Site Plan, Bryant Park and the New York Public Library. Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates and Hanna/Olin Ltd.
In mid-December 1987, the New York City Art Commission unanimously gave preliminary approval to a revised proposal to build two restaurant pavilions and otherwise improve Bryant Park behind the New York Public Library. Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates are architects of the project. Hanna/Olin Ltd. are the landscape architects.

The Art Commission’s preliminary approval gives the legal go-ahead to the four-year saga of the rejuvenation project, since approval from the Art Commission is what is required for any building in a city-owned property. Final approval awaits only the presentation of revised documentation.

Even though Bryant Park as well as the New York Public Library are landmarks, the Landmarks Commission serves only in an advisory capacity on municipal building projects. Its approval, therefore, is not legally required. (The Commission’s report was not complete as this issue went to press.) Only the standard Building Department approval is required in addition to the Art Commission’s.


The client for the project is the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation, a nonprofit development corporation, whose executive director is Daniel A. Biederman. The corporation is administering the project and will operate the park under the supervision of the city’s Parks and Recreation Department.

At issue has not been the consensus that the five-acre park has become a notorious and none-too-stealthy open-air drug supermarket and a magnet for dealers and derelicts. That is the impetus for the rejuvenation project. Instead, controversy has waxed over:

1. the preservation of open space in the city,
2. the impairment of the landmark qualities of the park and the Library,
3. the ethics of private profit being made on public land—even if the profits go to improve that public land,
4. contingent real estate profiteering,
5. the building of another visible demarcation between the poor and the more affluent,
6. the subsequent danger of unsuccessful restaurant buildings remaining empty, and
7. the aesthetic impact of partially obscuring the west/rear elevation of the Library.

The architects’ and landscape architects’ plans are presented on these pages, followed by statements from concerned organizations.
Background and Description
This revitalization plan for Bryant Park, substantially revised from a 1985 proposal, is designed to increase public access to the Park and, simultaneously, to preserve its best features. Restoration of the five-acre Park reinforces the basic elements of its design: raised terraces paved with bluestone and planted with bosks of trees surrounding a great lawn. Adjustments to the composition include creating greater access (increasing the number of entrances from six to ten), providing ramps, which give handicapped access to all areas of the Park, and offering six new informal seating areas.

New Buildings
Two new food pavilions and four kiosks are proposed. These new buildings, designed as part of the overall restoration of the Park, provide amenities and attractions for the large numbers of people who frequent this midtown oasis. They are conceived in the decorative tradition of Parisian parks, a tradition to which Bryant Park belongs. All six buildings, like their cousins in Paris, provide shelter and amenities. Elegant, small-scale structures nestled in the trees, they create intimate pedestrian areas within the larger Park.

New Kiosks
Four new kiosks are located in the Park, one off 42nd Street, one off 40th Street and two more off the Sixth Avenue entrance. Light and airy, these small buildings bring new attractions to an important midtown preserve and help insure its active and safe year-round use.

Two Restaurant Pavilions
The overall design character of the restaurant pavilions is based upon layers of enclosure, which integrate these buildings with the Park. The two 5,250 sq. ft. structures flank the monument to William Cullen Bryant on the west terrace of the Library. Each has an inner layer of glass and steel surrounded by an outer layer of wood trelliswork. They are 18-feet high and seat approximately 175 people each. Identical on the outside, each restaurant has a different character on the inside. Each serves different types of foods. Operable French doors and windows on both structures are adjustable to create open-air dining in warm weather or enclosed dining in cooler months. Ground-level planting and the weathered wood of the trellis both soften and enliven the pavilions, integrating them with the surrounding landscape. The trellis is composed of patterned columns, set on cast stone bases, which support a paneled frieze of lattice. This entire rustic structure serves as support for wisteria vines.

West Wall of the Library
The two restaurant pavilions are designed to obscure as little of the west wall of the Library as possible. A repeating pattern of horizontals and verticals found on the Library’s great marble wall is echoed in the lines of the restaurants. The Library's two corner pavilions are clearly visible, and the vertical slots of the book stack windows can be fully seen. At the center of the composition the removal of a few trees permits the full height of the Library’s west wall to be viewed as a background for the Bryant Monument. Only a portion of the windowless, rusticated base of the Library is therefore obscured.

Outdoor Seating and Service
Outdoor seating is located overlooking the street beside both restaurant pavilions. Public seating in the park is increased, with new seating added across from the restaurants and near the kiosks. Food service in the pavilions is provided by a single, or as many as four independent operators. Each leases space from the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation. Service to the pavilions is through an existing service dock on 40th Street in an area currently used as storage for the Library. Deliveries are brought to the site by hand carts through an 8-foot corridor between the rear of the Library and the restaurant buildings.
Bryant Park Restoration

Art Commission of the City of New York
A resolution adopted by the Art Commission on December 14, 1987:
RESOLVED, That the Art Commission, having considered designs for the construction of two restaurant pavilions, four kiosks, and related site improvements, including the restoration of the William Cullen Bryant Memorial, Bryant Park, Manhattan, submitted by the Department of Parks and Recreation, represented by exhibits 1843-BH and BI, of record in this matter, hereby gives to the same unanimous preliminary approval. Preliminary approval is with the understanding that the Art Commission will review the restoration proposal for the Bryant Memorial.

The Art Commission commended the architect for responding so fully to the Commission's comments and concerns and urged the City of New York to retain more architecture firms like Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, who were so responsive to design issues.

Patricia E. Harris
Executive Director

The New York Public Library
Testimony to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, September 22, 1987:
This is not the first time that I have come before you to speak about the need to revitalize Bryant Park. As the Park's nearest neighbor, the Library has an obvious and vital interest in seeing that Bryant Park is reclaimed for the public. It deserves to be known as one of the crowning jewels of 42nd Street, not as part of the blight that plagues midtown.

Since the City, the Parks Department, the Library, and the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation (BPRC) signed a pact to reclaim Bryant Park five years ago, we have worked with the Parks Council and many other organizations and civic groups to introduce new activities into the Park. They have unquestionably improved conditions by making it a safer, more lively place. But we have known all along that these activities could never be a permanent-enough presence to displace the undesirable uses that dominate the park after hours and off-season. We therefore feel that the plans for the Park's physical and economic revitalization, which include the proposed restaurant, offer the best hope to reclaim this space fully for the public.

We at the Library are very pleased with this new design by architect Hugh Hardy. We feel that it is very respectful to the rear facade of our building and quite sensitive in its use of light and the materials of steel, wood, and glass. In other words, the integrity of the Library's magnificent edifice is not compromised. The plans also address the safety and security issues that have previously been raised by keeping the restaurant's facilities separate from the Library's own activities.

I would also like to take the opportunity to remind you that while much attention has justifiably been focused on the restaurant, it is just cont'd. on p. 13

The Parks Council
A statement to the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, September 22, 1987:
"By Jove—she's got it!" sings Professor Higgins about Eliza Doolittle in My Fair Lady when she finally masters The King's English. That sums up nicely the Parks Council's reaction to the restaurant and kiosk design proposals submitted by the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation and the architectural firm of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates.

The Parks Council's previously stated primary concerns with regard to these architectural structures have always been related to issues of scale and security.

The two proposed single-story restaurants each with a 5,200 sq. ft. footprint, and seating capacity for 175 people, sited symmetrically at each side of the Bryant statue are a successful response to our concerns. This represents a significant reduction in size from Warner Leroy's first proposal for a restaurant with 41,000 sq. ft. and a seating capacity for 1000 people.

The greatly reduced square footage, siting, architectural design, and choice of exterior finish materials of the restaurants reflect great sympathy and understanding of the traditional values and scale of park buildings, without compromising the west facade of the Public Library. The buildings are now objects in the Park seen against the Library, rather than the awkward, multi-story addition competing with the Library, which was presented by previous designs. The restaurant's indented corners at either side of the Bryant statue provide a responsive setting and an acceptable replacement for the existing ballustrade.

Park security will be improved and bolstered by the location of the restaurant entrance off the north/ south mall, in accordance with our cont'd. on p. 13
The Municipal Art Society

Testimony before the Landmarks Preservation Commission, September 22, 1987:

The Municipal Art Society would like to offer its resounding approval for the proposed kiosks and restaurant pavilions in Bryant Park.

In design and scale the proposed pavilions are successful in relationship to their surroundings. The present scheme carefully takes into account the importance of the Library's rear facade and is sympathetic to it. Thanks to the openness that surrounds the free-standing pavilions and to their low-scale, vertical design, they respect and complement the rear facade of the Library. The pavilions do not appear as extensions of the Library, but leave the original design by Carrere and Hastings free and visually apparent.

The exquisitely designed pavilions and kiosks relate directly to Bryant Park and are appropriate to their park setting. Delicate in design, they have an open, airy quality to them that will augment their natural setting and serve as a continuation of it.

The pavilions especially will make what is now an unfriendly, rather foreboding area of the Park vibrant and welcoming.

The Fine Arts Federation of New York

A letter to the Landmarks Preservation Commission, October 21, 1987:

The Fine Arts Federation of New York approves and supports the new design for Bryant Park. We have monitored and responded to the proposals to redesign and privately manage this park for over three years. Virtually all our concerns have been addressed in both the earlier submission for construction of the park itself and the current one for the proposed restaurant and kiosks.

The three-year delay has resulted in a greatly improved proposal. However there are some suggestions that our Board feels should be explored: 1) Instead of replicating the stone used in the park buildings and railings, why not use natural stone rather than cast stone, and 2) The arbitrary introduction of the colored band around the roof of the restaurants to relate to the kiosks is open to question.

Our initial concern with the proposed restaurant was its vast size and lack of setback from the two side streets. This has been improved by reducing its height to one story, placing significant setbacks from the 42nd and 40th Streets, and the reduction of the indoor seats from 1000 to 350. However, the number of outdoor seats for the restaurant and the four kiosks is still over 1000. The park will become (and already is, in the summer) a major lunchtime attraction. Hopefully the impact on the park fabric will be offset by the increased maintenance promised by the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation.

This project has come a long way. A great deal of sensitivity has been displayed as the design evolved. We applaud the improvements in access to and across the park, along both sides, 6th Avenue, and at the northwest corner. Other changes for betterment of design were very much in keeping with what we envisioned.

Friends of the Upper East Side Historic District

A letter to Oculus, January 2, 1988

Now that the two pavilions for a restaurant plus some gourmet kiosks for Bryant Park have been approved by the Art Commission, if not by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, I have a few comments to make.

Whereas I have no great objections to the pleasant enough pavilions themselves, and I rather like the idea of attractive kiosks where attractive food can be bought, and whereas I will not belabor the point that I still like looking at the rear of the Public Library and see the stacks, for I find beauty in the knowledge that this is where knowledge is... my real concerns are purely of practical nature.

Restaurants are a fragile business venture, and go out of business alas at the drop of a hat, and I believe that this restaurant or restaurants will only be a fair-weather and a seasonal success. For while from May to October some people think that food tastes better if they can look at trees and flowers while they eat, and while at lunchtime, especially in the beginning, tables will be hard to get, come November, and then come the dead of winter, the place will be dead and possibly out of business. So there may be a couple of empty pavilions looking for new tenants in Bryant Park.

Furthermore I do not for a minute believe that a restaurant or two, will be a cure-all which will "clean-up" Bryant Park. To expect that is to be somewhat naive. The people who hang out there looking for customers for whatever it is that they are selling, will find even more, and better customers to prey upon among the restaurant's patrons. If any cleaning occurs, it will be in way of increased garbage details to collect food and trash generated by the new and assorted establishments.
Progress on Prominent Projects

Guggenheim addition
On December 17, the Board of Estimate voted to review recently granted zoning variances that would allow the museum to construct the revised Guggenheim Museum addition by Gwathmey Siegel & Associates, creating yet another delay in its construction. The 8-member Board of Estimate was scheduled to vote on January 14 (as this issue goes to press) on whether there was substantial evidence for the recent Board of Standards and Appeals decision to grant the zoning variances necessary for the construction of the addition.

Cityspire tower
On December 21, the City Planning Commission refused to grant retroactive approval for approximately 11 feet of the Cityspire tower that were not originally permitted by the planning body and the Board of Estimate in 1985. The nearly completed office and residential tower designed by Murphy Jahn Architects on West 56 Street next to the City Center is 813.53 feet. It was to have been 802.65 feet from the curb level to the top of the dome. Ian Bruce Eichner, the building's developer, plans to appeal the decision in State Supreme Court. Realistically, will the building have to cut off the top 11 feet?

Coliseum site
The Columbus Circle tower is not dead. David Childs of SOM has been named by Boston Properties, the site's development firm, to redesign the tower in a smaller version, and on New Year's Eve Mortimer B. Zuckerman of Boston Properties signed with the City a new agreement to proceed. He will pay the City less for the site and build a structure with 52 acres of floor space rather than 63. Zuckerman also agreed to pay the City a large guarantee even if the project was eventually blocked by a municipal board or agency.

Proposed CPW District
No action was taken at the January 12th public designation hearing conducted by the Landmarks Preservation Commission (see Oculus, Jan. pg. 2). The public, however, could still submit written information on the proposed Central Park West District to the Commission for 30 days after the January 12th hearing.

Times Square redevelopment
In the attempt to block a hearing on the assignment of leases in the $2.5 billion Times Square development project, a community group led by State Senator Franz S. Leichter and City Councilwomen Ruth W. Messinger and Carol Greitzer, was rejected by a State Supreme Court Justice in Manhattan (see Oculus January, page 6). The group contended in court papers that the UDC announced the hearing on short notice and refused to let them see the leases or to release information needed to make public comment meaningful.

Television City development
The removal of 60,000 cubic yards of soil and rubble from Donald J. Trump's Television City development site has stirred up environmental and archaeological concern among city officials and neighborhood opponents of the project. The remains of an Indian fishing camp, and a 19th­century forge have attracted the attention of archaeologists, whereas environmentalists are concerned that the soil might be contaminated since the area was in industrial use for many years.

Names and News

Philip Johnson is guest-curating an exhibition, “Constructivist Architecture,” which will open at the Museum of Modern Art in June . . . Habitat for Humanity, a Georgia-based nonprofit group that provides housing for the needy, has been named the 1988 recipient of the American Institute of Architects' Whitney M. Young Jr. Citation. NYC/AIA nominated the group for the award . . . Important pieces of Frank Lloyd Wright furnishings were sold at a December auction at Christie's. They brought $1,560,515 . . . Andrew Pierce MacNair has opened an architecture office at 35 East 21 Street . . . The New-York Historical Society and Yale University Press plan to publish The Encyclopedia of New York City in 1991. Entries "will discuss social, ethic, political, maritime, commercial, religious, and cultural history" from settlement by the Indians to the present day. Kenneth T. Jackson, Mellon Professor at Columbia University, will serve as the Encyclopedia's editor in chief . . . M. Paul Friedberg has recently been appointed to the Board of Directors of the Landscape Architecture Foundation . . . The Department of City Planning has released its report, New Housing in New York City 1986, which provides new housing data for the city, the boroughs, and the city's community districts . . . Les Maisons Jaoul, the two adjoining houses designed by Le Corbusier at Neuilly-sur-Seine, Paris, and completed in 1956, are being offered for sale by Sotheby's International Realty and Hampton and Sons, Paris. The Jaoul Houses, whose shallow concrete tunnel vaults soon became an international motif, are still inhabited by surviving members of the Jaoul family.

Tour
The Boston Society of Architects; the Washington, DC. Chapter of Architects, Designers and Planners for Social Responsibility; and International Design Seminars have announced a 15-day tour of the Soviet Union and Finland, April 8-23. Meetings between professionals involved in the fields of architecture,
landscape architecture, design, and planning are scheduled with local chapters of the Union of Soviet Architects in Moscow, Tbilisi, and Leningrad. For more information and registration: Lisa Saunier, Boston Society of Architects, 305 Newbury Street, Boston 02115 (617-267-5175).

1988-89 Fellowships
The Temple Hoyne Buell Center for the Study of American Architecture has announced two new fellowships for the study of American architecture beginning September 1988. These awards will be made to a senior fellow and a junior fellow who wish to pursue a research project at Columbia University, and participate in activities at the Center as well as at Columbia's Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation. February 15th is the deadline for postmarking applications. For more information and application forms: the Temple Hoyne Buell Center for the Study of American Architecture, 305 Buell Hall, Columbia University, NYC 10027. 280-8262.

Applications for the 1988-89 Cintas Fellowship in architecture must be postmarked by March 1, 1988. With a stipend of $10,000 for a 12-month period, the recipient is free to pursue his or her arts activities either in the U.S. or countries approved by the Foundation. Individuals wishing to pursue academic programs are not eligible. Applications may be obtained from: Associate Program Officer, Arts International Program, Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, NYC 10017.

NYSCA Grants
The Architecture, Planning, and Design Program of the New York State Council on the Arts has announced the second year of its "Sponsored Projects" grants with a March 1 deadline for applications. Grants of up to $10,000 will be available for architects, designers, and scholars to realize specific innovative projects that advance the field and contribute to the public's understanding of the designed environment. For more information: 614-2962.

Letters
Dear Editor:
An item in the October 1987 Oculus Names and News (page 11) marks, to a historian, a new low. "Thomas Hall Beeby, Dean of the Yale School of Architecture, is supervising the 'redevelopment' of 745 Fifth Avenue ... the building will be renovated as it might have been built had the Depression not interfered." This statement also appeared in the "paper of record" but it should not go unrefuted in a specialist journal like Oculus.

Ely Jacques Kahn's elevation drawings for 745 Fifth Avenue are dated July 2, 1929, and show the facade exactly as it was completed—well after the October crash. (The writer was retained by the owner in 1986 to locate the original architectural drawings of the building.) If Mr. Architect wants to glitz up a perfectly harmless 1929 commercial building, then fine—a waste of money, but de gustibus.

Have things really gotten so bad that living architects need to duck behind patently false alibis that run down the work of their deceased colleagues? Every generation needs to make way for the next one, but this is a kind of architectural euthanasia.

And what does this fabrication, in the press for months without correction or retraction, say about the depth of the architect's investigation of the existing structure?

Christopher Gray
Office for Metropolitan History

Dear Editor:
Congratulations on keeping Oculus fresh and lively at all times, I find that it always manages to keep me well informed about the various goings on, and I appreciate this very much.

I like the coverage of the Upper West Side Historic District in the current issue, the photos are great as is the to-the-point text taken from the Landmarks Preservation Commission's statement. Whereas the SPONY objections, I admit, leave me cold. We had the same kind of opposition here to the Upper East Side Historic District when it was proposed and heard at various forums, but when you come down to it, if you have to repair a roof, you have to do it whether the building is a landmark or not, same is true of repairing windows etc. More expensive, perhaps it is yes, but then the increase in value of the property itself-cum-landmark-atop-of-it more than compensates for the occasional extra cost. And what of civic pride? that too is a thing of value. It was to me. I love having a landmark and living in it, and feeling that because of this I too am part of the City's history.

Halina Rosenthal
Friends of the Upper East Side Historic District
Send Oculus Calendar information to:
New York Chapter/AIA, 457 Madison Avenue, N.Y. 10022

Oculus welcomes information for the calendar pertaining to public events about architecture and the other design professions. It is due in writing by the 1st of the month for the following issue. Because of the time lag between information received and printed, final details of events are likely to change. It is recommended that events be checked with sponsoring institutions before attending.

**MONDAY 1**

**SEMINAR**
The building of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. Dean James Parks Morton will speak on the history of the cathedral as the first in a series of 8-Monday events moderated by John Barton, Architect-in-Residence. 7-9 pm. Cathedral House conference room. Donation will be requested. 749-0100.

**TUESDAY 2**


**WEDNESDAY 3**


**THURSDAY 4**

OPEN MEETING, FEB. 4-6
Sponsored by the AIA Committee on Historic Resources and featuring a workshop on masonry restoration. Washington, D.C. Contact: Bruce Krimsky, 202-626-7452.

DESIGN AESTHETICS
THEORY AND PRACTICE

**FRIDAY 5**

WORKSHOP
One-day workshop sponsored by the National Trust on "How do you design infill housing compatible with historic neighborhoods?" Philadelphia. For more information: Katherine Adams 202-673-4162.

**MONDAY 8**

**SEMINAR**

**TUESDAY 9**

1932: The exhibition, "International Style" opened at the Museum of Modern Art.

**WEDNESDAY 10**

1840: British architect Sir Jeffrey Wyattville died (1766-1840).

**THURSDAY 11**

DESIGN AESTHETICS
THEORY AND PRACTICE

**FRIDAY 12**

CONFERENCE, FEB. 13-14
"Theory and Practice: Bridging the Gap," 2-day conference presented by the Association for Preservation Technology will address the preservation of paint, sandstone and limestone, and architectural terra cotta. Co-sponsored and hosted by Columbia University. 744-6787.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY 24</td>
<td>EXHIBITION &quot;Firing the Imagination: Artists &amp; Architects Use Clay&quot; organized by the Friends of Terra Cotta. The Urban Center. 226-6265.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEDNESDAY 26</td>
<td>EXHIBITION &quot;The Biographical Background: What We Have to Know. Client's Requirements &amp; Budget. Designer's Background, Dates, Schooling, Idiom, Procedure.&quot; Fifth in 15-Thursday series in which C. Ray Smith explores the aesthetics of design in theory and practice in architecture, interior design, and products for interior use. 8 pm. Cooper-Hewitt Museum, 860-6868.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Around the Chapter

by Lenore M. Lucey

GRASSROOTS is the Institute's annual leadership conference for component Presidents, Presidents-Elect, and Executives. It is held each January in Washington, and provides a series of panels, round-tables, workshops, and discussion groups for these Chapter representatives. Most seminars are geared to component size, with similar sized and staffed components grouped together in order to share similar problems and solutions. NYC/AIA is a member of the "Seven Sisters," the seven largest components of the Institute, of which we are the largest. It is a hectic four-day mini-convention, and provides a solid grounding for your Chapter's elected leadership and staff.

It is also the point at which the Host Chapter for the upcoming Convention gets to make its sales pitch. And sending home this gathering full of enthusiasm for "your" convention is most important. Previous year's offerings have ranged from skits to classic iambic pentameter rhyming poetry; we were determined to be different. Taking our cue from the New York Chapter's personal invitation concept, we invited fifty members of the Chapter to join us for the presentation. Each Chapter member "hosted," and extended a personal invitation to, those with whom they shared a table at the presentation lunch. We stressed that each NYC/AIA member extends a personal invitation to each of their members to join us in May in New York. We answered questions, exchanged business cards, and made a few new friends for the Chapter. Enthusiasm for this convention is running high, and it was an exhilarating day for all the NYC/AIA members who could attend.

Following the lunch, Ted Pappas, 1988 Institute President, and Mel Brecher, 1988 Convention Chair spoke briefly before introducing New York Chapter President Gene Kohn. At the conclusion of his brief remarks, Gene introduced John Winkler, Host Chapter Convention Chair. John's remarks reiterated the personal invitation theme, and in reinforcement of that idea, he then named the New York Chapter representatives who had joined us. It was a stunning display of the commitment, concern, and excitement that the New York Chapter continues to evince for this Convention.

Convention Invitation

On other fronts, we are still looking for your participation on committees, panels, tour, and all the other myriad of details that the Convention brings. There is still time to get involved, and find out from the inside just how exciting this Convention will be. If you are not a Convention goer, this is the year to put aside your cynicism and put it on your calendar. You almost do not even have to leave your office to attend! You have already paid almost half the registration fee in your assessment, and paying the balance with your registration form will get you complete access to "Art in Architecture" at a heavily discounted rate. This is not the year to miss a thing: panels, plenary sessions, tutorials, tours, parties, reunions, student and design awards exhibits, and even the exhibit floor. The registration package should be on your desk this month. Do not put it aside, fill it out immediately and send it in.

New Committees

Some interest has been expressed in forming new committees: Architects in Education, Architects in Development, Architects in Graphic Arts, Architects for Religion, and Asbestos in Architecture. Education would focus on the state of architectural education, building on the five schools Dean's Committee formed for the Convention. Development would be a discussion/focus group for those of you who work for owners, builders, and developers, or who are personally involved in development. Graphic Arts would become a discussion group for those who have specialized in the graphics area. Asbestos would tackle the thorny issues raised for architects encountering this toxic material. If you are even remotely interested, call me or send a note to the Chapter. If enough interest is expressed we will establish a discussion group.

A reminder too that it is (almost) never too late to request appointment to an existing Committee. If you have lost your descriptive sheet, call the Chapter and ask Judy Rowe to send you another. If you have a particular area of expertise or interest, just mention that and we will try to find you the right Committee.

Twenty Largest Firms

Early returns from NYC/AIA sustaining member firms show that the 20 largest firms (based on reported numbers of technical employees) are:

- Skidmore Owings & Merrill: 208
- I.M. Pei & Partners: 124
- Kohn Pedersen Fox: 112
- Gensler & Associates: 97
- Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Assoc: 70
- James S. Polshek & Partners: 56
- Haines Lundberg Waechler: 53
- Ferrenz Taylor & Clark Assoc: 52
- Gwathmey Siegel: 51
- Emery Roth & Sons: 50
- John Burgee Architects: 50
- Warner Burns Toan Lunde: 40
- Edward Larrabee Barnes: 38
- Perkins Geddes Eastman: 37
- Philip Birnbaum & Assoc: 35
- Perkins Eastman & Fawkes: 33
- Brennan Beer Gorman Arch: 27
- Wank Adams Slavin Assoc: 27
- Conchon & Sput Architects: 25
- Butler Rogers Basket: 24
- Abramovitz Kingsland Schiss: 23
- Voorsanger & Mills: 23
- Schunckwitz & Partners: 23

Coming Chapter Events

- Tuesday, February 16, 6:00 pm. The Urban Center. The Computer Applications Committee is sponsoring "New Video Presentations of Architectural Applications by Barry Miliken of SOM, the first of three seminars. The second one, "Importance of High Technology Design Tools on Architectural Visualization," will feature Hans Christian Lischke on March 22; and the final one, "Recent Work With Computers," with Sam Anson Haffey on April 19.

- Tuesday, February 23, 5:30 pm. The Urban Center. The Professional Practice Committee is sponsoring "Architects Communicating With Clients: Opportunity or Dilemma?" the first of three seminars. The second one, "Licensing of Interior Designers: The Architect's Perspective," will be on March 29; and the final one, "New Markets: Opportunities or Headaches?" on April 26.
On Licensing

by Lenore M. Lucey

Recently a member of the Chapter approached me with a serious concern. The fear that fellow members would look down on this architect professional, who had taken a position with an interiors firm, was based on the question: "Why do architects oppose the licensing of interior designers?" It made me realize that perhaps many other members also misunderstand the Chapter's position on the interior designer's proposed legislation for licensing "certified interior designers."

The Chapter is not opposed to licensing interior designers to the same minimum State standards that architects are held to. What we oppose is the current bill, which would allow interior designers to practice architecture without meeting these mandated minimum requirements. This is a vital safety concern that should be paramount to any discussion of licensing. The designers' proposed legislation would license them, providing a stamp and seal, which they would be permitted to use to file drawings with building departments around the State. This would permit them to file the same drawings you do now: demolition, new construction, electrical, plumbing, mechanical, structural, and fire protection, for any "interior" work.

Our argument is that they have not proved to the State that they have the education, training, and testing to properly evaluate the drawings they are submitting, even those that would require the stamp of another licensed professional. Architects not only have to study and master the rudiments of each of those other disciplines, but are required to prove proficiency to the State before they are entrusted with the safety of any building's inhabitants.

We have repeatedly stressed the fact that interior designers, with accredited schooling and the work experience for a licensed professional, can apply for the current licensing examination. This would allow them to demonstrate their competence to the State and would provide them with a stamp and seal. Many interior design-trained persons have already done so. Interior designers will counter this argument with the statement, "We do not want to practice architecture, we only want to practice interior design, and do not need to meet the same standards you do."

Those who counter with this argument are not opening their eyes to the reality of the situation. The supporting statements for their licensing bill give proof that the "we only want to practice interiors" claim is patently untrue. In their material they claim that the (illegal) purchasing of an architects stamp and seal is one of the reasons they should be licensed: that if they have to buy a stamp, they should have one of their own. Not only a specious argument, using the fact of breaking the law as an excuse to change the law (I need the money so they should make bank robbery legal) but an admission of the fact that what they are doing is architecture.

If you need a stamp and seal to file drawings you are rendering architectural services. If you are rendering architectural services and are not licensed to do so then you are breaking the law. And if you want to stamp and seal the documents that are required to protect the public health, welfare, and safety, then you have to meet the State's minimum standards.

The designers claim that this is a turf battle, and it is—for them. They want to practice architecture without meeting the same standard you had, or are having, to meet. If that does not make you angry, it should. Their pitch to the design community is that you must support licensing or the whole interior design profession will be wiped out. That is not true, but if you do not oppose the licensing—of interior designers to lesser standards—the profession of architecture will be wiped out. Who will meet the standards and sit for a grueling four-day architecture licensing examination when they can become a "certified interior designer" for a lot less education (two to four years), training (education plus work for a designer totaling six years), and a thirteen-hour examination.

The 1988 legislative session has started, and the designers are mounting a strong campaign, with a lot of money, and key supporters. We have only our letter-writing power and a modest NYSA/PAC. You must write or, even more importantly, speak to your own legislator as well as to other key legislators. Building Department officials from around the State are writing in opposition to this law, and you must too. In addition, mark your calendar now for Lobby Day, March 29, 1988. Your presence in Albany really counts.

Check your new NYC/AIA Legislative Alert package for the key points, the right person, and send a letter today while you are thinking about it. And do think about it, the health, welfare, and safety of the public, as well as the continuation of your profession are at stake. The largest contribution to NYSA/PAC that you can make will help. Make checks payable to NYSA/PAC and send to NYSA/PAC at 235 Lark Street, Albany, New York.

Mark Your Calendar Now!!!

Lobby Day
Tuesday, March 29, 1988

Join us for a concerted effort this year on the Statute of Limitations bill and our continued opposition to the creation of another licensing law for interior designers. Your presence in Albany does make an impression on the Legislators!

The Chapter will arrange for a bus leaving in the morning and returning early evening. Lobby Day provides the opportunity to meet with, and gain strength from, our fellow practitioners from around the State in forwarding our professional concerns to our elected officials.

Call Judy Rowe at the Chapter to reserve your seat now.
The New York Public Library
cont'd. from p. 4
one of many components in the overall effort to rescue this most visible and important block for the people of the City of New York.
Vartan Gregorian
President

prior recommendations. The four freestanding kiosks have also been scaled down from the original plan, which proposed two kiosks measuring 16 ft. by 66 ft. and two measuring 16 ft. by 20 ft. The present proposal calling for four kiosks, each measuring 14 ft. by 14 ft. is a welcome improvement. The structures themselves are graceful and in keeping with the park landscape.

The Parks Council
cont'd. from p. 4

within the restaurant buildings or the library, to compact, refrigerate, and store garbage. In addition, the garbage pick-up must be made directly from the storage facility. At no time should any garbage be left in the 8-foot walkway separating the restaurant from the library, or in the service area at the 41st Street side of the Library.

Other than this potential problem, which needs to be monitored and resolved as the plans move forward, the Parks Council is delighted with the proposal and fully supports it.

The Municipal Art Society
cont'd. from p. 5

creativity that has brought us this thoughtful proposal.

Congratulations are in order for this inventive proposal, which is responsive to the needs of Bryant Park—a special urban oasis in our city. We look forward to the day when the pavilions and kiosks will grace Bryant Park and add to its lively spirit.

The Fine Arts Federation of New York
cont'd. from p. 5

In sum, despite small differences that still might require resolving, which we've indicated above, we urge your approval of this greatly improved proposal.

Bert Deiner
President

Please notice that I have not said anything about my natural reluctance to accept the privatization of public parks . . .

Halina Rosenthal

Friends of the Upper East Side Historic District
cont'd. from p. 5

Please notice that I have not said anything about my natural reluctance to accept the privatization of public parks . . .

Halina Rosenthal
Bryant Park Restoration

View west through a bosk along 40th Street.

The William Cullen Bryant memorial.

cont'd. from pg. 3

The Bryant Monument
Implementation of this plan proposes removal of 5 small sycamore trees and 12½ feet of balustrade on either side of the Bryant Monument. (The urns and their bases are left intact). A new paved plaza area is provided to the monument’s rear. This adjustment enhances pedestrian circulation to the rear wall of the Library, permits more direct access around the monument, and better relates this sculpture to the new restaurant pavilions.

Night Lighting
Night lighting for the Park is found in three distinct areas: the landscape, the Library facade, and the restaurant buildings. In summer the three bosks are indirectly lit from below. In all seasons lamp standards, copied from those in place on the west terrace, provide pedestrian illumination. Significant architectural details (such as the balustrade surrounding the green, the Lowell Fountains, and the Bryant Monument) are softly accentuated with light. The west facade of the Library is also gently washed with light to enhance its sculptural mass and distinguish its basic composition. The restaurant and kiosks are lit from within so that their layered qualities are maintained and they appear inviting and active when seen from the street.

Signage and Graphics
Following lease agreements, signage and graphics will be developed in concert with restaurant operators and regulatory agencies. It is our intention to keep them to a minimum.
Credits

Client: Bryant Park Restoration Corporation

Architect: Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates. Hugh Hardy, FAIA, Partner in Charge

Landscape Architects: Hanna/Olin Ltd. Principal-in-Charge, Laurie D. Olin; Associate-in-Charge, Christopher N. Allen; Staff: Beth Meyer, David Dougherty, Barry Kew, Barbara Merkel, Shaen Eyring, Craig McGlynn, Edgar David


Park Area: 5 acres
Completion/Cost: 1989/$5 million

Restaurants
Square footage: 5250 sq. ft. footprint, each. 10500 sq. ft. total, each (including basement).
Height: 18 feet to parapet cap.
Seating: 178 interior. 72 exterior South restaurant. 80 exterior North restaurant.
Distance to monument: 14 ft. 6 in. from trellis to monument base.
Distance between restaurants: 61 feet from trellis to trellis.
Length of restaurants: 122 feet.
Distance to rear wall of library: 8 feet.

Kiosks: 4
Square footage: 196 sq. ft. each.
Height: 14 ft. 6 in.

Trees on Upper Terrace
Existing: 53, plus 5 smaller trees behind monument.
Proposed: 36, including 5 replacement trees.
The New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects is grateful to the following for their sponsorship of OCULUS

LeRoy Callender, P.C.
CAD and Project Management Groups, Computer Systems/Charette Corporation
Consolidated Brick & Building Supplies, Inc.
Cosentini Associates
Domestic Marble & Stone Corporation
Formica Corporation
Hudson-Shatz Painting Co., Inc.
Imperial Kitchens, Inc.
Institute of Design Construction (40th Anniversary 1947-1987)
RA License Review Department
Kallen & Lemelson, Consulting Engineers
John Lagenbacher Co. Inc.
Lane's Floor Coverings, Inc.
Morse/Diesel, Inc.
National Reprographics
The Office of Irwin G. Cantor Member Cantor/Seinuk Group
Republic Elevator Company
Rose Associates, Inc.
Judith Selkowitz
Weiskopf & Pickworth