are going to foundations to get help on funding, and we are also working with them on selecting an architectural group, which may be us or may be someone else."

Many of the Center's clients are low-income community groups seeking both design and development services. Sewill elaborates: "One of the things we do a lot is start up non-profit groups. The last three years we have worked with the West Hollywood Housing Corporation, Hollywood Housing Corporation, Pasadena Housing Alliance, Church and Temple Housing Corporation, and Esperanza Community Housing Corporation in south central Los Angeles. We help them get incorporated, file for non-profit status, and walk them through their first project." With a staff of approximately 12, the Design Center office is organized into two divisions: architecture and development. Typically, the development side of the office puts together the financial package and gets the loans, and the architectural side of the office handles design and construction. Of the dozen or so projects currently in the works, the two sides of the office collaborate on only about half.

Projects are chosen on the basis of feasibility and public benefit. "Most people come to us with an idea they have been working on for a while. They have reached a point where they are stuck—they know what they want to do, they have a particular site in mind, but they need the development side to tell them what it will cost, and the architectural side to do a site analysis." Most projects are funded through a combination of grants and fees. About 90% of the Center's operating costs are paid for by fees from development, consulting, and architectural projects. The remaining 10-15% comes from grants from foundations or corporations (among them ARCO, Great Western, Equitable, Parsons Foundation, James Irvine Foundation, and HAP Depot), allowing the Center to spend a certain number of hours helping groups with no money to pay fees.

Originally conceived in 1967 by past president (AIA/LA) Carl Maston, FAIA, and associated with the Southern California Chapter of the AIA in its early years, the Community Design Center was modeled after other community design centers around the country which offered architectural services free of charge to low-income neighborhoods. In 1968, the Center's first year of operation, USC donated office space and the services of faculty member Sal Mereleto in the organization running. A board of committed volunteers donated design as well as administrative services. Margot Siegel, AIA, now a partner in Siegel Diamond Architects, served as a volunteer executive director until the Center was able to assemble enough grants to hire James Bonar, FAIA, as a full-time executive director in 1972. By then the Center had exhausted its supply of volunteers, and it fell to Bonar to recruit new ones. "I can't tell you how many times I heard, 'Why do low-income communities need design?'" Bonar complains. "It was an uphill battle to convince people that design is not a superficial thing. (Community groups) can get money if they have a good plan, and they need an architect, a planner and an engineer to get that plan." A $22,000 grant from the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) paid for Bonar's salary, a part-time secretary, and several "project managers" who, in turn, recruited volunteers. Although Bonar had appealed to VISTA in 1972, it wasn't until 1975 that they could be convinced to donate volunteers. "That first VISTA group made all the difference, and by the first time I had real professionals in the sense that they had at least graduated from school."

Over the years the Community Design Center has evolved from a largely volunteer group whose projects were more service-oriented (health clinics, childcare centers, community parks, and community planning projects) to a professional development/architecture firm devoting 80-90% of its time to housing. Now chairman of the Design Center's board of directors, Bonar comments on some of the changes. "In the sixties, there was this naive concept of going out to the ghetto and saying, 'Here we are, we're architects and you need us.' In the seventies, there was more sophistication; you have to earn respect (in low-income communities) like you do anywhere else. And now, there is another view, which is that you do it and talk about it later."

In an age of growing homelessness, and more talk about it than action, Ann Sewill states that the Center is "committed to re-
explained that his understanding of space was not tied to platonic stasis but to the kind of spontaneous happening as when his countrymen gather under the short-lived cherry blossoms.

Situated himself between images of a Mongolian tent and lunar capsule, Ito showed off his unrealized proposal for Tokyo where Frei Otto-like penthouses leap across the rooftops creating a new, cosmically-attuned datum. A harranacric block completed in a downtown ward has a Brutalist frame eclaircifying up in Himmelblauesque vertigo to a metal and glass exosite. At this point, Ito seemed to be continually saying "pow."

Proposed for a suburban cultural forum was a silver, interplanetary village with a translucent domed "oasis." In tandem with his contemporary Itsuko Hasegawa, Ito extracts from Metabolism a certain Pop乐观ism that focuses on the attendant over-muscularity. And finally, now in working drawings, is an astonishing Amusement Center in Nagoya where an enormous pod, elliptical in section and containing a bowling alley, hovers provocatively over a topological assortment. These forms, which seem to be reproducing themselves over the parking structure below, include restaurants, shops and bathhouses, and are sheltered by the belly above. Ito calls this his "mini-Tokyo."

Although Tokyo serves as Ito's muse and focus of intervention, recent projects reveal both an international list of commissions and a dialogue with landscape. Earth is folded, bumed and punctured in a manner not unlike that of Ambar. For a museum being built on the southern island of Kyushu, forms—by now familiar to the visiting patron—are protected by a domed parkland as vaulted planes worthy of Capuchin nunnery float on over. At both the completed entertainment pavilion Sapporo Breweries and the kindergarten under construction in Frankfurt, West Germany, a heavy, curving wall serves as a barricade from which a diaphanous structure of glass and metal can fly.

The Japanese protagonists in Jim Jarmusch's "Mystery Train" argue as to whether or not the railway station in Memphis, Tennessee looks like that in Yokohama. Well, they must never have gone outside! Ito let up after two hours with a departing look at his Tower of Wind by the concourse at Yokohama, a brooding, 65-foot water tower given new life by a cylindrical sheath of perforated metal; sensors programmed to fluctuations in wind and noise control emittance from the 1000 bulbs and sundry neon tubes within. At night, it looks like a more kaleidoscopic cousin of the stair drum at the Pacific Design Center.

Ito has succeeded in making beautiful and provocative pieces of architecture. The private begin from zero, creating autonomous designs which, as in the U-shaped house for example, aim not at an "architecture par excellence," but at a non-erotic "architecture silencieuse." The larger projects have a certain dumb cacophony of forms assemled together in a kind of communal homage to sunburst, shadow, cloud, and their contrived mirroring.

From the hermeticism of his sister's house, Ito has evolved into a kind of "meta-en-scene." The "Mad Max" expectancy of his own home suggests that the focus must no longer be forever mute, but that it awaits some spark, whether a welcome ashpit or the fashion performance in Ito's slides.

Particularly interesting from the LA vantage is the way in which Ito accepts the even more clamorous agglomeration of his urban culture with its acute lack of center, and has been able, in a way which is neither cynical nor nostalgic, to propose a viable domestic and civil architecture for it. His interiors and furniture plug into the nomadism of life in the late 20th century. It was thus disappointing that he rushed through his contribution to the MOCA's Euro Study House show with its diaphanous existenz minimum for older folk.

Ito resists bricolage and the multiplication of yet more objects. He is intent on making filters between things: spindly mesh screens that are more industrial than shoji, more elegant than Gehry, wrapped cocoons that are reminiscent of Christo and Lumsden. But rather than entrapping things, these skins act as lyrical membranes between which the architect can do and the corroding jumble without, between the outer chaos and the inner void.

Ray Ryan
Mr. Ryan is LA Architect's Interview Editor.
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On February 7 at SCI-ARC’s Main Space, Toyo Ito addressed the multitudes. Niftily attired in a neo-sixties tunic, Ito unveiled a plethora of projects—commissions which have taken him from his native Japan to the US and Europe.

Speaking through an interpreter, Ito characterized his work from the seventies as being concerned primarily with light, whereas his recent architecture strives to capture and refract the wind.

Two houses on adjacent suburban lots illustrated the difference. Ito’s sister’s house of 1976 is a vertically extruded “U,” a hollowed-out horseshoe magnet which is frugally underfurnished. Admitted through specific cuts into the building mass, sunlight washes the interior, a seemingly endless corridor. In a manner akin to the acts of the Turrell/Erwin/Bell brigade, the silent passing of the day is thus registered and celebrated.

Ito’s home next door signals the current phase of his work. Barrel vaults of varying diameters and opacities are strung out across the site to create a family of super-elegant quonset huts. Vertical separation is negated by transparent and maneuverable walls. The eye is continually directed upwards, to the spartan struts, webbed skin and triangular rooflights. Ito’s subject here is less the masterful play of objects in light and more engaging the sky as the ultimate surface.

Ito described his philosophy of architecture as being indelibly linked with his interpretation of Tokyo, the metropolis which he and the majority of his projects inhabit. He chose five words—in English, curiously—to define those characteristics of contemporary Tokyo which most inspire and intrigue him: chaotic, superficial, floating, ephemeral, and sequential.

The chaotic is manifested in the abrupt non-contextuality of the U-shaped house, and the floating in the athletic roof of his own house. As an example of his resistance to the superficial, icon gluttony of today’s consumers, Ito showed his 1976 PMT Office Building in Nagoya where the skin begins to slip off its frame in such a way that it is no longer easily classifiable. For ephemeral, Ito pinpointed the yen-driven building boom in Tokyo, and by sequential, he referred to new experiences of space through time, easily perceived by hurtling about on his local subway system.

Having distilled these perceptions of the reality of his environment, Ito then jumped scale with a series of urban projects from the mid-eighties onward. Paramount is the sense of an interactive urban space which is Japanese without being slavishly nostalgic, and contemporary in its flexibility and technological integration. Ito
The owner must notify in writing, upon a form prescribed by the Department, all per-
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etered for inclusion on the list by the Cultural
Heritage Commission or the Council, and
(2) is subject to vandalism, or unlawful
entry, or has become a hazardous building,
nuisance or substandard building, then the
Department may cause the building,
structure, or premises, or any portion thereof,
to be immediately barricaded and
protected by such means as the Department
may deem advisable, including the use of a
Department-awarded contract. All costs
incurred by the City plus an administrative
fee of 40 percent of the costs, where the
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Associates

Recently, the AIA/ALA Associates held an
orientation at USC Harris Hall for all candi-
dates taking this year’s Architectural Li-
censing Exam (ARE). Attended by 150, the
event was a great success.

The intent of the program was to bring
all candidates up to date on changes to the
exam and licensing process, as California
will no longer administer their own exam
(CALE), but rather will administer the
national exam (ARE) produced by the
National Council of Architectural Registra-
tion Boards (NCARB).

AIA chapter Associate representatives
from San Fernando Valley, Pasadena,
Huntington Beach, and Santa Barbara were in attendance to
attend with different licensing study seminars conducted by various AIA
chapter Associates in the region.

Randy Swanson, director of professional development/IDP, spoke about the need for
interns to become involved in the Intern
Development Program. He stated that
many other states require completion of the
IDP program prior to reciprocity.

Robert Marks, director and co-founder of
Architectural Licensing Seminars (ALS), in
Westwood, spoke about the examination
itself, Marks, who has been giving study
seminars for 21 years, offered a few “tricks
of the trade,” but also emphasized the
importance of studying.

William McColluck, AIA, past
president of CCAIA, invited candidates to
become part of the AIA. He discussed the
lobbying and legislative efforts of the
CCAIA in Sacramento, as well as local
chapter benefits.

Robert DePietro, president of CAEB, and
Larry Chaffin, AIA, vice president of
CAEB, spoke about the state of California
exam process and some of the changes in
this year’s exam.

The Associates would like to thank
ten members and staff of the California Board
of Architectural Examiners for their
participation as speakers and panelists.

New Members

AIA: Carlo Alfano, Wilma Pacific Inc.;
Diane M. Coughtry, Stephen S.M. Cheng,
Center West Development; Philip James
DeBolko, Landworth DeBolko & Brown;
Monika Harte, Johannes Van Tilburg; Wil-
liam M. Taylor.

Unassigned: Antoine Pedock, Antoine
Pedock Architects;
Reinstatement: Bruce Ehrliek, Ehrliek
Group; John H. Gormley, Tomko, Will,
Gllman, Richard Ramer, Richard Ramer
Architects.

Emeritus: David Hyun, AIA; David Freed-
man, AIA; Robert M. Zigman, AIA;
Associate, Karen E. Anderson, US Air
Force; Peter W. Garran, Skidmore, Owings
& Merrill; Jan Purdy Mintz, FPIA,
Lazarus Papademetropoulos, Lazarus
Associates.

Travel: Out. Laura Barker, AIA,
Tudor to Pasadena; Robert F. Griedke, Spectrum
Land Planning Inc., to San Fernando
Valley; Stuart Greenfield, AIA, to Central
Valley; Leslie Nathan, AIA, to San Fer-
ando Valley; Eric B. Rhodeselam, AIA,
Hellmuth Obata Kassabaum, to Washing-
ton, DC; Deborah K. Shepley, The Chris-
ter Partnership, to St. Louis.

Professional Affiliates. Thomas P.
Bumsosky, Jr., M.R.C., McGrew-Hill, Inc.; Ralph
Perkinson, Dibeh USA.

Code Talk
Concerned about the shortage of decent, safe and sanitary housing in the City of Los
Angeles and the increase in the number of homeless, the City Council has passed the
following ordinances relating to demolition or relocation of residential buildings and
structures.

Ordinance No. 165279 (passed October 18, 1989) amended Section 91.0203 of the
LA Municipal Code relating to withholding demolition permits for residences contain-
ing one or more dwelling units, for the purpose of notifying interested persons that

the buildings are available for relocation.
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THE POLITICS OF DESIGN CONTROL

Historic Preservation
The Historic Preservation Committee will hold a planning meeting March 12 at 6 p.m. at the chapter office. Knowledgeable and creative response will be welcomed as the committee begins to re-establish itself as a supporter of Los Angeles' cultural and historic landmarks. Topics to be discussed will be the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum, strengthening Los Angeles landmark ordinances, and planning program events.

Urban Design Committee
At its February meeting, the Board of Directors unanimously adopted a resolution prepared by the Urban Design Committee, objecting to proposals by the Department of Water and Power to cover urban and suburban reservoirs in Los Angeles, such as Silverlake, Ivanhoe, Rowena, and Lake Hollywood. The DWP is considering the possibility of covering reservoirs as part of its water quality improvement and conservation program. The department is currently holding a series of public meetings to gather input for the program environmental impact report it is preparing.

At the public meeting in Silverlake, the Urban Design Committee presented the chapter's position. While AIA/LA shares DWP's concern with water quality and conservation, covering the reservoirs would have significant adverse impact on the economic value of the surrounding neighborhoods which were planned around the reservoirs, and would deny the visual amenity to both residents and the larger community that uses them for recreation. The AIA/LA resolution also stated that the Urban Design Committee would study the PEIR alternatives, and take further recommendations to the DWP.

In October, the 1990 National AIA Regional and Urban Design Committee conference, hosted by the Urban Design Committee and the chapter, will focus on regional urban design in Southern California. The four-day conference, held for the first time in Los Angeles, anticipates attendance of up to 100 AIA members from around the country. Conference activities are planned to provoke debate about the region's economic engine, community life, environmental matrix, and transportation systems. Other AIA chapters in the region, as well as the greater urban design community, will be invited to participate.

At its February meeting, the Board of Directors asked the Urban Design Committee to review the development issues surrounding the future Ambassador Hotel façade. After several hours of heated debate and some cookies, the committee unanimously recommended that the chapter consider holding a public forum to increase awareness of the wide range of issues raised by the development of the site. The Urban Design Committee is not concerned about any one particular development proposal, but be it Donald Trump, the Los Angeles Unified School District, or the Wildfire Stakeholders, a coalition of local landowners. Rather, we are concerned about the appropriate development of the site with respect to the full range of issues, and the open public debate required when such a site is under consideration.

Contextual issues of concern include the area's sense of community, its changing social and cultural fabric, its potential historic preservation value, the possible urban and architectural opportunities, and concerns for public open space and facilities. The committee will be working with the Board of Directors to consider forming a chapter task force to address these issues. Member input is strongly encouraged.

Minority and Women's Resources
Forecasters predict that the stereotypes will be characterized by renewed consciousness toward self-advancement. In keeping with that theme, the AIA/LA Minority and Women's Resources Committee 1990 programs will focus on improving and promoting contributions by architects who also happen to be women and ethnic minorities. For two years the committee has worked to receive a lot of participation and interest in its varied programs. In the third year, the co-chairs, Michaela Pride-Wells, AIA, and Donna Jean Bowen, AIA, are encouraged to turn interest into activism and productivity.

The primary goal of the committee is to become obsolete—eradicating the awareness and support of women and minority design professionals in the profession and the community. To this end, the committee has set up an integrated directory and data base of minority- and women-owned design firms and individuals within the Los Angeles area: support and encourage the membership, participation, leadership of minority and women architects and other design professionals in the AIA and Los Angeles chapter; serve as a liaison between the AIA/LA and other area organizations (Asian American Architects
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Real Problems Results

On January 12, 1990 at the Pacific Design Center, the winners of the 1990 Real Problems Competition were announced. First place ($10,000) went to the team of Douglas Sung and Anthony Cheung, 1988 graduates of USC. Second place ($1,000) went to the team of Patrice ($400), and honorable mentions included Fernando Bactraneo (SCI-ARC), Patrice Bergovich, Kent Chiang, and the team of Nick Cascarano and Lee Lohmar.

The competition program focused on the adaptive re-use of the exterior shell and Streamline Moderne-style entry facade of the Pan Pacific Auditorium, an historic landmark building recently destroyed by arson. Entrants were asked to provide an architecture/cinematics museum space, and a strong emphasis was placed on the historic and symbolic characteristics of the building as well as its impact on the site and adjacent park. The competition's objective was three-fold: to provide award money and recognition to talented young designers; to bring attention to the plight of this historic structure; and to offer alternative solutions for the site.

Juries included Louis Naidorf, FAIA, of Ellerbe Becket, Joseph Pica, AIA, of Pica & Sullivan Architects, Robert Boyle of the Art Directors Guild at the American Films Institute, and Rick Rosen of the LA Conservation. The jury commented that the presentations were thought-provoking and well-executed, but noted that many of the projects failed to convey a clear concept because the drawings did not contain enough information. Some of the projects attempted to address the historical significance of the Pan Pacific Auditorium, but the jury felt that most of them did not make a strong enough statement. The winning solution enclosed the original entry facade in a glass box that became the museum's focal point. Unfortunately, the designer did not do much else in the way of reconstruction or preservation.

The exhibit was on display for the 1990 AIA/LA installation of officers and directors on January 13, 1990. An opening reception is scheduled for March 22 at 7:30 pm at the chapter office. For information on the 1990 Real Problems competition or AIA/LA Associate membership, call (213) 380-4595.

Steven Geoffrion

Robert Leach

Mr. Leach is president of the AIA/LA Associates, and Mr. Geoffrion is chairman of the 1990 Real Problems Competition.

Mayor Creates Urban Design Workshop

Responding to an invitation from Mayor Tom Bradley, the AIA/LA has agreed to co-sponsor a unique urban design workshop in the Beverly-Fairfax-Miracle Mile area. The workshop represents an important step in creating a pro-active role for the AIA/LA in contributing to the quality of Los Angeles' built environment. The goal of the workshop is to explore the benefits of coordinating site planning and the design of public and private projects in such a way that the positive qualities of the neighborhood can be protected and negative impacts can be minimized.

Two significant proposed projects, one at the Farmer's Market site and one at the Park LaBrea site, served as a catalyst for creating the workshop. The existing EIR and City design review processes do not provide an opportunity to study the cumulative impacts of these and other projects within the physical and social environment of the community. The only similar planning tool presently utilized by the City is the LA/DAPT program, which also represents a cooperative effort of the City Planning Department and the AIA. Unlike the LA/DAPT, which produces a plan for a specific community, the workshop will not produce a plan. Its product will take the form of a set of urban design guidelines which will assist property owners in developing their proposals and help the City both in evaluating the proposed developments and conducting future in-depth planning efforts.

Under the leadership of the Urban Design Committee, the workshop will assemble a team of urban design experts, residents, community organizations, and property owners to look at the dynamics of the Beverly-Fairfax area, and how the unique qualities of the area can be enhanced as properties are recycled. The workshop is planned as a forum for all interested parties to voice their concerns in a non-adversarial manner. Issues addressed will include housing, the needs of the senior and immigrant populations, religious and cultural centers, parks and open space, transportation, traffic and environmental resources.

Elected officials' interest represents an opportunity for architectural professionals to demonstrate the impact of urban design on the quality of civic life. The success of the workshop could, therefore, translate into a stronger role for the AIA and the architectural profession as a whole in contributing to design policy. Members interested in participating should contact the chapter office—any assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Katherine Diamond, AIA

Ms. Diamond, a member of the Urban Design Committee, is a partner in Siegel Diamond Architects.