ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NEW YORK CHAPTER, JUNE 1965

ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS

President Wilson brought the gavel down with finality and, savoring these final moments, turned over the meeting to his successor. On this second day of June, the New York Chapter had a new president: Max 0. Urbahn.

It had been an exciting year; a year marked by many successes and many accomplishments. Landmarks preservation, a popular crusade, had become a hard political fact. Final touches were being made to the new fee schedule. The formidable voice of the Chapter had been brought to bear on the inequities of the Housing Redevelopment Board program; and its repercussions were still being felt at Albany. The prestige of the Chapter had gone undiminished and its members were sought. Robert Cutler had been named president of the N.Y. Building Congress. George D. Brown, a key figure in the Mitchell-Lama statements, was to be sworn in as the only architect in the 21-member N.Y.C. Board of Higher Education.

MEDAL OF HONOR TO BREUER

One of Mr. Wilson's last official acts was the presentation of the Chapter's highest award, the Medal of Honor, to Marcel Breuer FAIA, "in recognition of distinguished creative design for construction and industry; of outstanding architectural design achievements in many parts of the world showing a truly consistent character; of significant contributions to the profession through many years of teaching at the Bauhaus and Harvard; of the ability to recognize the importance of and to use all the visual arts in the creation of a complete architectural environment."

Marcel Breuer was born in Hungary. He studied and taught at the Bauhaus. At the invitation of Walter Gropius, he came to the U.S. in 1937 and taught at Harvard for nine years. He opened his New York office in 1946.

RUTKINS MEMORIAL AWARD TO NORVAL WHITE

Also honored by the Chapter at the annual meeting was Norval White, who received the Harry B. Rutkins Memorial Award "for his creative leadership and devoted service to the Chapter, the profession and the community."

Mr. White is chairman of the Chapter's Housing Committee and former chairman of the now defunct Younger Architects Committee. He served on last year's Nominating Committee, and was a member of the Urban Design, Admissions, Exhibits and Chapter Goals Committee.

Norval White is perhaps better known for his principal role as...
AWARD TO NORVAL WHITE
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chairman of AGBANY, a group which desperately sought to prevent the destruction of Penn Station. A member of the board of NYCE, he is also a trustee of ARCH, vice-chairman of Manhattan Community Planning Board No. 8 and a director of the Municipal Art Society.

ABRAMS MADE HONORARY ASSOCIATE MEMBER

Charles Abrams, cited for his "contribution to architecture through his endeavors to provide better human shelter," has been identified with the housing field since 1933. As a member of Mayor LaGuardia's administration, he laid the groundwork for the laws and procedures for public housing in America.

Author of "Man's Struggle for Shelter," Mr. Abrams has helped formulate housing policies for 16 nations. He has participated in United Nations housing missions to Turkey, Pakistan, India the Philippines, to name a few. He is presently engaged in a major study of urban renewal in the U.S. for the Ford Foundation. He was recently appointed chairman of Columbia's Division of Urban Planning, one of three divisions, recently created in a major reorganization of the School of Architecture.

Charles Abrams, cited for his "contribution to architecture through his endeavors to provide better human shelter," has been identified with the housing field since 1933. As a member of Mayor LaGuardia's administration, he laid the groundwork for the laws and procedures for public housing in America.

Author of "Man's Struggle for Shelter," Mr. Abrams has helped formulate housing policies for 16 nations. He has participated in United Nations housing missions to Turkey, Pakistan, India the Philippines, to name a few. He is presently engaged in a major study of urban renewal in the U.S. for the Ford Foundation. He was recently appointed chairman of Columbia's Division of Urban Planning, one of three divisions, recently created in a major reorganization of the School of Architecture.

MARCEL BREUER

To a great form-giver of architecture, the Chapter's highest award, the Medal of Honor.


This volume, first in a series of works describing important architectural epochs, supplies a treasury of startlingly handsome photographs of Mayan work in Mexico and Central America. It also, in readable text, supplies archeological information, critical comment and Mayan building techniques.

The series is intended particularly to advance the layman's appreciation of architecture (volumes on Egyptian, Baroque, Roman and Gothic architecture are in preparation) but there is no writing-down: Architects will find technical discussion, plentiful keyed plans and clearly drawn details as well as the 80-odd amazing shots of plazas, buildings and sculptured details. And for those architects whose acquaintance with the Mayan stops at Chichen Itza the wealth offered by other sites is eye-opening.

In fact, the layman might have been given a few more handy explanations; definitions of "pisé" and "binder molding" for example, or a plan showing how chambers are "linked to the exterior only by means of right-angled corridors." The rather arbitrary assumption that a pillar is always rectangular and a column always square may have come from a translation difficulty. A reminder that Mayan stucco facings were painted in what might seem a "barbarous" way to modern eyes is countered by a general note describing "shining white facades."

A few text references to photograph page numbers where such photographs are not in the immediate group under discussion would save scurrying about, although leafing back through the plates in search of a particular one is in itself rewarding. And a more detailed explanatory map of Mayan territories, including boundaries of the Peten region often mentioned in the text, would be welcome.
ART WORK SUBMISSION FOR N.Y.C. SCHOOLS — 3
TOWARD A NEW POLICY

by GRAY TAYLOR, A.I.A. School Committee

This is the third installment in the debate initiated by OCULUS to examine the Board of Education policies on artwork in its building program. Last May, Vice-President Todd launched the debate and found more timidity than boldness in the Board's "didactic standard of personal opinion" while Ronald Allwork AIA, President of the Architectural League, expressed the need for defining the objectives of such a policy.

In this issue, Gray Taylor AIA of the Chapter's School Committee examines the pitfalls inherent in the Board's present criteria and outlines the recommendations of his sub-committee toward a more equitable and challenging program.

The School Committee has been interested in art submissions for New York City schools for some time. We have discussed the ills of the present system at some length and offer the following:

First—the present allowance for art work is too low. It is now well below 1% of the total construction funds. We strongly urge that an art work cash allowance of 1% be included for New York City schools. In cities such as Boston and Philadelphia, ordinances have been in force since 1959, stipulating that "an amount not to exceed 1% of the total dollar amount of any construction contract for a building, bridge and its approaches, arch, gate or other structure or fixture to be paid for either wholly or in part by the City, shall be devoted to the Fine Arts . . .". We believe New York City should have a similar ordinance. The use of art helps support the architectural concept and furthers the pleasure of the viewer. It is not intended to be a substitute for good architectural design. However, when funds are restricted to the bare essentials or purely utilitarian, the potential of the architect is limited.

Second—At present the work of the artist is initially reviewed by the Board of Education. Sometimes the artist must submit several sketches and original concepts are changed; and in many instances diluted to the point where there is no longer strength or meaning. Finally, the art work is brought to the Fine Arts Commission for review. It would seem far better and more logical to us that people knowledgeable about art and architecture should be the prime reviewer, not the Board of Education. As the Art Commission meets but once a month and has a full agenda for each meeting, it might be well for the Art Commission to appoint a reviewing committee, possibly composed of members of the Aesthetics Committee of the New York Chapter of the A.I.A. This group would take suggestions and recommendations from the Board of Education, selection of the artist being by the Architect, and consider the concepts and ideas of both architect and artist. All presentations to this committee would have architect and artist present. When the artist's sketches were approved by the committee, then they would be presented to the Fine Arts Commission for formal approval. We believe an arrangement such as outlined would tend to improve the art work now being incorporated in New York City schools. Selection of art work should not be a Board of Education function, and we believe it would be most happy to avoid the criticism of the past by placing the responsibility in other hands.

Third—after artists are approved for an art commission, they are asked to work on sketches, many times often revised, for a considerable length of time for no pay. It is possible for an artist to make several sketches and have them all rejected, and ultimately the decision made to have no art work. In this case, the unused allowance would be returned to the Board of Education, and the artist would be unreimbursed. This, of course, is a highly unfair practice. There should be an agreement between artist and Board of Education, and payments made at various stages of development. Perhaps payments should be authorized at approval of the initial concept, final concept, completion of the art work, and upon final installations. Better still, a system of prepayments would give the artist some money for supplies and equipment, so that he would not be financing the design and fabrication from his own pocket.

LETTERS

Dear Sir:

I note with pleasure from current issues of OCULUS that my old friend Bill Ballard is at last being recognized by being made a Fellow of the Institute. This word to you is only to ask you to correct the impression given by your write-up of him that he attended Columbia and Fontainebleau (true) but did not attend anyplace else (false!).

Bill is a member of the Class of 1927, Princeton, graduated from the Department of Architecture there in '27, then went to Columbia and Fontainebleau, but returned to Princeton to take his graduate degree under Jean Labatut, whom he had met at Fontainebleau in 1932 . . . Under the circumstances, I think you will agree that Princeton should come in for its proper share in the credit of having turned out an architect like Bill Ballard.

RAYMOND A. RUGE, A.I.A.

We are grateful to Mr. Ruge for setting the record straight and for an informative thumbnail sketch of Mr. Ballard's academic pursuits.
The growing cost of hospitalization in New York State is the persistent concern of the Hospital and Health Committee of the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. Our efforts are concentrated in two principal directions:

1. To reduce actual hospital construction costs.

2. To devise hospital facilities that can provide more economical and effective medical care.

It is obvious that a hospital that is housed in an obsolete building cannot provide first-class medical and nursing services—nor can it operate efficiently. Unless old and obsolete hospitals are constantly being replaced or modernized no state can provide its citizens with adequate and economical health services.

As hospital architects, this is the area of our prime responsibility but we are frequently frustrated in our efforts and embarrassed by our inability to provide new and improved facilities when they are needed. We are sometimes asked: "Why did it take two years just to add an X-Ray room to our hospital?" or "Why does it take so many years to build a hospital that by the time it is finished the men who started it are no longer around to use it?" There is no one answer to these questions. After all, a modern hospital is the most complex machine ever conceived by man to house and heal the sick. It cannot be designed and constructed overnight. However, much of the time and expense in building a hospital is spent in attempting to obtain the approval of a multitude of Federal, state, municipal and private agencies and departments, each one of which has rules and regulations; and which requires submission of building plans and other data deemed to be significant for examination, evaluation and review.

As approval by these bodies is mandatory, and as their function is regulatory rather than advisory, the hospital seeking to improve its efficiency or extend its service has no recourse but to submit to the delays and frustrations those applications create. Each such submission involves cost. Every delay results in more expenditures.

These frustrations are compounded by the fact that most of these agencies are understaffed and that the persons they employ are frequently underpaid and sometimes incompetent. The examiner's only defense against departmental rebuke is the strictest interpretation of their code. As the exercise of judgment is dangerous, the examiner tends to "go by the book" even if his decision may run counter to common sense.

When a disapproval is received, there are always means available to appeal the adverse decision but these means are frequently so costly and so time-consuming that the hospital is forced to direct the architect to comply or abandon the project. Should a hospital decide to fight a disapproval, the course to be followed requires judgment, experience and usually a good deal of time and money. Generally, the architect will first seek out the examiner responsible for the disapproval and attempt to convince him to reverse his decision. Failing this, he may go over the examiner's head to his superior. Such administrators frequently do have some limited discretionary powers but they are frequently loath to undermine the authority of the examiners unless the architect's arguments are overwhelming. Failing at this level, the architect may begin to work his way up through the hierarchy of the agency. This may be a simple structure as in most municipal agencies, or more complex. A disapproval of a Hill-Burton application by the state agency for example may be appealed to the regional office and then, if necessary, to the VSPHS in Washington.

Finally, most state and municipal legislation offer some formal ave-
to approve or disapprove without
Requirements differ, not only in kind, but in extent; one agency may
be concerned only with preliminary proposals while another may be
concerned only with final working drawings and specifications; one
agency may require submissions of only a single application while an­
other may require a whole series of applications, plan reviews, and
building inspections extending through the entire building pro­
cess; one agency may publish a comprehensive code of require­
ments, such as the N.Y.C. Health Dept., while another, like the
N.Y.C. Fire Department, may pref­
er to keep its standards to itself,
thereby giving itself the freedom
limitations, or make demands for
alterations even after completion of
the building and the issuance of
a Certificate of Occupancy.

This, then, is the general situa­
tion under which architects in this
State have been operating for
many years and despite these diffi­
culties have succeeded in making
some very real progress. The sit­
uation today, however, has under­
gone a very radical alteration by
the introduction of the Metcalf-Mc­
Closkey legislation which has
been superimposed upon this reg­
ulatory structure and the question
must now be faced as to whether
or not our medical facilities can
continue to develop under this now
unimaginably complex situation.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION OVER HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

FEDERAL AGENCIES

Bureau of the Budget   Department of Justice
Department of Defense   Department of Labor
Department of Air Force U.S. Housing & Home Finance
                      Administration
Department of the Navy —Community Facilities Administration
                      —Office of Education
Veterans Administration —Office of Vocational Rehabilitation
                      —Public Health Service

STATE AGENCIES

N.Y.S. Department of Health
N.Y.S. Hospital Facilities Program
N.Y.S. Division of Hospital Review and Planning
N.Y.S. Bureau of Maternal and Child Care
N.Y.S. Bureau of Tuberculosis Control
N.Y.S. Narcotic Control Section — Executive Division
N.Y.S. Environmental Sanitation
N.Y.S. Department of Mental Hygiene
N.Y.S. Department of Social Welfare
N.Y.S. Department of Public Works
N.Y.S. Department of Labor
N.Y.S. Education Department

MUNICIPAL AGENCIES

(VARIES, DEPENDING ON LOCATION, THE FOLLOWING IS FOR N.Y.C.)

Planning Commission
Building Department
Fire Department — requires separate filings for oxygen, sprinklers, in­
terior fire alarm, exterior fire alarm, refrigeration, standpipe, fire pre­vention, involving a number of bureaus.

Department of Water Supply, Gas and Electricity
Department of Health
—Division of Hospitals and Institutions
—Maternity and Newborn Division
Department of Hospitals
Department of Air Pollution Control
Department of Highways
The Metcalf - McClosky Act

The Metcalf-McClosky Act was put into effect in October of last year with the laudable intent of eliminating the unnecessary duplication of medical care facilities and providing for their better distribution by controlling the construction or extension of any private, voluntary or municipal medical institutions on the basis of public need. By these means, it is clear the State has acquired the power and assumed the responsibility of determining whether or not the hopes and aspirations of any medical institution may or may not be fulfilled. To the State Department of Social Welfare, the State and Regional Hospital Review and Planning Councils and every State agency and department previously concerned with the design of hospitals and nursing homes (see previous list) have been assigned this awesome responsibility.

Into this elaborate administrative machine must, of course, be fed information and it was with considerable shock that hospital architects first obtained their application forms from the Area Office of the State Department of Social Welfare. The forms, some fourteen pages in themselves, require complete data on the institution itself, including the financial reliability of its directors, the competence of the staff, and many other details. In addition, demographic information concerning the population within the hospital's catchment area and the kinds and qualities of existing services now provided within that area are required. This kind of information is often not easily available to the institution and may require extensive research. We are particularly concerned by the requirement of the submission of complete preliminary plans even before approval of the project in principle is given. Not only will such architectural talent be wasted on projects that never proceed but hospitals are loath to spend the time and the money that is really necessary to design these projects properly when the effort is so highly speculative. Unfortunately, once a project is approved, it must proceed without substantial change, no matter how badly its original conception proves to be.

The administrator of the act, Mr. Antonio A. Sereri, at a recent meeting of our Committee, admitted the current inability of his department to evaluate these applications but stressed the point that the only "safe" course he could follow would be strict observance of each and every provision of this Act and expressed the hope that in time the administrative machinery would be strengthened and improved. His assurances did little to modify our view that the Metcalf-McClosky act as it now stands will:

1) Discourage needed modernization.
2) Increase the time necessary to complete a project.
3) Reduce the quality of architectural and engineering design.
4) Increase the cost of hospital expansion and improvements.
5) Reduce the efficiency of hospital operations.
6) Postpone advances in medical service.
7) Discourage long range institutional planning.

A solution to this problem is urgently needed, bureaucratic obstruction must be ended. In its place be provided the kind of guidance that is needed in the development of the health service of this State.

---

Non-Governmental Agencies

Hospital Review and Planning Council (Required)
Joint Commission for the Accreditation of Hospitals
National Board of Fire Underwriters
The Insurance Carrier

George D. Brown, member of the New York Chapter and partner in the firm of Brown Guenther-Battaglia Galvin, was sworn in by Mayor Wagner along with Dr. Loyd H. Bailer as new members of the Board of Higher Education. The 21-member Board is also the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York. Its members are appointed by the mayor for nine year terms and serve without pay.

Long active in the profession, George Brown is a former member of the N.Y. Chapter's Executive committee and Vice Chairman of its Fees and Contracts committee. He is also a former member of the Board of Directors, and Chairman of the Fees and Contracts committee of the NYSAA. He is on the Board of Directors of the Citizens Housing and is serving on the Cardinal's Committee of the Citizens Housing and is serving on the Cardinal's Committee of the Laity for Catholic Charities.

His prior activities in public service include four years as executive secretary, NYS Division of Housing, and consultant to the NYC Housing Authority, the City Planning Commission, HRB, and the Civil Service Commission.

George Brown's architectural practice is as diversified as his service to the profession. It includes housing and educational projects as well as medical facilities.

He is a graduate of Columbia College and of the Columbia School of Architecture.
A.I.A. membership pins are now available to all members. The new pin, which officially replaces the maroon octagon-shaped pin, features the A.I.A. eagle and column symbol atop a maroon enameled bar with the letters A.I.A. in gold. Pins may be ordered directly from the Institute for $3.00 each.

**WELCOME NEW MEMBERS**

The New York Chapter extends its warmest welcome to the following new members:

**Corporate**
- John D. Evans
- Minor L. Bishop
- Burton Wm. Berger
- Wei Foo Chun
- David E. Glasser
- William A. Godsall
- David Schwert
- August F. Ventura

**Professional Associate**
- Roger S. Blaho
- C. Richard Hatch
- Orest Prypkhan
- Stephen D. Jakobs
- Joe Y. Fuchida
- Roy H. Thomson
- Howard F. Itzkowitz

**Associate**
- Roger S. Blaho
- C. Richard Hatch
- Orest Prypkhan
- Stephen D. Jakobs

**CANDIDATES**

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

**Corporate**
- Paul Sheldon Cooper
- Bruno R. Marcus
- Laurie Mutchnik
- Stanalor Maurer
- Rolf H. Oldhassena
- Charles A. Platt
- Mildred Popkin
- William Charles Shapsin
- David Iacore Smotrich
- Theodore Wiel
- Frank W. Munzen
- Peter Gale Moore
- Irving Telch

**Professional Associate**
- George J. Rehl
- Charles Theodore Egil III
- Sponsors: John J. Andreas & Gordon J. Wise
- Sponsors: C. Gates Beckwith & Leon S. Barton, Jr.

**Associate**
- George M. Gabor
- Theodore Maggos
- August Mario Petrone
- Peggy Cotton Winslow
- Sponsors: Ralston W. Newsam & Herbert Beckhard
- Sponsors: William Bailey Smith & David N. Leslie
- Sponsors: Joseph Pietrakiewicz & Ronald E. Woodward
- Sponsors: Lionel R. Coste & Richard Roth, Jr.

**COMING EVENTS**

- **September, 1965**
  - Chairman Luncheon: Pine Room
  - NYSSA Pre-Convention Luncheon: Dining Room
- **October, 1965**
  - Regional Council Conference: Concord Hotel
  - NYSSA Convention: Kiamesha Lake, New York
- **November, 1965**
  - Chapter Fall Opening Meeting: Dining Room
  - Nominating Committee Luncheon: Dining Room
- **January, 1966**
  - Membership Cocktail Party: Dining Room
  - Nominating Committee Luncheon: Dining Room
- **February, 1966**
  - Anniversary Dinner: Thrus. Feb. 17 (Lent starts Feb. 23 and ends Apr. 17)
- **May, 1966**
  - A.I.A. Pre-Convention Luncheon: Dining Room
  - Membership Cocktail Party: Dining Room
- **June, 1966**
  - Annual Luncheon: Denver, Colo.
  - A.I.A. Convention: Dining Room

**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 catalo1.

**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.

**-safe space saving self instructive playscapes**

**PLAYGROUND CORP. OF AMERICA**

Exclusive Agents New York City
division of lighting associates, inc.
351 east 61st street, new york 21/pl 1-0575
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.