N.Y.C. LANDMARK PRESERVATION LAW SIGNED

Following a public hearing at City Hall on April 19, Mayor Robert F. Wagner signed into law the long-awaited city Landmarks Preservation bill.

At the two-hour long meeting held in the ornate first floor Executive Chambers, the N. Y. Chapter A.I.A., the Fine Arts Federation and the Municipal Art Society expressed their long-standing support for the proposed legislation amending the city's Charter and Administrative Code.

The open meeting heard statements by Councilman Boyers, sponsor of the Bill and its adroit champion, and by Landmarks Chairman Geoffrey Platt and City Planning Commissioner Harmon Goldstone in reply to the reservations advanced by real estate interest groups. Although not opposed to the landmarks preservation concept, these groups including the N. Y. Real Estate Board stated that the language of the bill was confusing even to trained legal minds. Beside imposing an unnecessary financial burden on owners of so-called landmarks, the realtors observed that the adoption of the bill would signify a substantial loss of potential tax revenue to the city.

Speaking for the Municipal Art Society, Mr. Giorgio Cavaglieri praised the bill as one of the most enlightened steps ever taken by the city and acknowledged the superlative efforts of Councilman Boyers and of the Landmark Preservation Commission Geoffrey Platt and James G. Van Derpool.

Representing the N. Y. Chapter A.I.A., Charles E. Thomsen challenged the Real Estate Board and the other groups to join forces with architects to make the landmarks of the past into useful instruments of the present.

BALLARD, CAVAGLIERI AND JOHNSON ELECTED FELLOWS

Three members of the N. Y. Chapter have been elected to the rank of Fellow of the A.I.A., one of the highest honors in the architectural profession. The advancement to Fellow, granted by the Institute in recognition of distinguished achievement in architectural design, education, literature, public service or service to the profession, was awarded this year to William F. R. Ballard, Giorgio Cavaglieri and Philip Johnson.

With their election, the N. Y. Chapter will have 73 of the State's 88 A.I.A. Fellows. The Fellowship will be formally conferred on June 18 at the Institute's Annual Banquet climaxing the 97th A.I.A. convention in Washington.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

MUNICIPAL ART SOCIETY 1965 AWARDS

At the 73rd Annual Meeting of the Municipal Art Society held on May 10th, in the Seventh Regiment Armory, the Society presented its Illuminated Scroll of Honor to Mayor Robert F. Wagner for his role in the enactment of the city's new landmark preservation law. Representing the Mayor at the meeting were City Planning Commissioner Harmon Goldstone, A.I.A. Also cited were Queen's Councilman Seymour Boyer who sponsored the new legislation and steered it skillfully to adoption by the Council and the Landmark Commission Chairman Geoffrey Platt.

The CBS Building by Eero Saarinen Associates received the Society's Bronze Plaque awarded only three times since 1955. Receiving the award were Mrs. Aline Saarinen and CBS president Frank Stanton. CONTINUED ON PAGE 6
**CHAPTER'S SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS PRESENTED BY BOROUGH PRESIDENT MOTLEY**

Five scholarships were awarded by the Equal Opportunities Committee at the Annual Student Meeting of the N.Y. Chapter on April 15, 1965. At a stirring ceremony at the Architectural League, some 200 members and students heard Mrs. Constance Baker Motley, President of the Borough of Manhattan, make the unprecedented awards. It was particularly fitting that Mrs. Motley, the first woman of her race to attain such high office in New York, did the honors for the five Negro students from Pratt Institute and The City College. The recipients were: Eglon E. Simons, Clarence Pete, Jr., David Danois, Harold Francis and Albert C. Morgan.

In her presentation to the first of these young architects, Mrs. Motley stated:

"I am very pleased that you have been selected by the New York Chapter American Institute of Architects to receive this scholarship award.

"There has been an imbalance in the architectural profession because relatively few members of minority groups have found the opportunity to practice. The Chapter, in recognizing its responsibility and influence as a professional organization, has taken an important and needed step toward correcting this situation.

"By establishing an Equal Opportunities Committee to raise funds to encourage young people such as yourself to enter architectural training, it has set an example of public spirited behavior that will hopefully be followed by other groups throughout the city.

"In selecting you for one of the initial scholarships, practicing architects have acknowledged those qualities of aptitude and personality which fit you for the task ahead. In accepting this honor, you assume the splendid responsibility of showing the way for others to follow.

"I join the Chapter membership in wishing you well."

Mr. William Wilson, President of the Chapter and Mr. Holden, Chairman of the Equal Opportunities Committee, introduced the Borough President and reviewed the purposes and achievements in this effort to correct a historic, social injustice. About $10,000 has been contributed to this special scholarship fund by Chapter Members and by a growing number of contractors, representatives of the building industries and the N.Y. Chapter of the Producers Council.

Much more is needed to make real impact on the situation currently and for endowment. The fund raising is continuing. Please draw your check to the order of the New York Chapter A.I.A. and mail to the Chapter Office at 115 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.

**SIMON BREINES**
**Equal Opportunities Committee**

**NEW CHAPTER COMMITTEE ON NATURAL ENVIRONMENT**

The Executive Committee has authorized the formation of an Ad Hoc Committee to explore the pros and cons of the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Natural Environment.

Chapter members especially interested or knowledgeable in the matters affecting air purity, water, open land, nature preservation and similar aspects of the human environment are asked to contact Frithjof M. Lunde, CO 5-2815.
COMING EVENTS

MAY 12
Housing Symposium
Dining Room, Wednesday, 5:30 P.M.

MAY 18
Technical Committee Lecture
Dining Room, Tuesday, 12:30 P.M.

JUNE 1
Hospitals & Health Seminar
Dining Room, Tuesday, 5:15 P.M.

JUNE 2
ANNUAL LUNCHEON
Dining Room, Wednesday, 12:30 P.M.

JUNE 14-18
A.I.A. Convention
Sheridan-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

OCTOBER 10-13
New York State Association of Architects
Convention, Concord Hotel, Kiamesha Lake, N.Y.

MEMBERSHIP
WELCOME NEW MEMBERS
The New York Chapter extends its warmest welcome to the following new members:

Corporate
Robert J. Alderdice
Richard Spronz

CANDIDATES
Information regarding the qualifications of the following candidates for membership will be considered confidential by the Admissions Committee:

Corporate
John Frederick
David Dambowicz
William Barnett
Gleckman
David Brian Shoemaker
Edmund William Stevens, Jr.

Professional Associate
George J. Rehl

Associate
Howard Frank Itzkowitz
Bernard Kessler
Richard Roth, Jr.
Roy Revere Thomson
Joe Yoshiya Fuchida

SEVERUD • PERRONE • FISCHER
Consulting Engineers
Reports - Buildings - Airports
Structural Design - Supervision

OLKO ENGINEERING
Consultants - Designers
Structural and Civil Engineering
500 FIFTH AVE. NYC BR 9-2822

SAFEBASE
SPACE SAVING
SELF INSTRUCTIVE
PLAYGROUNDS

Imagine playful playscapes provide safe, stimulating fun for children from 18 months to 13 years. No supervision necessary. The children move, the equipment does not! Write for catalog.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGNER/PLANNER
STERLING FOREST

Responsibility and work will include:
1. Development of an overall 15 year plan for the Forest.
2. Land and site planning for subdivisions and building complexes that the Forest will develop.
3. Architectural design consulting service to the Forest and to potential clients who will build in the Forest.
4. Architectural supervision for buildings that the Forest will construct.

Remuneration will depend on training and experience. Full-time and permanent availability preferred, but part-time or summer work will be considered. For convenience in commutation (New York City is one hour away) and work trips in the Forest an automobile is necessary.

If interested, contact: Mr. John R. Wilson, Vice President, Sterling Forest Corporation, Box 608, Tuxedo, N.Y., Tel: (914) EL 1-2151.

SUMMER OPENINGS
WILLIAM SIGAL & ASSOCIATES,

William Sigal and Associates is an architectural, planning and engineering firm with principal offices in San Juan and offices in both St. Thomas and St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands.

The firm would be interested in hiring architectural apprentices and draftsmen for summer employment, and would like young men who are eager and willing to prove their abilities and gain experience that will be valuable in their further education and future work.

Applications should be addressed to Miss Virginia Gonzales, William Sigal & Associates, 1193 Ponce De Leon, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.

LIGHTING EXPOSITION—JUNE 6

The fifth National Lighting Exposition and World Lighting Forum opens at the N.Y. Coliseum June 6th for four days. Over 25,000 different lighting units covering all phases of lighting will be on view, with engineering staff available for general and technical questions. Highlighting the exposition will be six 2-hour long symposia on lighting by leading authorities in the field. Admission for the entire series will be $10.00 or $2.00 for each symposium. Tickets may be obtained at the office of the exposition, 310 Madison Ave., For invitations contact Miss Carole Levy at MU 7-6290.
NEW WOOD HANDRAILS with an aluminum core substructure are furnished as a complete unit by Blumcraft. The solid walnut wood, with a natural hand-rubbed oil finish, is bonded to the aluminum at Blumcraft's factory. This new railing concept combining wood and metal is trademarked RAILWOOD®

Complete 1964 catalogue available from Blumcraft of Pittsburgh, 460 Melwood St., Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

*Trademark © 1964 Blumcraft of Pittsburgh
LAFARGE AND TAFEL TO
FINE ARTS FEDERATION

The New York Chapter has named L. Bancel La Farge and Edgar Tafel as representatives to the Fine Arts Federation of New York. The Federation, of 14 constituent organizations, representing 5600 members active in the fine arts, endeavors to foster and protect the artistic interests of the community. It also nominates persons for appointment to the Art Commission by the Mayor and aids in the selection of the Mayor’s panel of architects.

Mr. LaFarge, F.A.I.A., is a past president of the Chapter, Municipal Art Society and the Liturgical Arts Society. A partner in the firm of LaFarge & Morey, he is a member of the Architectural Advisory Council to the New York Board of Trade. He is an associate member of the National Academy of Design and director and a member of the executive committee of the American Arbitration Association.

Mr. Tafel, chairman of the Chapter’s Committee on Aesthetics and member of the architects’ committee for the design of Washington Square, he is architect for the Protestant Chapel at Kennedy International Airport, the multi-award winning First Presbyterian Church School at Fifth Avenue and 12th Street and the Minisink Community Center in Harlem. A native New Yorker, Mr. Tafel studied at N.Y.U. Prior to World War II he was apprenticed to Frank Lloyd Wright for nine years.

Other Chapter representatives to the Fine Arts Federation are Marcel Breuer, Philip Ives, Alfred Easton Poor and G. E. Kidder Smith.

NEW YORK CHAPTER TO INCREASE DUES

In October of 1964, the Finance Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that it was necessary to raise the dues in 1965-66 in order to meet the demands of an expanding budget (1964-65). The Executive Committee, since that time, has devoted much study to other available means of raising funds for the Chapter.

It appears that there is no single manner in which sufficient funds can be obtained to balance our budget, save that of raising the dues. The Executive Committee is making a continuing effort to increase the number of Sustaining Firm Memberships. This year 50 additional new firms were added, bringing the total to 144 firms. This has been a considerable help but will not balance the budget.

The services performed by the Chapter Office are continually expanding. At present the staff has grown to include four assistants to help the Executive Secretary in the discharge of her duties. Extensive evidence of our growth has occurred in the past few years. Growth in numbers of requests from the public, growth in membership, and growth in participation of community affairs, all result in increased expenses. We believe that our growth is a healthy result of the Chapter’s recent efforts in committee activities, public relations, and other Chapter functions.

The budget for the fiscal year of 1964-65 requires $30,000 for committee activities. The Executive Committee has been forced to curtail committee activities this year. Even with this curtailment, we will have a deficit at the end of the fiscal year of approximately $7,000.

The existing by-laws permit the Executive Committee to recommend to the Chapter a raise in dues not to exceed 20% of the present dues. After due consideration, much discussion and some success in increasing the roll of Sustaining Firms, the Executive Committee, by the required majority vote, now recommends an increase which will raise the corporate dues from $43 to $51 with corresponding raises for other categories of membership. This recommendation will be submitted to the Chapter for approval by majority vote at the annual Pre-Convention Meeting on April 29, 1965; the raise to be effective as of October 1, 1965 for the Chapter’s fiscal year 1965-66.

It is expected that this proposed increase in dues will yield to the Chapter approximately $10,000 which together with other efforts will enable the Committees to function more actively, increasing their activities in publications, exhibitions, meetings, etc.

The Executive Committee has made a comparison of Chapter dues across the nation and found that there are approximately twenty chapters with higher dues. We believe that our Chapter Headquarters serves the entire metropolitan area extremely well, and is, in fact, the unofficial host to most European architects. The Chapter is a major support to the activities and facilities of the Architectural League which this year is receiving a special award from the Institute for its continued contributions to architecture.

On several occasions in the past year, the Executive Committee has been obliged to curtail the numbers of public meetings and even their

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2
NEW YORK CHAPTER TO INCREASE DUES  
CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

locations due to budget limitations. As the Chapter is expanding and growing, the need for adequate meeting space has increased. Each public meeting involves increasing expenses, such as announcements, mailings, rentals, and/or presentations. We believe that the N. Y. Chapter should assume its role of leadership in the community, and believe that this increase in dues will assist in this goal.

CONTINGENCY RESERVE FUND
The Chapter has basically a sound financial position. It is part of the by-laws that 10% of the dues are deposited to a contingent reserve fund. The Contingency Reserve Fund now is approximately $86,000. Income from this fund reverts to the General Fund.

HEADQUARTERS FUND
The N. Y. Chapter, the largest in the country, became aware of its tenuous physical position when the building leased by the Architectural League was sold to new owners in 1963 and there was a general fear that it would be demolished. Since that time leases have been extended and we are presently on a two-year lease basis. The Executive Committee created a Headquarters Fund to which $5,000 per year from general funds have been added. This fund now totals $18,000, plus interest, and will be available in the event the Headquarters Committee recommends appropriate action. The Executive Committee, 1964-65, faced with a curtailed budget, did not hesitate to see that this fund should grow and proceeded to transfer $5,000 to this account. If similar contributions can continue as well as other donations from the general membership toward this fund, the Chapter will gain strength in its desire to find its truly unique position in relationship to the New York Community.

DUES INCREASES
The following is a breakdown of Annual Dues, to the American Institute of Architects, The New York Chapter A.I.A., and to the New York State Association of Architects, for Corporate, Professional and Associate members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20% Increase From:</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National N.Y. Chapter N.Y.S.A.A. Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year:</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>28.00-33.00 9.00 62.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 registration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year:</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>36.00-43.00 9.00 82.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year:</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>43.00-51.00 9.00 110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associate (Chapter affiliation only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year:</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year:</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year:</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate (Chapter affiliation only) First five years:</td>
<td>18.00 (per yr.)-21.00 21.00 (per yr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th year &amp; thereafter</td>
<td>36.00-48.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td>10.00-12.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Income from Proposed Raise Corporate—1st year</td>
<td>$8,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Associates</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARCHITECTS AND FEES

by SAMUEL M. KURTZ, Chairman
Fees and Contracts Committee

In a news item in the New York Times an Architect “sought to remove the air of mystery that has grown up around the fees charged by members of the profession.” This lifting of the “veil from fees” included statements that—“architects are often reluctant to talk about their fees”; “because of this, clients are unaware of the cost of producing a drawing or blueprint”; “a guide to . . . fees . . . prepared by the A.I.A. . . . is rarely followed”; that “the cost of producing one drawing or blueprint (SIC) is $1,600, a figure that reflects only salaries and overhead—and no profit”; and that it is “the mystery about fees that has fostered a good deal of what is bad in today’s architecture.”

The intent of this “revelation” is laudable; its effect in total terms of misinformation is unfortunate. The picture of the architect obtained from this news item is that of a professional who is unable to convince his client of the value of his services and is thus obliged to accept low fees, give poorer services—and produce “catalog architecture.”

The facts are that recommended minimum fee schedules have been published annually by such organizations as the New York Society of Architects since 1912; and by the N. Y. Chapter of the A.I.A. at least since 1947. These two organizations alone represent about 3,000 architects in the metropolitan New York City area. In 1952, and again in 1961 the A.I.A. published a chart indicating that A.I.A. chapters in almost every state from Alabama to Hawaii had a published fee schedule. In addition, many of these organizations published with the fee schedule a statement of the architects services. Periodically, and often at least annually, many of these organizations revised their fee schedules to conform to current practices.

Most fee schedules group buildings into four categories or types and set fees on a sliding scale of a percentage of the “Cost of Construction.” In 1960 the New York Chapter published a Statement of Services and pioneered a fee schedule which listed 73 building types and 21 rate schedules. The N. Y. Chapter Fees and Contracts Committee early in 1962 conducted a survey of its membership to evaluate this document. While the results were gratifying in terms of the usefulness of the document to the membership, it was also clear that it needed revision to conform with revised A.I.A. architect/owner agreements and with current practices.

The Committee decided that the Statement of Services should be rewritten in non-contractual language, and that the Owners responsibilities and obligations should be clarified and amplified. It was also felt that there appeared to be inconsistencies in building type categories and too many rate schedules; and that there was inference that if the cost of a project was great enough, the fee curve continued to descend indefinitely. Study of these two phases of the document continued until the statement portion was completed and approved by the Executive Committee in November 1964. Several additional Chapter surveys of the proposed fee schedule section were conducted. After several revisions based on suggestions received, it too was approved by the Executive Committee in March 1965. The survey of the new fee schedule in its final draft form indicated general approval and much commendation, and include:

STATEMENT OF SERVICES
Rewritten to relate to current A.I.A. Owner/Architect agreements and to be in simple language.

THE RATE SCHEDULE
1) The number of rate schedules have been reduced from 21 to 10.
2) Apparent inconsistencies in rates applicable to building types have been eliminated.
3) Building types—not usually encountered, or vague in description have been eliminated. Current and new building types have been added.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
GUIDEBOOK

Chapter members Dixon, White and Willensky have been appointed authors of a guidebook to N.Y.C. architecture, primarily for the A.I.A. Convention, 1967, but also purchasable by architectural schools, libraries and individual architects.

The proposed guidebook will be planned and patterned somewhat after the French Michelin guides. Possibly other contributions might be forthcoming towards its publication and distribution.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Chapter members who wish to serve on a committee for the 1965-1966 academic year are urged to signify their preference of committee assignment on the registration blank below. It is requested that only one selection be made from the committees listed and that the form be promptly mailed to the Chapter.

The committees are

PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY
Admissions Finance
By-Laws Membership
Chapter Headquarters
EDUCATION
Advisory Lehrun Fellowship
Brunner Scholarship Scholarship
Stewardson Student Chapter Fellowship Equal Opportunities
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
Fees and Contracts Office Practice
Housing Fees Metropolitan
Legislative Technical
ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN
Aesthetics Housing
Hospitals and Health School
House Consulting Urban Design
PUBLIC AFFAIRS
Awards Oculus
Convention 1967 Public Affairs
Exhibits Publications
Historical Buildings Speakers Bureau
Meetings Visitors

Committee Registration 1965-66

NAME: ........................................
ADDRESS: ...................................
TELEPHONE: ..............................
COMMITTEE: ................................
SIGNATURE: ..............................

ARCHITECTS AND FEES

Schedule of rates applies to the alphabetical list basically—and for general reference have been grouped in a separate list under each rate Schedule.

4) Rates have been adjusted to conform with suggestions received from surveys of chapter members and with current economic conditions. Intended generally for private practice, they are also meant to serve as a guide to governmental agencies.

5) Schedule of fees has been limited to $10,000,000. A general note covers costs above 10 Million Dollars.

6) A “limited ladder” (limited to cost between two rates) method for basic fee adjustment has been suggested as preferable to interpolation.

7) Recommendation for Multiple of Direct Personnel Expense Rates, and definition of same has been added.

8) Recommendations for rates for alterations, and a definition of alterations has been added.

9) Recommendations for additional fee for construction let on cost plus or separate contracts have been included.

10) As many answers as possible to questions usually asked have been included.

In the past few years the N.Y. Chapter’s Fees and Contracts Committee, Fees and Contracts Committee for N.Y.C. Schools, and Housing Fees and Contracts Committee have been working with various public agencies towards more equitable fees and contracts. As recently as January 27, 1965, the New York Times published a news item to the effect that the Chapter has rejected the proposed increase in fees by the N.Y. City Housing and Redevelopment Board “as totally inadequate.” The N.Y. Chapter also devoted the February 1965 issue of its publication the “OCULUS” to a full scale exposure of its discussions with this agency, with a warning to architects on the financial dangers inherent in these programs. The New York Society of Architects similarly advised its membership. The N.Y. State Association of Architects and its Fees and Contracts Committee has also taken a strong position regarding the low fee schedules used by some governmental agencies for State financed housing and other projects, and passed four resolutions on this subject at its annual convention in October 1964. These actions of the N.Y.S.A.A., the N.Y. Chapter A.I.A., and the N.Y. Society of Architects hardly reflect a “reluctance to talk about fees.”

It is hoped that the notoriously low and economically unfeasible fee schedules used by some governmental agencies will be influenced by the new fee schedule; and that architects will not undertake commissions for fees that can only result in fiscal insolvency.

The percentage fee system based on the cost of construction is perhaps outmoded. It can lead to misunderstanding by clients and the general public. The Architect is a professional, and he should be paid a professional fee. Unlike some other professionals, his work includes not only his advice and artistic talents; it requires a highly complicated technical and administrative organization and a physical plant equipped for research, and production of drawings and documents (something more than “blueprints”). For this portion of his work he should be compensated on a basis of actual cost. His fee should be just that: a professional fee; and that should be established on the basis of the magnitude, and complexity of the services required, and on the basis of his talent and skill. This is not an unattainable dream, because standard A.I.A. contract forms for this purpose now exist, and are being used by an increasing number of architects who refuse to provide their services on any other basis. This is the solution to the “mystery” about fees, and all it needs is its acceptance by architects as the best professional basis for payment of their fees. Ultimately it should provide the only basis.
“Public housing in New York will not overcome its dismaying sameness, antiseptic qualities and cookie-cutter molds unless bold steps are taken to produce great projects through planning experiments and pilot programs.

“This is the only way we will achieve quality of design,” according to David F. M. Todd, vice president of the New York Chapter American Institute of Architects. Mr. Todd made his remarks at the housing design seminar sponsored by the Chapter at its headquarters at 115 East 40th Street, late in March.

Herman D. Hillman, Public Housing Administration’s regional director for the eight-state northeastern area, also took part in the program. He said that “good architectural design will never be at-
testation, for new techniques, for any-
tional dwelling unit that can be ProJect, he said.

“Other way can quality be achieved,” he said.

Mr. Todd proposed that enabling legislation be utilized to its maxi-
mum, that site work budgets be in-
creased drastically to overcome a
dreadful flaw in planning housing, and that the private sponsor be
used and not negated. “There must
be a willingness to allow the spon-
or maximum freedom so that new
forms and new solutions can be
found through the traditional role
of the private entrepreneur who is
willing to take risks,” he said. He
also added that competitions might
serve a useful purpose but that
they will be not better than the
programs on which they are based.

There are people in the city who
care about achieving quality in ar-
chitecture, Mr. Todd indicated. He
said that Mr. Hillman; Max Schrei-
ber, deputy director of design of
the New York Housing Authority;
Samuel Ratensky, chief of the Hous-
ing and Redevelopment Board’s
bureau of project development; and
Ira Robbins, vice chairman of the
New York City Housing Authority,
are asking questions about how to
get quality in public housing and
are hoping for the right answers.
Messrs. Schreiber and Ratensky
also participated in the seminar.
“But they are stopped by the ma-
nery that they must use—the
legislative limits and political real-
ities. Within their limits they have
done some great things. Look at
Carver Houses and Jefferson Houses
and consider the imagination be-
hind the West Side Urban Renewal
Project,” he said.

“We need to refine quality by ex-
ample. Common agreement on what
quality is will not come either po-
litically or administratively until
there are some great examples to
point to that will in turn become
the standards rather than the ex-
ceptions. We are on our way to-
ward some of this quality in the
plazas of Carver Houses and Jeffer-
son Houses. These projects have
shown one way of achieving an
approach to total design of urban
space,” Mr. Todd stated. He said
that public housing should not have
to go to foundations for money to
build plazas such as those at Car-
ver Houses and Jefferson Houses.
It should be considered an inherent
part of the public housing program.
He added that total design is ham-
ered by laws such as the one for-
bidding development of shopping
facilities in public housing.

“If real architectural quality of
design is to be found, it certainly
will not be found in the present con-
text of the city or state Mitchell-
Lama programs.” He called these
“timid programs” where the qual-
ity of design is looked upon as a
matter of “pretty pictures.”

Mr. Hillman said that “until a
few years ago housing for low-in-
come families was plain, standard-
ized strictly and minimally func-
tional. Too often in cities around
the country, low-rent housing fa-
cilities were designed that, instead
of blending with the architectural
patterns surrounding them, stuck
out like sore thumbs creating a
sense of pride rather neither in the
occupant nor in the community.
With the advent of Marie McGuire,
as Commissioner, there evolved a
new concept and spirit about the
Government’s role in improving
the quality of American life and
advancing the cultural and aes-
thetic values of our environment.”

He added that “the importance
of superior design to urban Amer-
ica cannot be minimized. Through
exploration of problems, evaluation
of solutions, improvement of com-
 munications between owner and
architect, we can achieve better
housing and better communities.”

Mr. Ravitch stated that from a
building point of view “good archi-
tecture does not necessarily mean
more expensive construction costs.
The builder should be selected at
the same time the architect is
chosen and picked on the basis of
being able to work well with the
architect. When builder and archi-
tect work together from the start,
the builder can be helpful to the
architect in the development of
plans and such a relationship can
help keep costs down,” he said.

Norval C. White, chairman of
the Chapter’s Housing Committee,
presided at the seminar.
A NEW PROFESSIONAL: THE CORPORATION ARCHITECT

Based on remarks made by the author at the American Marketing Association construction seminar in Chicago on March 22.

The staff architect with a commercial or industrial firm or simply a corporation architect is a somewhat new idea on our scene. However, this development seems so natural and reasonable that many feel sure it will become common for the corporation and good for architecture. Other related ideas and terms that have recently come to the fore include corporate image, corporate identity and corporate identity system. This phrasing may carry a whiff of Madison Avenue with it, but is valid in the context of the corporate client. Thus, we might define corporate identity system as the organization of wordage and objects into an identifiable whole which represents the nature of the corporation. A few of these elements are nomenclature: the names or initials for the corporation and its divisions, logotype, product styling, packaging, display methods, motor vehicle styling, and of course, architecture, including interior design. This system might finally be considered a means of communication.

Each part of the corporate identity system has its unique part to play, and architecture is no exception. Architecture’s persistence and its omnipresence may be neglected or favored, but it cannot as a rule be hidden. There it stands representing the corporation whether it likes it or not. The story is told with the help of good design or by default. It makes sense to make the best of this architectural bargain.

Let us examine another particular quality architecture has as it communicates. Good architecture defines the corporation public image. As it tells the story of a company it offers a bonus not to be expected of packaging or advertising. Included in the “price of the dinner” are good working conditions, employee productivity, and the staff loyalty that will flower if nurtured by progressive management.

One may agree that the corporation architect is as valid a category as corporation lawyers, but wonder when it applies to a given company. One measure is that the need can be considered as a function of size. When enough sites are being considered, when enough roofs are being specified, when enough foot-candles are falling on work benches and desk tops you will need proper representation in these areas. When enough vice presidents, directors, sales managers, office managers are playing planner, architect, interior designer, and sacrificing hours from their own jobs—then there is a need for an architect. In time, an architectural department will be needed.

Architects come in all shapes and sizes; there are new ones and there are veterans; there are specialists and there are general practitioners. What version is suited to the executive suite? What is special about the role of corporate architect? Generally speaking, this architect should be a Jack of All Trades. He will wear a coat of many colors and a good assortment of hats. Let us consider a few of these special demands.

The first is a yardstick not particularly known in architectural school. It is a matter of the architect bringing his talent and training to bear with a hard measure of the corporation’s land and buildings. The test being: will these facilities increase the quality of our product, the excellence of our service, and the margin of our profit? Here is where Mr. Hardnose appears in hat number one.

We have a second hat for our corporation architect. This one is worn in the rarified air of corporation policy making. The company’s nature and product would determine the extent of the architect’s part, as to whether the corporation should staff adequately to design and specify its own buildings or limit its architectural staff and retain outside architects for the bulk of the design service it requires. Another good policy question is the desirability or not of developing a prototype building for adaption to various locations as the need develops.

Negotiation is another special demand on the staff architect. He has come to feel at home in the world of the “lease back,” the “build lease,” space rentals, lease maintenance clauses and “Exhibit A’s.” In recent years some companies tend to negotiate the “turn key job.” Here again architectural counsel is as fitting as legal counsel.

Our fourth architect’s hat is the well known “hard hat” of the construction world, and with it firmly in place we turn to the corporation’s building program. Here we have the architect’s most pertinent responsibility. The range of the building program can be far and wide. The far may be upwards of one hundred cities. The wide may include the manufacturing plant, headquarters offices, branch facilities and agencies. These company quarters are variously approached sometimes with a view of abandonment, another day with the thought of refurbishing, and often with a sparkling new construction project in mind. Be it old, new or middle-aged let us select some of the many facets of the building process.

Construction is our word of the day, and one of the most sweeping words in anyone’s lexicon. However, in the long grey line of the construction world we include the company architect. He will be counted upon to approve, inspect, specify or select item after item, from vapor barrier to five-ply roofing or concrete, be it pre-stressed, exposed, lightweight or slab on grade. When mechanical equipment is of the moment the phone may ring, the telegram may arrive, the specifications may be delivered and the architect is the clearing house be it fluorescent lamps, exhaust fans or ventilating ceilings.

Finally there is site work and these out-of-doors decisions which can include drainage tiles, black top, seeding, pin oaks and privet. With that leafy green note may we conclude our little tour, from pre-stressed concrete to privet, of the architect’s new profession: the corporation architect.

by BONNELL IRVINE, A.I.A.
WELCOME NEW MEMBERS
The New York Chapter extends its warmest welcome to the following new members:

Corporate
Eric J. Pick
Norman D. Larsen
Harold G. Young
David A. Yerkes
Michael McCarthy
Harry A. van Dyke
Roberto J. Gambacher
John Yang
John P. Staton

CANDIDATES
Information regarding the qualifications of the following candidates for membership will be considered confidential by the Admissions Committee:

Corporate
John M. Colgan
Jose L. Collazo

Professional Associate
Charles Theodore Eells III
Sponsors:
C. Gates Beckwith &
Leon S. Barton, Jr.

TRANSPORTATION COURSE
A short two-day course in Urban Transportation Planning will be offered on May 10 and 11 by the Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute.

SPECIAL OFFER FROM THE A.I.A. JOURNAL
The Journal is now being offered, through June, at the special rate of $2.50 per year to Professional Associate and Associate members of this Chapter. Only those who are new subscribers or whose subscriptions have expired are eligible for this special offer.

Checks made payable to the A.I.A. Journal and the subscription blank below should be mailed directly to: The Journal, A.I.A., 1375 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

NEW YORK CHAPTER, A.I.A.
NAME: .............................................
ADDRESS: ..........................................
..................................................
..................................................
Prof. Associate ...............................
Associate Member ..........................
New ............................................
EXPIRATION DATE .........................

COMING EVENTS

APRIL 29  A.I.A. Pre-Convention Luncheon
Dining Room, Thursday, 12:30 P.M.

MAY 12  Housing Symposium
Dining Room, Wednesday, 5:30 P.M.

MAY 18  Technical Committee Lecture
Dining Room, Tuesday, 12:30 P.M.

JUNE 1  Hospitals & Health Seminar
Dining Room, Tuesday, 5:15 P.M.

JUNE 2  ANNUAL LUNCHEON
Dining Room, Wednesday, 12:30 P.M.

JUNE 14-18  A.I.A. Convention
Sheridan-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

WOMEN’S ARCHITECTURAL AUXILIARY
WANTED! HUBBY’S HOBBIES
FOR EXHIBIT ON THE NIGHT OF MAY 19th
AT THE W.A.A. SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS DINNER.
PLEASE DELIVER TO 115 EAST 40th STREET,
NEW YORK, NO LATER THAN MAY 18th.

OLKO ENGINEERING
Consultants – Designers
Structural and Civil Engineering
500 FIFTH AVE. NYC BR 9-2822

SEVERUD - PERRONE - FISCHER
STURM - CONLIN - BANDEL
Consulting Engineers
Reports - Buildings - Airports
Special Structures
Structural Design - Supervision

SAFE SPACE SAVING SELF INSTRUCTIVE PLAYGROUNDS
Imaginative playscapes provide safe, stimulating fun for children from 18 months to 13 years. No supervision necessary. The children move, the equipment does not! Write for catalog.

Imaginative playscapes provide safe, stimulating fun for children from 18 months to 13 years. No supervision necessary. The children move, the equipment does not! Write for catalog.

PLATÓN CORPORATION
division of lighting associates, inc.
351 east 61st street, new york 21/pl 1-0575

Imaginative playscapes provide safe, stimulating fun for children from 18 months to 13 years. No supervision necessary. The children move, the equipment does not! Write for catalog.
NEW WOOD HANDBRAILS with an aluminum core substructure are furnished as a complete unit by Blumcraft. The solid walnut wood, with a natural hand-rubbed oil finish, is bonded to the aluminum at Blumcraft's factory. This new railing concept combining wood and metal is trademarked RAILWOOD.*

Complete 1964 catalogue available from Blumcraft of Pittsburgh, 460 Melwood St., Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

*Trademark © 1964 Blumcraft of Pittsburgh