From the President

John H. Winkler

We would sincerely like to hear from you concerning your feelings about Oculus. I have heard to date from only a small, very vocal group. Actually, two small groups—one in support and one not in support. Each group is very outspoken, but neither represents a statistical viewpoint as each one is a small minority when one looks at the total membership. We would like you to tell us how you feel. We want every one of you to realize the conduit for forwarding information to Oculus is not stopped or even slowed.

Please take the time to think about what you believe and let us know by answering the survey included with this edition. One of the issues before us involves your perceived lack of Chapter participation in the direction of Oculus. Others of you believe Oculus has never been more interesting or vital for the Chapter and its members. The issues before us cannot be addressed unless we hear from you. I promise I shall answer every letter with a note of sincere gratefulness. We look forward to your response to the survey.

Views

To Lenore Lucye (re: her column in Oculus, November 1990, p. 12): Please count my vote against your plea for “boosterism” and your vision of rescue for our profession from the European Economic Community or reversion of Hong Kong.

Your faith in international consumerism might have been appropriate ten years ago for our big commercial firms and some architectural superstars. I doubt it will work for them in this decade, and it has never worked for those of us with small offices.

Fifteen years ago we were doing badly, but we did not have the critical shortage of housing that has caused the visible despair of the homeless. We did not have the arrogant greed and contempt for urban planning that was expressed by Donald Trump’s agent in Oculus. We did not have the present level of deterioration in our schools and jails or on our streets.

During these fifteen years there has certainly been some prosperity and some fine architecture, but I wonder if we have not slighted our primary professional and artistic responsibilities. Now there is dramatically less money to be had, but that might compel us to examine where we have recently been, and where our profession should be going.

You seem anxious to put on a brave face and continue the jolly party. I would prefer to join Suzanne Stephens as she makes a serious attempt to analyze our present condition.

Herbert B. Oppenheimer, FAIA

Oppenheimer, Brady & Vogelstein, AIA

Service Lit

The Restoration Directory

The fifth edition of the Restoration Directory, published by the New York Landmarks Conservancy in 1990, is an excellent sourcebook for the specialized disciplines required in historic preservation projects. The Directory has been expanded considerably since the last printing in 1987, and many new entries have been added under various headings such as Restoration Consultants, Professionals, and General Restoration Contractors. Trades, such as Roofers, Metalworkers, and Stained Glass Restorers, are also included. Two clearly useful new categories are Architectural Salvage and Substitute Materials.

Up to three representative projects are described under each firm or contractor. But in the next edition, the category of “Engineers” should be expanded and subdivided into structural, mechanical, and other disciplines. Providing information such as the size of the professional firms and adding a contact person for each entry would make this comprehensive reference even more helpful. The Directory can be ordered from The Princeton Architectural Press, 37 East 7th Street, New York, New York, 10003 for $27.95.

—Jean C. Parker, Chairman of the NYC/AIA Historic Buildings Committee

Corrections

Nominating Committee ballots were mailed with incorrect information about Margot Woolley. Ms. Woolley is Vice President for Design at New York City’s Public Development Corporation.

Oculus reported that Roxanne Warren & Associates was “designing” the new Kingsbridge Bus Depot, for the New York City Transit Authority. Ms. Warren says the building is already under construction.
MoMA's Expansion

The latest revelation that The Museum of Modern Art is contemplating expanding its gallery space by building under the garden would sound fine — for any other museum. But the garden happens to be the only real architecture the museum now has. The design, executed by Philip Johnson in 1954, has long been recognized as a rare and special oasis in midtown: the trees, sculptures, and reflecting pools have a beauty, serenity, and timelessness that make the garden a work of art. Yet the Modern has not been known for treating its architecture like art. In 1984 its expansion and renovation encroached on the garden with the two-story restaurant wing built at the eastern end, and with the inclusion of the glass escalator core on the north wall of the museum proper. Even though the expansion and renovation that were undertaken by Cesar Pelli (who has shown himself very sensitive in other projects) managed to sweep away the born-to-be-Bauhaus character for which the Modern had been famous since 1939, one at least hoped the museum would finally call it a day. No more talk of expansion for at least several decades. It is only seven years later.

The museum says it is weighing other expansion options. However, one realizes going underground is cheaper and easier. The museum says it would put Johnson's garden back just as it was. For his part, Johnson was reported in the New York Times as being against the scheme and telling his colleagues on the museum's board of trustees that it was not "a good idea to go down 30 feet to an important gallery." Johnson now says, "The trees, the water, the paving are sacred. It would all go back. It is not as bad as it sounds."

While MoMA would not make public the underground scheme by Alexander Cooper of Cooper, Robertson & Partners, one does have to wonder if Johnson is being a smidgy too disingenuous. Somewhere there is going to have to be a way of getting down to the galleries. Would it be in the garden? Would not there be an escalator — with a skyline (perhaps a pyramid) ? What about additional skylights to introduce some sort of daylight to those dreary, cavernous, loftlike spaces the museum would be saddled with — and which the museum already has enough of downstairs and upstairs in the "new" building?

The Modern says it needs more space for larger artworks. Even more, it needs to preserve its own very large and fragile work of art called the garden.

Close to Home

A Dutch-Revival structure built in 1929 in Chelsea has just been renovated for elderly homeless residents by Perkins Geddis Eastman. The seven-story building, notable for its thickly textured brick walls and limestone trim, had once been a women's hotel, but was abandoned in the late 1970s. Under a New York State program, Trinity Church and housing development consultant Howard Burchman decided to turn the house at 443-445 West 22nd Street into The Frederic Fleming Residence. . . . On the other side of the city, the country's first mixed-use, HUD-subsidized elderly housing project will be built from scratch in Chinatown at Walker and Centre Streets. The Chung Pak Building is to be realized under HUD's Section 202 program. Judith Edelman of the Edelman Partnership is designing the eleven-story tower that contains 88 apartments and sits on a two- and three-story base of community and commercial space. The base is being designed by Charles Lauster of Anschoetz, Christidis & Lauster. Edelman is the architect of record for the entire building; Lauster is the author of the feasibility study that first proposed this mix of uses. . . . This spring Byard and Platt Architects is resubmitting its South Street Seaport project to the Landmarks Preservation Commission. The scheme for 250 Water Street being developed by Milstein Properties (Oculus, November 1989) didn't make it through its last round. But now the design has been fixed up to meet the concerns LPC had about its attic level, the way it fits into the district, and the placement of certain materials. "These are delicate changes," Platt says. "It was very nice before, and it is even nicer now." . . . Meanwhile Byard and Platt, with new partner Ray H. Dovell, are currently working on the reconstruction and expansion (100,000 square feet) of Chanel's manufacturing plant in Piscataway, New Jersey. Byard and Platt have also begun work on the master plan of the Department of Music at the University of Connecticut in Storrs. The project involves 60,000 square feet of renovation and 15,000 of expansion. . . . A new shoe store at 701 Madison for Unisa, a South American company, opened earlier this winter. The design by Morrison Murakami Architects has a sparse white interior with a second color introduced through the extensive use of natural shoe leather. The look is certainly appropriate. The sleek, crisp fittings for the small, 828-square-foot store give some strong clues about the backgrounds of the two principals: Catherine Morrison was most recently with I. M. Pei and Johnson/Burgee; Jun Murakami also worked for Johnson/Burgee. Frederic Schwartz, a principal of Anderson/Schwartz, was the set designer for dancers Ruby Shang and Company's appearance at the Joyce Theater in January. He created four hanging screens from synthetic and natural materials, such as fuchsia-colored plastic tubing, thick natural rope, chrome-plated chain, and 1,000 feet of Christmas tree lights. "It had to be low-budget, and it had to be from Canal Street," Schwartz says. The ordinary materials were each transformed into diaphanous, suspended curtains about 4 feet wide and 22 feet high following the proportions of Oriental scroll paintings as sets for the premier of "Yellow Punk Dolls." . . . The NYC/AIA's New York Foundation for Architecture has named Roann Barris, a graduate student of art history at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, as the winner of the Douglas Haskell Award for Student Journalism. Her article, "Peter Eisenman and the Erosion of Truth," appeared in the Spring 1990 issue of 2011, published by the School of Art and Design at the University of Illinois-Chicago campus. Jurors led by Charles Hoyt of the Architectural Record also included Stanley Abergom, editor of Interior Design, architect Harold Frederenburgh, and David Morton, the architectural editor at Rizzoli. According to hearsay, the jury's decision for the $1,000 award was unanimous. The
winning essay was reportedly clear and insightful (a rare combination today). In spite of the psychological drift of its title, the essay deals with architectural issues, not personal ones. . . . Director of the City Planning Department Richard Schaffer recently appointed Rosina Abramson as the department's executive director. She replaces Con Howe, who is speculated, is being given a special position in City Planning. Until recently Abramson was president and chief executive officer of Roosevelt Island Operating Corporation and is a lawyer with a long track record in real estate, administrative, and municipal law. . . . It is not going to be so easy to figure out who did what in the new Henri Bendel store opening up behind the restored, landmarked Rizzoli and Coty Building facades at 712-716 Fifth Avenue. Involved in the store's design is a team that not only includes architect Christopher Barriscle of Beyer Blinder Belle as associate partner in charge of design (along with John Beyer as partner-in-charge and Richard Southwick as project manager), but also James Mansour of the Limited Store's planning department (which is owned, as is Bendel's, by Leslie Wexner), French designer François Catroux, who has designed four boutiques in the new store, and Marie-Paule Pellé, creative director of the Condé Nast Traveler magazine. The store, which occupies 79,000 square feet of space in the shadow of the Kohn Pedersen Fox tower, actually fills the two buildings mentioned above plus a newly built townhouse that forms a low-scale row along Fifth. A four-story atrium designed by Beyer Blinder Belle in collaboration with Marie-Paule Pellé will serve as the central space in which the famous Lalique windows, now restored, will be seen. . . . Swanke Hayden Connell Architects is currently designing office space for Time Warner Books that totals 150,000 square feet in the headquarters at the Time-Life building. The firm is also programming and designing 200,000 square feet of law offices for Chadbourne and Parke. . . . Architects Buttrick White & Burtis have completed the restoration of three townhouse buildings in the Upper East Side Historic District. One for art dealer Richard Feigen has already won a Restoration Award from the Friends of the Upper East Side Historic Districts. The design involved exterior restoration of the neo-Georgian landmark at 49 East 68th Street, which was designed in 1914 by Rowbridge & Livingston. Buttrick White & Burtis also redesigned the interior, previously gutted, as an understated setting (exposed brick walls, polished granite floors) for Feigen's galleries and offices. Another project, a neo-Renaissance townhouse at 35-37 East 62nd Street, designed in 1905 by George Keller, is being restored and renovated for offices. Another project, a neo-Georgian townhouse at 215 Park Avenue South, which had a long, twisting corridor, just won a New York State AIA award. The firm has made the procession through the space dramatic by designing an entry with a brushed copper barrel-vaulted ceiling and limestone walls. . . . Douglas Korves has recently finished the two-year renovation and restoration of the exterior and public spaces of the Beekman Tower Hotel at 49th Street and First Avenue. The building, originally known as the Pan-Hellenic House, was conceived and developed by a woman, Emily Eaton Hepburn, as a hotel for college sorority women. It was designed by a man, however, John Mead Howells, who with Raymond Hood won the famous Chicago Tribune Tower competition in 1922. But by the time he was designing the Pan-Hellenic, as Thomas van Leeuwen points out in his book, The Skyward Trend of Thought (1986), Howells was inspired by the second-place scheme for the Chicago Tribune, the tower designed by Eliel Saarinen. Since the hotel's exterior is pending landmark designation, Korves consulted with the Landmarks Preservation Commission about the removal of certain elements that had become accreted to it over the years, the restoration of such materials as iron-spot
brick, and the recasting of certain stone panels. Korves also redesigned the lobby, designed the new restaurant, the Zephyr Grill (once Peartrees), and installed meeting rooms on the site of La Petite Marmite. The interiors are intended to evoke the period with deep, muted colors and geometric motifs in the design of the stainless steel rails, trim, mahogany, and pomele veneers. While the client, Manhattan East Suite Hotels, used in-house designers for the bedroom suites, there is still a little more for Korves to do. Not to be forgotten is the famous, tatty old cocktail lounge at the top of the Beekman. Korves hopes it is next.

Follow-up

Beyer Blinder Belle is still at work on the master plan for the restoration of the Grand Central Terminal. Now that the plan has been adopted by the MTA, the architects are going ahead with the various parts of the scheme as they get funding. They are focusing first on the restoration of the two waiting rooms, while continuing to test and to explore the restoration required for the ceiling in the main hall, and to undertake studies for the access from the north. Meanwhile the MTA, as has been reported, is trying to buy Grand Central Terminal or at least get a long-term lease before embarking on the $400 million supporting square feet of air rights, which the MTA station for its Metro-North commuter rail service and to explore the restoration required for the ceiling in the main hall, and to undertake studies for the access from the north. Meanwhile the MTA, as has been reported, is trying to buy Grand Central Terminal or at least get a long-term lease before embarking on the $400 million supporting square feet of air rights, which the MTA station for its Metro-North commuter rail service and to explore the restoration required for the ceiling in the main hall, and to undertake studies for the access from the north.

North Coast Harbor of Lake Erie, will be something of a mecca for museum traffic because of an aquarium and a science and industry museum also being planned there. The only trouble is that the city’s design guidelines for the area were drawn up before the R&R Hall of Fame decided on the move. Now new guidelines need to be adopted by Cleveland’s city planning department. Jon Barnett is advisor to the city and to the North Coast Development Corporation for a master plan of the area in which the Pei contingent may be involved. Meanwhile the extra space is going under the building lobby, an option that evidently was physically impossible to carry out on the original site.

Inside Media

Architectural Record has turned to Massimo Vignelli of Vignelli Associates to re-design the magazine that was redesigned last year. The decision came about because the magazine felt it too should reduce its pages from 9 by 12 inches to 9 by 11 inches, following the direction taken by P/A with its July 1990 issue and by Architecture this past January. Printers for the large-sized format are becoming too scarce and too expensive.

With the move to downsizing, Editor Stephen Kliment says that last year’s design, initiated in January 1990 by graphic consultant Nancy Butkus, didn’t work with the new proportions. As Kliment explains it, the thinking last year (before he arrived as editor) was based on the idea of making the magazine more like popular magazines and therefore using larger type and different caption sizes. The design by Butkus, the former art director for Manhattan, Inc., was received with extremely faint praise in the architectural community — although Kliment doesn’t say that had anything to do with the decision. At any rate, Massimo Vignelli, who had redesigned Record in the early 1980s, reappeared. Vignelli has come up with a design that Kliment says helps separate the three parts of the magazine — front, center, and back — more clearly, especially the front that will have a yellow tint to it. The new design will also feature a smaller logo. Ironically the first issue is about preservation. But whoever said it had to apply to graphics.

Out of Town

Tod Williams and Billie Tsien are currently designing a residential college...
Mt. Jefferson residential college, U. of Va., Williams Tsien and Assoc.

for the University of Virginia, in association with VMDO Architects of Charlottesville. The 180,000-square-foot project involves seven separate buildings on a ten-acre site, with a total of 526 rooms, plus faculty apartments, reading rooms, and dining facilities for 670 students... At Yale University the firm is the architect for the graduate school of nursing, a 50,000-square-foot building in a medical complex near Frank Gehry's new Yale Psychiatric Institute. Meanwhile Williams and Tsien have just finished the master plan for the Phoenix Art Museum and Little Theater (Oculus, February 1990, p. 5). The firm is designing the project, which includes 75,000 square feet added to 186,000 square feet, with Lescher & Mahoney Architects of Phoenix.

**Events**

The Shape of the City: Conversations with Paul Goldberger at the YMHA by Kelly Shannon

In a conversation on January 3 with Paul Goldberger at the 92nd Street Y, Stanton Eckstut offered comments on public participation in architecture: "Battery Park City, especially the South Cove, would not have happened if we had a public review." However, he did say, "I am glad the public is getting involved in the Penn Yards Development," the controversial project designed by Eckstut's former partner, Alexander Cooper, now of Cooper Robertson. "The project will no doubt profit from the process," he remarked after a little prodding from Goldberger.

On January 9th Tod Williams and Billie Tsien presented their New York City projects, both speculative and realized. As Williams said, "Many layers are being thought about in our work. But we are attempting to be specific to the place." Tsien added, "Our projects are not driven by theory, but driven by life. Many of our thoughts come from living with our six-year-old son, not by theory or historic precedents."

On January 24th the automobile was the focus of Paul Rudolph's thoughts: "The way you get there is as important as the architecture... The East River Drive serves this purpose extremely well — it not only covers the 'awful machine,' but provides excitement in getting there and unifies architecturally the diverse buildings above." Rudolph himself lives in one of those "diverse" buildings overlooking the East River Drive.

**BIDding for Success**

by Andrea Monfried

What Mayor David Dinkins can't or won't do for the City of New York, groups of businesspeople and merchants can and will. Those who will profit most from a new and better New York are banding together to form Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), a state-legislated method of taxing building owners in an area to fund a variety of changes — physical, cosmetic, and social service — that will benefit them directly.

Started in 1977, Fulton St. Mall was the first BID in the city, and Grand Central BID, initiated in 1986, has been the largest and most elaborate. Currently there are twenty in existence and twelve in the process of formation throughout the five boroughs. The formation of a new BID for the 34th Street area, from Park to Tenth avenues and generally from 31st to 35th streets, was announced in November.

The 34th Street area BID will be administered by the staff that runs the Grand Central Partnership, not only have they "learned so much about how to do it," says Arthur Rosenblatt, Vice President for Capital Projects, but they will be able to eliminate a layer of administration and associated costs — after all, the group is also working on the successful and nearly complete restoration of Bryant Square Park behind 42nd Street's New York Public Library. While it is far too early to discuss concrete proposals, Rosenblatt says this district will probably be much more difficult to work with because of its tougher social problems.

The BID will certainly have support from the area. Already a group of budget hotel owners has formed their own group to clean up and police their 31st Street locations. Manager Abraham Puchall of the area. Already a group of budget hotel owners has formed their own group to clean up and police their 31st Street locations. Manager Abraham Puchall of the area. Already a group of budget hotel owners has formed their own group to clean up and police their 31st Street locations. Manager Abraham Puchall of the area. Already a group of budget hotel owners has formed their own group to clean up and police their 31st Street locations. Manager Abraham Puchall of the area. Already a group of budget hotel owners has formed their own group to clean up and police their 31st Street locations. Manager Abraham Puchall of the area. Already a group of budget hotel owners has formed their own group to clean up and police their 31st Street locations. Manager Abraham Puchall of the area. Already a group of budget hotel owners has formed their own group to

only hope that the city itself responds in kind so that the BIDs are not the only safe commercial oases in the city.

**URBAN CENTER BOOKS' TOP 10**

As of January 29, 1991

1. The Details of Modern Architecture, Edward R. Ford (MIT Press, cloth, $55.00).
2. New York Architects 3, Livio Driti (USA Books, paper, $45.00).
3. On Broadway: A Journey Uptown Over Time, David Dunlap (Rizzoli, cloth, $65.00).
5. Adopt-a-Mural, Phyllis Cohen (Municipal Art Society, paper, $3.00).
7. Women in Architecture, Clare Lorenz (Rizzoli, cloth, $29.95).

**RIZZOLI BOOKSTORES' TOP 10**

As of January 28, 1991

2. Decorative Style, Kevin McCloud (Simon & Schuster, cloth, $39.95).
3. Private New York, McLean Irving (Abbeville Press, cloth, $50.00).
4. The New Japanese Architecture, Botond Boglar (Rizzoli, paper, $35.00).
7. Richard Meier: Architect (Rizzoli, paper, $45.00).
9. London Living Style, Leslie Astaire (Rizzoli, cloth, $40.00).
10. New York 1930, Stern, Gilmartin, Mellins (Rizzoli, cloth, $75.00).
The project began to come to life in 1982 with the city's Waterfront Revitalization passed in 1984 with the New York City's Public Development Corporation as its sponsors. The Port Authority, PDC, and New York and New Jersey and New York City's environmental studies, site acquisition, and infrastructure improvements. In 1989 the New York State Urban Development Corporation became the lead agency under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act, and it was allowed to exercise powers of condemnation and zoning override in order to implement the project. This meant ULURP applications could be withdrawn, except for remapping review since parks and streets are owned by the city.

Gruzen Samton Steinglass and Beyer Blinder Belle were commissioned to draw up the General Project Plan. The $2.3 billion project of 9 million square feet has 6,385 apartments, with 10 percent in the first phase designated for below-market rents. (Of these half will be for community residents displaced by the project and half for senior citizens.)

Then there are 2.35 million square feet of commercial space, including a 350-room hotel, an elementary school, a community center, parking garages for 5,353 cars, 19.24 acres of parks, including a 12.8-acre esplanade stretching along several miles of land on the East River.

The project, endorsed in concept by Queens's Community Board 2, was rejected by the board in April 1990. But in July it was voted in by the City Planning Commission and approved by the Board of Estimate in its last meeting in August. Modifications were made to the plan to respond to community input, reflected in the numbers above. The modifications included an on-site school for 650 pupils, a community center, and an agreement to provide 10 percent of the intended “up to 20 percent” below-market housing units in the first phase. In addition several more parks were added, which meant the removal of an apartment building in the southern section, and seven acres of parkland were reserved for active open space. Other changes included the reduction in height of the street wall for buildings along Fifth Street.

Opponents, led by the Hunters Point Coalition, have had some objections, including the fear of the Manhattanization of Queens. Three of the buildings are 38-story towers and the surrounding community has a low density, although the architects say the FAR for the project is 7.5 net. In spite of the added acres of open space, Marcia Reiss of the Parks Council has pointed out that there are only 1.28 acres of park per 1,000 residents, under the city standard of 2.5 per 1,000.

But as usual there are many ways of looking at the plan. The NYC/AIA endorsed the plan. Its president, John Winkler, wrote that “the planners have chosen the best from Battery Park City and Roosevelt Island.”

Let's look briefly at the community of Hunters Point to see why some people find it so ideal for this kind of mixed-use large-scale project while others do not. In the early eighties Hunters Point struck planners as being part of New York’s “decaying” waterfront. It is dominated by light industrial and manufacturing uses, which have often been considered — inaccurately according to some — not important to New York’s service-based economy in the late twentieth century. Ironically, in the eighties Long Island City has been undergoing a certain amount of growth. Small and medium-sized businesses have been moving there as rents go up in Manhattan; for example, the air cargo business is expanding, as are other light industrial businesses. Its artist population has also become slightly heftier because of the location of PS 1 to show the work and because rents in SoHo and TriBeCa are soaring. It is estimated that
Hunters Point: The Debate

Presentations by Jordan Gruzen and John Beyer explored aims and goals of the general design proposal

20,000 people work in Hunters Point and 5,000 people live there now, mostly in 40 blocks adjacent to the proposed project and within the boundaries of the Special Hunters Point Mixed-Use District.

Naturally this kind of growth is different from that occurring in Long Island City, especially with the completion of the Citicorp building at the northern end of this development. People have been buying real estate and until recently real estate prices have tended to go up with the expectation that office buildings were to come. With more Citicorp-type development, planners Abeles, Phillips, Preiss & Shapiro have estimated in an article in City Limits that somewhere around 2,300 businesses, of which three-quarters pay rent, would feel pressure to leave.

The community also says one-third of the 2,100 households in the area risk being displaced through gentrification. There would be other changes: the 13,500 new residents would require police, fire, and sanitation, all taxing the city's system. Subway systems are crowded. LIRR has two stations, but service is infrequent. City Limits reports that even the PDC admits public costs could exceed the city's estimated $155 million now budgeted.

We have two visions for this area. The first is to bolster it as a light industrial, manufacturing area in which surplus space can be used by artists, and the moderate and middle-income community remains intact. The second is to have it be a chip off of Manhattan, where there could be the kind of city-within-a-city we see at Battery Park City that has been so successful in attracting businesses and residents. We want to discuss further whether the two visions can be reconciled, and, if the Hunters Point project goes ahead as planned, whether it would truly be able to accomplish its intended goals.

The many design principles we evolved from that occurring in Long Island City, where there could be the kind of city-within-a-city we see at Battery Park City that has been so successful in attracting businesses and residents. We want to discuss further whether the two visions can be reconciled, and, if the Hunters Point project goes ahead as planned, whether it would truly be able to accomplish its intended goals.

So now is the time to talk.

Jordan Gruzen: We first want to thank team members Michael Kazan and Crystal Sitkowski for their contribution to the plan.

Unlike some large-scale planning projects such as Trump City, Hunters Point was not developer-driven. This project was guided by three agencies carrying out the mandate of the last administration to move back-office space out of Manhattan into the boroughs. It was also shaped by a task force of about twenty or thirty people representing city planning people and community planning groups who met weekly for several years.

John Beyer: Hunters Point's history is a microcosm of the evolution of the New York City waterfront. In the seventeenth century there were Dutch farms; in the eighteenth century it was largely composed of residential communities. By the nineteenth century, the area had become commercial, with landfill expanding into the river. This commercial era peaked in the 1920s and '30s and soon deterioration set in.

The site

Hunters Point is a very dramatic location in New York City. It is staggering to be on the site and realize its place exists a quarter of a mile from the Manhattan shoreline, with marvelous historic remnants of transportation and industry, such as the gantry by the water's edge and the railroad cut that runs through the site.

It was important to play up the irregular configuration of the river's edge and the enormous, wonderful views.

Area as it exists today

The existing communities in the north of the project area are very different from those in the south. In the northern section of Hunters Point, residential, commercial, and industrial uses currently prevail. To the south are industries and railroad yards that offer an opportunity for future development. In the center is a complex of residential and commercial uses where the IRT subway is located — one stop away from Grand Central.

General plan

The many design principles we evolved from that occurring in Long Island City, where there could be the kind of city-within-a-city we see at Battery Park City that has been so successful in attracting businesses and residents. We want to discuss further whether the two visions can be reconciled, and, if the Hunters Point project goes ahead as planned, whether it would truly be able to accomplish its intended goals.

The three agencies and the team of consultants say they are starting to work on detailed Design Guidelines, both for the entire site and parcel by parcel. The agencies want to move toward developer selection and start the Request for Proposal process soon. While a consortium of private developers, led by William Zeckendorf, owns some parcels and has indicated interest in developing Hunters Point, there are no private developers involved yet. The immediate future is bound to be determined by the economic climate.

So now is the time to talk.
The forms of buildings allow the street. The handling of the water's edge was like Broadway. The angles and scale of the system to extend to the water's edge, ensembles should create interest and be focused on a major park inspired by the planning for Forest Hills in Queens. To the south the large circular architectural form is generated by the shape of the land mass as well, and it is organized around an open space. The south residential neighborhood provides a real opportunity for density since it is further away from existing residential neighborhoods. We obviously looked to Bath, England, for the concept of the urban form. Both passive recreational space and a second active ballfield would occur in this area.

We have three tall residential buildings: one on either end and one in the middle of Hunters Point. The high-rise buildings are carefully placed. We tried to allow for a variety of building types and differently sized structures so the whole wouldn't become monotonous or congested.

The first phase of the development is a neighborhood planned around the gantry and an open space. At the center of the site are the commercial core and the Gateway Plaza. The existing bulkheads, rip-rap, platforms, and the large gantry are to be restored. The LIRR railroad cut is developed both as an access to the thoroughfare and as an active recreational area. The cut would be the major gateway to the site and would become a park as well as recreation space for connecting the development with the surrounding community where traditionally there has been an imposing barrier.

The plaza is intended to be a nautically themed, hard-surface space, with water-oriented activities and festivities. It would have retail shops and services for the community. The commercial core of office buildings and a hotel would be in the center of the site where we are also placing a mandatory, covered pedestrian space.

The design guidelines are meant to unify the project and guarantee that each developer conforms to a set of objectives along various points. The guidelines call for a street wall 85 feet high — lower at the water's edge — plus setbacks of ten feet and retail spaces.

The commercial center is denser and will have more intense activities day and night. The articulation of facades, the use of balconies, color, a variety of stone and brick, and forms to animate masses are things we want to encourage. Traditional bay windows one sees on the Upper West Side, grade-level setbacks, landscaped strips, and a zone with entrances to doctors' offices or stoops would also be used.

The forms of buildings allow the street system to extend to the water's edge, where accessibility is clearly delineated and the park becomes a destination point.

The handling of the water's edge was inspired by the great precedent established by Cooper/Eckstut at Battery Park City. At Hunters Point a landscaped esplanade runs one and one-quarter miles along the waterfront, opening it up to public use. Along the inland side, the western boundary of the site is intended to form a friendly edge to the existing community. Here the buildings would be stepped down to a height of four, five, and six stories.

**Placement of activities and uses**

At the core of the development are about 2.1 million square feet of office space, and flanking it are two residential neighborhoods to the north and south. The larger residential area is situated to the north because the land formation allowed it to be focused on a major park inspired by the planning for Forest Hills in Queens. To the south the large circular architectural form is generated by the shape of the land mass as well, and it is organized around an open space. The south residential neighborhood provides a real opportunity for density since it is further away from existing residential neighborhoods. We obviously looked to Bath, England, for the concept of the urban form. Both passive recreational space and a second active ballfield would occur in this area.

We have three tall residential buildings: one on either end and one in the middle of Hunters Point. The high-rise buildings are carefully placed. We tried to allow for a variety of building types and differently sized structures so the whole wouldn't become monotonous or congested.

**Center**

The first phase of the development is a neighborhood planned around the gantry and an open space. At the center of the site are the commercial core and the Gateway Plaza. The existing bulkheads, rip-rap, platforms, and the large gantry are to be restored. The LIRR railroad cut is developed both as an access to the thoroughfare and as an active recreational area. The cut would be the major gateway to the site and would become a park as well as recreation space for connecting the development with the surrounding community where traditionally there has been an imposing barrier.

The plaza is intended to be a nautically themed, hard-surface space, with water-oriented activities and festivities. It would have retail shops and services for the community. The commercial core of office buildings and a hotel would be in the center of the site where we are also placing a mandatory, covered pedestrian space.

**Credits:**

John H. Beyer, partner, Beyer Blinder, Belle
Jordan I. Gruzen, partner, Gruzen Samton Steinglass
Michael A. Kazan, project manager
Crystal Sitkowski, project designer
Richard Peterson, planner
Halina Starzewicz, designer
Nina Gladstone, planner
Ross Muir, technical support
Vollmer Associates, traffic, transportation, civil engineers
EDAW, Inc., and Signe Nielsen, landscape architects

**Twist around to generate a series of angles that would relate to the views, somewhat like Broadway. The angles and scale of the ensemble should create interest and excitement along the boulevard.**

The forms of buildings allow the street system to extend to the water's edge, where accessibility is clearly delineated and the park becomes a destination point.

**Water's edge**

The handling of the water's edge was inspired by the great precedent established by Cooper/Eckstut at Battery Park City. At Hunters Point a landscaped esplanade runs one and one-quarter miles along the waterfront, opening it up to public use. Along the inland side, the western boundary of the site is intended to form a friendly edge to the existing community. Here the buildings would be stepped down to a height of four, five, and six stories.

**Placement of activities and uses**

At the core of the development are about 2.1 million square feet of office space, and flanking it are two residential neighborhoods to the north and south. The larger residential area is situated to the north because the land formation allowed it to be focused on a major park inspired by the planning for Forest Hills in Queens. To the south the large circular architectural form is generated by the shape of the land mass as well, and it is organized around an open space. The south residential neighborhood provides a real opportunity for density since it is further away from existing residential neighborhoods. We obviously looked to Bath, England, for the concept of the urban form. Both passive recreational space and a second active ballfield would occur in this area.

We have three tall residential buildings: one on either end and one in the middle of Hunters Point. The high-rise buildings are carefully placed. We tried to allow for a variety of building types and differently sized structures so the whole wouldn't become monotonous or congested.

**Center**

The first phase of the development is a neighborhood planned around the gantry and an open space. At the center of the site are the commercial core and the Gateway Plaza. The existing bulkheads, rip-rap, platforms, and the large gantry are to be restored. The LIRR railroad cut is developed both as an access to the thoroughfare and as an active recreational area. The cut would be the major gateway to the site and would become a park as well as recreation space for connecting the development with the surrounding community where traditionally there has been an imposing barrier.

The plaza is intended to be a nautically themed, hard-surface space, with water-oriented activities and festivities. It would have retail shops and services for the community. The commercial core of office buildings and a hotel would be in the center of the site where we are also placing a mandatory, covered pedestrian space.

**Jordan Gruzen: The design guidelines are meant to unify the project and guarantee that each developer conforms to a set of objectives along various points. The guidelines call for a street wall 85 feet high — lower at the water's edge — plus setbacks of ten feet and retail spaces.**

The commercial center is denser and will have more intense activities day and night. The articulation of facades, the use of balconies, color, a variety of stone and brick, and forms to animate masses are things we want to encourage. Traditional bay windows one sees on the Upper West Side, grade-level setbacks, landscaped strips, and a zone with entrances to doctors' offices or stoops would also be used.

We are going to mandate signs, lighting, building entrances, and openings in the street wall to allow safety and the visual penetration into lobbies. We are going to encourage an active retail base to allow stores to pop out with store windows and marquees, and a whole variety of possible commercial uses including street-side restaurants.

We are concerned with the buildings' profiles, since the buildings will be seen clearly from Queens and from Manhattan. We will attempt guidelines mandating interesting building groups, tops, and silhouettes.

**Moderator: Question about the design guidelines for Hunters Point and their relationship to the current scheme**

**Beyer:** The plan as approved included general guidelines as mandated in the UDC plan that are equivalent to zoning controls. We have not started on the next phase, design controls, which will be much more specific.

**Gruzen:** What you saw here is not specific design: these towers could take many other forms in general envelope. The developer and the architects can have their own variations.

**Moderator: Question about opposition's allegation about Hunters Point creating a wall**

**Beyer:** As a program requirement we were to provide corporate back-office space for which a large building footprint was required. The best place to locate that is next to industrial uses, and these tend to fall in the southern end of the site. In the long term, the railroad yards will be developed — so this is a logical place for further office development.
Hunters Point: The Debate

Comments by Saskia Sassen and Richard Ravitch highlighted economic and political questions, and statements from the audience focused on community concerns

[ Moderator: Question about economy of the city and how this project fits into the larger picture]

Richard Ravitch: It is hard not to be Cassandra-like and to say there is no reality to any of this because of the economy, the glut of office space, the dearth of public subsidies to bring rents down. Having said that, I should add that this situation is temporary. Lots of things can happen. The population is increasing and with it the demand for residential space. But we have a miserable history in terms of planning. In times of prosperity, when resources are available, the multiplicity of planning reviews makes the gestation period of one of these projects so long that economic situations change. So therefore it is worth doing now.

This is a part of the city that should be rebuilt. But I question this kind of density in an area that does not lend itself to the repetition of that amount of density. One of the major values of public investment in large-scale residential projects is to stimulate private investment in adjoining properties. But this project strikes me as out of character with the surrounding area. I also wonder about the financing and marketability tests. There will always be pressure on the developer to increase density, particularly with the commitment of public funds to the infrastructure. Because of the legal problems in the way, the gestation period will be long.

Then too there might be foundation problems for towers that size. I assume their piles may be deep and might run into subways.

On the other hand, the plan is attractive. There is no way to create a new residential neighborhood and pay its costs and interest rates unless there is enough mass. To make it marketable, you must make it unusually attractive in its living spaces and open spaces. We learned a lot from Roosevelt Island, and it has been successful. That plan was thoughtful and serious. This is better.

[ Moderator: Question about New York's place in the global economy and this development's assumption of that strength]

Saskia Sassen: We all know New York is sinking a little now. But if we look at how it is organized, one thing emerges. There is a continuing mood for its being an international center of business and finance. The stock market will probably lose its significance because of electronic networks that allow direct trading. But even if the stock market becomes a smaller operation with a smaller role in the economy, other dimensions will expand. We still need a central business and finance center with a whole telecommunications structure. Insofar as the global economy is dependent on communication and because of the way telecommunications capabilities are distributed spatially, such centers for finance and business have a built-in advantage. They seem to promise an immense concentration. And therefore New York City will have an economy to sustain this kind of project.

The Hunters Point project is viable. But whereas the 1980s was a decade dominated by finance, now New York needs to develop an integrated urban economy. We need to support that development with technical training. Relying only on financial services or communications and ignoring industry and manufacturing is a mistake.

I see two potentials in the project. First there should be a connection to the manufacturing base in this city. We need that sector, for small-scale manufacturing units are actually a part of the global economy. And we have the potential for that kind of district in this project. The manufacturing sector occupies the district that lies behind Hunters Point. Yet there does not seem to be a connection to it. We have to strengthen that link.

The imagery of the Hunters Point project looks like a postindustrial corporate city. The project seems to create a wall, visually as well as operationally, between this corporate-style design with its high-income population and the nearby manufacturing district.

Second, the project does represent a location for growth that should happen. It is in a borough. There is too much concentration in Manhattan, and there is a distortion in real estate prices. This project displaces that growth to a borough.

But the imagery makes it look like an extension of Manhattan instead of something that connects to the borough. At the formal level the images capture only one part of what is extraordinary in the city. Yet there are so many good elements in the project. The design shows a potential for encouraging growth and the connection to the manufacturing sector as well as to the boroughs. But we have to ask how can we transcend its imagery as a high-income project? It is almost too pretty.

The real city is open-ended: its architecture is open, its planning is open, so that much can just happen from the ground up.

Beyer: The economic aspect of Hunters Point is undeniable. There is much difficulty building anything unless you have a certain amount of construction to justify its cost and to begin to create amenities. But in the day when the city’s grid was laid out [1811] and the city paid for the infrastructure, the developer didn’t have to worry about building a park, school, or streets. He just built houses. Today he is faced with a monumental challenge. How can you afford to build anything? The density is unavoidable if to we are to plan for quality and amenities.

New York City is a city of streets, and with this density of buildings most activities of a public nature occur on the streets. Our Hunters Point plan extends the grid system from the community behind it to the water. One thing you will see is an unbelievable variety of buildings, of uses, of edges. The mixed-use nature of what we have here will contribute to the vitality and potential of what will be to some degree an elitist-looking community.

Ravitch: I am a little concerned about the ratio of open space to apartments. Few residential projects have this size and complexity, except Battery Park City. The public amenities are relatively low per unit. At this point in the process you are setting a framework: that you shouldn’t make too many compromises until they are forced on you. The real world will do that in spades.

Gruzen: I live on the water at Battery Park City. Because of their frenetic pace of life, New Yorkers need that. The water is a calming place. Battery Park City has 35 acres of open space for 15,000 residents. But it has plenty of open space because of the water. You don’t need space always under your feet, for there you have it in front of you. The water’s edge is a logical place to create density.

[ Moderator: Question about the trend for high-income city-within-a-city, floating in a sea of poverty, not unlike the increased privatization of new and exclusive suburbs on golf courses with security guards]

Sassen: This kind of city-within-a-city does force some sense of privatization. Cities have ways of constructing invisible walls. We don’t need to build them. You can see this on East 96th Street.
In this site there is a way of opening up that city-within-the-city. And already this design avoids the pitfalls of suburbs with strip developments. This city-within-a-city is a better version of a suburb.

But there are two lost opportunities. First, its corporate form offers a wall of tall buildings where there is going to be an invisible wall anyway. Can we develop visual forms that open up the project more? The design both enhances its urbanity and its association with a protected suburb.

**Gruzen:** We needed a heart in the project, and we looked into several options. First we considered a bio-medical center. But consultants said that right now there should be more housing. Our first phase is based on housing so that something else could happen. Whether three office buildings or something else will bring further life to the area, only time will tell. Perhaps with the Astoria studios’ sound stage nearby, or something else will bring further life to this part of Queens could be a motion picture center.

**Jerrold Nadler, Assemblyman:** Luxury housing and commercial development are going to raise land values and price the 40,000 manufacturing jobs and the 20,000 ancillary blue collar jobs that are located within a mile and a half radius of the project out of existence.

Industrial jobs from lower Manhattan have been relocating to this area in recent years. But manufacturing cannot compete with commercial uses.

The City Planning Commission should study zoning protection for industry. Mixed-use zoning now means you cannot convert manufacturing to residential use as-of-right, but you can convert manufacturing to commercial use as-of-right. In the absence of zoning that rules industrial space, a project of this nature is a death sentence to jobs. Saskia Sassen is right: you need manufacturing as well as financial jobs.

**Sassen:** When we talk about the importance of manufacturing, we need to see it as part of an overall economy. Manufacturing has its own offices and its own corporate sector. It need not be in a ghetto. The potential of developing it involves creating a viable economy that incorporates the different economic sectors within its boundaries. We could use a development such as Hunters Point to promote and develop a dynamic economy that includes a massive industrial sector, a massive service sector, and a massive manufacturing center - such as an electronic high-tech industry. Then we could link all this to the world economy. Japan has found a way to protect its manufacturing.

**Ravitch:** There has to be fundamental economic need for manufacturing. It is not going to occur because planners say it’s good. Economic energy created a Chinese garment industry in New York that didn’t exist six or seven years ago. No planners planned for it, but it occurs all over the city. This kind of spontaneous economy is not going to be in heavy manufacturing. Light manufacturing will take place where people are willing to take economic risks.

**Sassen:** In the 1980s New York spent considerable money upgrading itself to become a corporate center. If you put up the money in advance you can attract a highly skilled manufacturing base. It doesn’t have to be sweatshop. The city can allocate resources and very modern, small manufacturing businesses can take many forms. It is very important to advance and compete in this area in the world market.

**Linda Davidoff, Parks Council:** If you take a colossus and put it at the waterfront, barring access to land, and put a beautiful skin and gorgeous fag leaf on it, it is still a colossus. The architects have an arresting concept at Hunters Point: empty out the center. We at the Parks Council say build high at the center and allow community access to the waterfront all around.

**Philip Howard, lawyer for Hunters Point Community Coalition:** Manhattan derives its strength from diversity and an anarchy in the character of its buildings. This project is not Manhattanization. It is Roosevelt Islandization.

Since nothing is going to get built in 1991, we can ask what public purpose is to be served by this project? Shouldn’t it be something to make the city stronger? Will people come to New York for this? People come to New York for this.

**Beyer:** If public purpose isn’t to encourage development of underused property in a location that has excellent access and visibility, then public purpose has no economic reality. Yet we need to create a certain density to justify development. We could create a huge park. But long-term planning calls for continued growth and attractiveness not only to residents but to people coming from outside. Change and development has to be part of public purpose, and inevitably it will be controversial. Nobody wants change. Ever. Except backwards. But cities evolve. Planning is destructive to what exists.

**Elizabeth Thomson, co-chair, NYC/AIA Housing Committee:** An integrated community should be encouraged here along with social services, schools, and affordable housing. Also you should look at the new and unexplored typologies of housing. The community should be able to transform the scheme to make it relevant and touch the lives of people around this development.

**Tom Paine, Hunters Point Community Coalition:** We have serious questions about height, density, and the transition made from the project to the existing manufacturing and residential neighborhoods. To visualize the project’s image the Coalition commissioned a computer-generated simulation video to be made with funding from Open Space Institute through the J. M. Kaplan Fund and the Vincent Astor Foundation. A video was to be shown in this program, and at the last minute it was taken out. We are not sure of the reason, but for those of us who saw it, it reveals the project’s overwhelming effect on the surrounding community.

Also the old railroad cut is a 200-foot swath of greenery forming a visual axis to the river. This project cuts into it by 100 feet and puts buildings there that will visually block off the waterfront from the community.

**Marcia Reiss, Parks Council:** I am struck by how often Battery Park City was held up as a model for Hunters Point. What occurred to me today is that we need some new pictures and new images — and not just for housing. We also need the vitality of manufacturing and should put some money into that search for new images for the waterfront. Now we have no idea how to create new manufacturing on the waterfront. The Parks Council has been involved in the design of parks combined with manufacturing uses — the Greenwood section of Brooklyn, which is used by employees and neighborhood residents. This is a tiny example of something we see on larger scale.
Balancing Act, Part II
by Lenore M. Lacey

Last month I discussed the Chapter budget from an Income perspective, with a promise to return with Expenses. It is always a challenge to make the wants and needs of the membership, as administered by the Board- and Committee-generated programming, come to life within the parameters of given income. Below I review how funds generated become real projects and costs for the Chapter.

Expenses

- Administration: Actual costs of running the Chapter, basically our overhead. Included are salaries, taxes, and benefits for the staff; supplies, miscellaneous purchases, and expenses for the office; expenses for the President, President/Elect, and staff to attend AIA-required meetings; postage and mail house; office equipment leasing and maintenance; and auditing, accounting, investment counsel, and legal fees.

- Contingent Reserve Fund: Chapter Bylaws require that 2 percent of dues collected go to the CRF (See Income article, Oculus, February 1991, for discussion of the CRF.)

- Documents: Represents the cost of purchasing documents from AIA for resale.

- Occupancy: Includes rent; escalation and taxes; electric; HVAC (overtime); telephone; insurance; and off-premises storage.

- Committees: All committee-generated program expenses, including announcements and flyers (design and printing); outside space rental; honoraria and travel expenses; and design, production, and marketing of catalogs and special reports. (Not every committee generates any or all of the above. Committee events and programming are expected to be self-supporting at the least, and income-generating if possible.)

- Oculus: Includes all costs associated with the writing, design, production, printing, and mailing of Oculus.

- Contingency: A floating number calculated by subtracting Expenses from Income. Gives the Board a monthly status of potential funds available for emergencies, unplanned items, anticipated deficits, and other needs.

Announcements

International Committee Conference, Washington, D.C., May 16-17, 1991

International Design and Practice: Europe is the theme of the International Committee's upcoming conference. Panel discussions featuring architects from large and small firms will consider positioning in the international market, practice issues, and pitfalls. Also present will be international consultants who will inform participants about foreign market opportunities, obtaining work, and important legal and liability issues.

The International Committee will form subcommittees focusing on issues such as markets, practice, international government affairs, education, trade, and international associations. The conference is aimed at both firms already engaged in international work and those wishing to enter the marketplace. For more information contact Dena Sollins at 202-628-7415.

Architecture Salaries

The January 1991 issue of Working Woman magazine reported the following 1989 median salaries in the profession, as compiled by Dietrich Associates, Phoenixville, Penn.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Responsibility</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing Partner</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner/Principal</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Architect</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head (non-partner)</td>
<td>$50,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for large staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(more than 20)</td>
<td>$48,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible for midsize staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10-20)</td>
<td>$42,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration as licensed architect required</td>
<td>$36,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level with BA</td>
<td>$20,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basics of Brickwork

An informative presentation of the basic concept of good brickwork design is offered by Glen-Gery. It includes an overview of movement, water penetration, shapes, and brick veneer over metal studs. For information about scheduling this program contact Glen-Gery Brickwork Design Center, Amsterdam, 211 E. 49th St., 319-5677.

Big Apple Mapped for Apple Mac

The Department of City Planning completed the first version of its microcomputer map series of New York with the release of nine diskettes containing map files of 24 community districts in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island. The files include tax block outlines, street names, and tax block numbers. They currently are only available.
for the Apple Macintosh computer, but are slated for release in an IBM-PC format this March. Each diskette costs $50.00 and is available at the City Planning Map and Bookstore, 22 Reade St., New York, N.Y. 10017.

Fire Alarm Systems
The New York City Department of Buildings has released a memorandum regarding filing procedures for fire alarm systems. For a copy or more information call Nalin Patel at 312-8327.

Woodwork Sourcebook
The Architectural Woodwork Institute has released its 1991 AWI Source Book, a complete reference guide for architects, interior designers, specifiers, and woodworkers. It features complete product and service listings of AWI member firms. The new edition is available free to AWI members and qualified design professionals. Contact Elaine Ferri, AWI, 2310 South Walter Reed Drive, Arlington, Va. 22206-1199, 703-671-9100.

Designing to Sell
The second edition of Designing to Sell, published by McGraw Hill, explains how to integrate a store's environment and merchandise to improve sales. It features floor plans, interior themes, merchandise display elements, materials and finishes, storefronts, and lighting. It is available for $49.50 from 1-800-2-MCGRAW.

Interiors Committee Meeting
On Fee Structuring
by Barbara McCarthy

The NYC/AIA Interiors Committee, under the leadership of Jonathan Butler, is focusing on broad administrative issues that affect many firms, such as compensating staff and hiring and retaining the best employees.

In the January 15 meeting, the subject, which was addressed in theoretical terms, was fee structuring, that is, the establishment of a method of compensation. Margaret Sedlis and Bruce Nelligan led the discussion on various methods of evaluating a project and determining the appropriate fee.

Once the monetary value has been determined for the scope of the work involved, the next step is to devise a method of compensation and fee structure acceptable to the client. The architect must first set cost guidelines, based on an intuitive feeling of what the work is worth, then estimate the in-house cost of the project (staff, firm resources, etc.). After these two points are settled, the marketplace and competition should be analyzed. The cost guidelines and the in-house project costs should be very close to each other. That means the proposed fee is near the mark. If they are not so close, the fee should be reevaluated.

Also addressed at the meeting was the establishment of a method of compensation, whether by flat fee, hourly rates with a maximum, open hours, or a combination of any of the above. The pros and cons of all these methods need to be evaluated both for their impact on the firm and on the client's perception.

DEADLINES

MARCH 1
Entry deadline for the Philip N. Winslow Landscape Design Award for design excellence in public open space. Write The Parks Council at 457 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10022, or call 838-9410, ext. 233 for additional information and entry forms.

MARCH 23
Nomination deadline for the 1991 Design Awards in Corportating PC Glass Block. Contact 924-7000.

MARCH 26

MARCH 29
Entry deadline for Progressive Architecture's Affordable Housing Initiative Competition. Contact Affordable Housing Editor, P/A, 600 Summer St., P.O. Box 1361, Stamford, Conn. 06904. 203-348-7531.

MARCH 31
Submission deadline for the Lucy G. Moses Excellence in Architectural Restoration Awards, sponsored by the New York Landmarks Conservancy. Categories are both for project leadership and project excellence (including buildings, facades, interiors, open spaces, and religious properties). Contact Frank Eberhard, 995-5260.

APRIL 26
Entry deadline for the Pittsburgh Corning Glass Block Product Design Competition for architectural and interior designs incorporating PC Glass Block. Contact 800-245-1717 for details and submission requirements.

MAY 1
Entry deadline for three 1991 Travelling Fellowships in Architectural Design and Technology at the American Academy in Rome. Contact the National Institute for Architectural Education, 30 W. 22nd St., New York, N.Y. 10010, 924-7000.

MAY 11

MAY 17
First-stage submission deadline for a civic center masterplan and City Hall for Santa Clarita, California. For information and competition program, contact William H. Linkaman, Competition Advisor, Santa Clarita City Hall, 23920 Valencia Blvd., Suite 300, Santa Clarita, Calif. 91355. 805-259-2489.

Entry deadline for the Waterfront Center's fifth annual awards program for completed waterfront projects and comprehensive waterfront plans. Contact Susan Kirk or Ginny Murphy at 202-337-6036.

JUNE 14
Final submission deadline for the 1991 Design America Accessible Student Design Competition: A Cottage for Beethoven. Contact the National Institute for Architectural Education, 30 W. 22nd St., New York, N.Y. 10010, 924-7000.


Do You Read Oculus?
Do you like it? Dislike it? Do you care one way or the other? This is your chance to let us know. Fill out the survey accompanying this issue.
THE CALENDAR
MARCH 1991

Shaking it up at the NYC/AIA:
Matchmakers’ Ball, March 5;
Earthquake Regulations, March 12;
Life Beyond the Design Press, April 2

Send Oculus calendar information to
New York Chapter, 457 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022.

Oculus welcomes information for
the calendar pertaining to public
events about architecture and the
design professions. Information is
due in writing by the first of
the month for the following issue.

Because of the time lag between when
the information is received and printed,
final details of events are likely to change.
We recommend that you check events
with sponsoring institutions before attending.

CONTINUING EXHIBITIONS

A Design of Public Open Spaces for
TriBeCa. Proposals by Karahan/Schwarting
Architecture Company. Sponsored by the
Municipal Art Society. The Urban Center, 457

Ageless Perceptions IV: Senior Women in
Architecture. Drawings and photographs.
SoHo20, 469 Broome St. 226-4167. Closes March 9.

The Drawings of Jakov Chernikov,
Arthur Ross Architecture Gallery, Bueil Hall, Columbia University.

Itsuko Hasegawa, Architect. 400 Level
Gallery, Avery Hall, Columbia University. 854-
3414. Closes March 15.

Cranbrook Design: The New Discourse.
Steelcase Design Partnership, 305 E. 63rd St.
725-6500. Closes March 22.

Bedrooms. Site-specific installations. Snug
Harbor Cultural Center, 1000 Richmond Terrace,

Kazimir Malevich, 1878-1935. Metropolitan
Museum of Art, 82nd St. and Fifth Ave. 879-

Liubov Popova. Museum of Modern Art,
11 W. 53rd St. 708-9400. Closes April 3.

Federal Hall: Washington’s Capitol.
Federal Hall National Memorial, 26 Wall St. 344-3830.
Closes April 26.

Art of the Forties. Federal Hall, closes April 26.

SUNDAY 3

LECTURE
Style at its Best. Given by Bradshaw and
DePalma, interior designers. 3:00 pm. Museum
of the City of New York, Fifth Ave. at 103rd St.
Reservations and information, 534-1672. $7 fee
(50 members).

TUESDAY 5

EVENT
Matchmakers’ Ball: A Collaborative
Workshop for Artists and Architects.
Sponsored by the NYC/AIA Art
& Architecture Committee. 6:00 pm. The
Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave.
Reservations and information 838-9670.
$10 fee.

LECTURE
Allan Greenberg. With Paul Goldberger.
8:00 pm. 92nd St. Y. 9:30 Lexington Avenue. 996-1100.
$15 fee.

SYMPOSIUM
Examining Postmodernism: Images/
Premises. With critics A. D. Coleman, Max
Kozloff, Donald Kuspit, Shelley Rice, and
psychoanalyst Martin S. Bergmann.
Moderator: Lynn Stern. Sponsored by the
Photographic Insight Foundation. 6:00 pm.
Tisch School of the Arts. 721 Broadway.
Reservations 787-4028. See March 7 for part two.

WEDNESDAY 6

LECTURE
The Renaissance Garden as Architecture/
Architecture as Garden. Given by Michael
Schwarting. Karahan/Schwarting. 6:30 pm.
American Academy in Rome, 41 E. 65th St.
517-4200. $7.50 fee.

TOUR
Inside the New York Public Library. 6:30 pm.
Sponsored by the 92nd St Y. 986-1100.
$15 fee.

THURSDAY 7

LECTURE
The Architecture of Public Works.
Sponsored by the Architectural League. 6:30 pm.
The Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave.
Reservations 980-3767, information 753-1722.
$5 fee (non-League members).

Recent Work. Given by Dan Hanganu,
Montreal architect. Sponsored by the Pratt
Institute. 6:30 pm. Higgins Hall, St. James Place

Writer’s Talk: Robert Adam on Classical
Architecture: A Comprehensive Handbook to
the Tradition of Classical Style. 12 noon.
The Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave. Reservations
935-3960.

SYMPOSIUM
Examining Postmodernism: Images/
Premises. With critics A. D. Coleman, Max
Kozloff, Donald Kuspit, Shelley Rice, and
sociologist Todd Gitlin. Moderator: Lynn
Stern. Sponsored by the Photographic Insight
Foundation. 6:00 pm. Tisch School of the Arts,
721 Broadway. Reservations 787-4028.

FRIDAY 8

LUNCH LECTURE
Fernando Ferrer, Bronx Borough President.
Sponsored by the City Club of New York. 12
noon. CUNY Graduate Center, 29 W. 42nd St.,
17th floor. Reservations 921-9870.

SATURDAY 9

FORUM
Probing the Issues of the Brooklyn
Environment, Housing IV: What Will Future
Housing Look Like? Karen Burkhardt,
City Planning, Brooklyn; Christopher Havens,
BEC New Communications; and Ron Shiffman,
Fertel Institute Center for Community and
Environmental Development. Sponsored by the
Brooklyn Center for the Urban Environment.
1:00 pm. Brooklyn Public Library, Grand Army
Plaza Auditorium. Reservations and information
718-788-8549.

MONDAY 11

EXHIBITION AND LECTURE
Works by Stan Allen. Lecture, 6:30 pm.
South Gallery, Bueil Hall, Columbia University.

LECTURE
Andrew Reicher, Urban Homesteading
Assistance Board. Sponsored by the NYC/
AIA Housing Committee. 6:00 pm. The
Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave.
Information, Liz Thomson 309-5415. $5 fee.

TUESDAY 12

PROGRAMS

Color Day. Sponsored by Contract magazine
and the Color Association of the United States.
9:00 am. IDCNY, 29-10 Thomson Ave.,
Long Island City. Information and registration,
718-997-7474.

Earthquake: How Safe is New York? Local
and National Trends in Seismic Design
Regulations. Sponsored by the NYC/AIA
Building Codes Committee. 6:00 pm. The
Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave.
Reservations 838-9670. $5 fee ($10 non-
members).

Public Relations: An Effective Marketing
Tool, With Bruce Ross, Bruce Ross Associates.
Sponsored by the Society of Architectural
Administrators. 6:00 pm. Law offices of Shea &
Gould, 1251 Avenue of the Americas, 45th floor.
For information call Fran Brill, 489-4747. $15 fee
(AIA members $10).

WEDNESDAY 13

EXHIBITION
Nicholson Reiser Unemoto: Selected
Projects. National Institute for Architectural
Education, 30 W. 22nd 924-7000. Closes April 19.

LECTURE
Kenneth Frampton on “Homage a Scarpa.”
6:30 pm. Wood Auditorium, Avery Hall, Columbia University.
854-3414.

SEMINAR
Exterior Paving with Brickwork. Sponsored
by Glen-Gery. 11:30 am. Glen-Gery Brickwork
Design Center, Amster Yard, 6:00 pm. The
Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave.
Information, Liz Thomson 309-5415. $5 fee.

Note: All events sponsored by the
New York Chapter of the American Institute of
Architects unless otherwise indicated.
Watch for:

The Architectural League’s
Second Annual Beach-Arts Ball is Saturday, April 13.

Nicholson Reiser Unemoto, closes April 18; collage by Jesse Reiser and Nanako Unemoto

Center, 457 Madison Ave. Reservations 980-3767, information 753-1722. $5 fee (non-League members).


WEDNESDAY 27

LECTURE


TUESDAY 26

EXHIBITION

MONTHLY LECTURE
Lunch Lecture

TUESDAY 25

EXHIBITION


SPECIFICATIONS LECTURE
Peter Eisenman on “Weak Form: Architecture in a Mediated Environment 1 — From Interpretation to Mediations: Icon and Index.” 6:30 pm. Wood Auditorium, Avery Hall, Columbia University. 854-3414.

TUESDAY 24

LECTURE

LECTURE

LECTURES


wednesday 3

LECTURE

Do not forget to send in your Oculus Survey by March 21.
The New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects is grateful to the following for their sponsorship of OCULUS

AJ Contracting Company
Forest Electric Corp.
George Kleinknecht, Inc.
Nastasi White, Inc.
Nordic Interiors, Inc.
Jaros, Baum and Bolles
Lehrer McGovern Bovis, Inc.
Syska & Hennessy
The Greenline Guides
National Reprographics, Inc.
Tishman Construction Corporation