The views expressed in Oculus are not necessarily those of the Board of Directors or staff of the AIA New York Chapter. The editorial material appearing on pages 2, 14, and 15 under the title “Around the Chapter” is generated by Chapter committees. The rest of the newsletter is produced by the Oculus editorial team.
Stuyvesant High School Criticism: Response by Alex Cooper, FAIA, Cooper Robertson & Partners and Ralph Steinglass, FAIA, Gruzen Samton Steinglass

It is disturbing to us as the architects for Stuyvesant High School that the November *Oculus* feature (pp. 6-9) is replete with inaccuracies (inexcusable in a professional journal) and innuendo (customary in a tabloid journal). As a few examples, "Cooper was able to persuade the Board of Education to raise the standard allowance to 135 square feet per student." It was not Cooper, but instead the Stuyvesant Coalition and BPCA, who persuaded not the BOE, but the NYC OMB, to update the standards. Second, "electronic outlay comprises 40 percent of the construction budget." Instead, it was suggested that the electrical work was perhaps 40 percent higher than standard electrical cost percentage, to accommodate air conditioning (for an eleven-month school year) and computerization. Third, [the article refers to] "symmetry of the ten-story facade facing Chambers Street." Instead, the facade is distinct asymmetrical. Fourth, [the article cites] "the ceramic tiles that cover the walls." Instead, structural glazed facing block is the material in the corridors. Fifth, [the article mentions] "the drab gray face of Manhattan Community College...." The building is clearly red brick. Sixth, [the article refers to] "the classroom layout, seats in those rooms with windows to the outside face away from the view...." Instead, in the typical classrooms students are seated parallel to the windows.

The innuendo in the article focuses primarily on the cost of the building. Phrases such as "notorious price tag," "scrambling to explain the cost," "paint the substantial remainder," "budget fattener," "price extracted," and "very high cost of the school is a burden" attempt to create a controversy where none exists. In fact, a very hard-nosed budget was developed by the architects, construction manager, and clients together and approved by a very hard-nosed OMB as appropriate for the school's program and recognizing the constraints of the site. The relatively small difference in the budget between Stuyvesant and other new schools is mainly due to its foundation and site development costs, as well as costs associated with its unusually small site, creating the need for a high-rise school with escalators. All in all, the final construction cost is within six percent of the original budget as approved by OMB in 1988 after intense review.

For the writer's design criticism, we choose to let the building speak for itself, and invite all interested parties to visit the school and form their own judgments.

Peter Slatin replies:

My apologies for misrepresenting the glazed facing block. However, there was no attempt or intent to create a controversy. Any public-facility budget is a legitimate area of inquiry. In the case of Stuyvesant, no matter how difficult it was to achieve this result at this cost, it is worth questioning what made it so.

Another Response:

by Renee Levine

I have just seen the November issue of your magazine, *Oculus*. I am not an architect and thus do not usually have the opportunity to read what I assume is a highly regarded professional journal. The article, "Stuyvesant High School of Science," written by Peter Slatin, leads me to wonder if that assumption is indeed true.

I met Mr. Slatin when he was invited to tour our building. I spent some time with him explaining the involvement of the Stuyvesant Coalition, of which I am a member. He seemed singularly uninterested in how the building was planned or for that matter how it functions. In reading his article, I wonder if he and I see the same building. I know we do not have the same agenda. Mine was, and is, to have planned and built (in collaboration with the architects) the best building that could be constructed within the constraints of the site, the regulations of the Board of Education, and Battery Park City. Mr. Slatin's agenda seems to be to make a name for himself by being negative, flip, self-righteous, and misinformed, not uncommon traits for journalists.

I grant you that everyone is entitled to his or her opinion, but this article strikes me as being unnecessarily mean spirited.
in the building. The center will also
contain New York State offices, part
of the state’s Global New York
Program, an investment initiative
to promote trade with Africa, Latin
America, and the Caribbean. The
center, says Norman, “ought to be a
catalytic ingredient on 125th Street.”
Construction should start this fall
and take two years.

Out and About
Deborah Berke Architect, until
recently of Berke & McWhorter,
years ago got a commission to design the
interiors for Harper’s Bazaar. The
project for the elegantly redesigned
magazine involves 20,000 square
feet on two floors at 1700 Broadway.
Berke got the job when Fabien
Baron, Bazaar’s creative director,
hired her to renovate his apartment,
and then suggested her to editor Liz
Tilberis. With her former partner,
Carey McWhorter, Deborah Berke
has received acclaim for the design of
Industria Superstudio, the very
spare, no-nonsense, converted
garage in the West Village that is
now the fashionable place to shoot
and be shot (for photos)....In Upper
Manhattan’s Bradhurst section at
152nd Street and Frederick Douglass
Boulevard, a new residential
building is under construction with
69 apartments for homeless and
low-income families. Designed by
Geoffrey Freeman Associates
with Morgan Architectural
Design, the housing includes 10,000
square feet of commercial space,
parking, and a community center.
An existing building next door is
also being renovated to contain 24
apartments for the homeless and
low-income groups. The complex,
named after Reverend Dr. John J.
Sass, has been financed by the New
York State Housing Finance Agency
and is being developed by the New
York Urban Coalition in Joint
venture with Procida Construction
Co....Eli Atittia Architects won the
competition for Shalom Center, a
mixed-use project in Tel Aviv that is
2.7 million square feet — “the
largest commercial project in Israel
to date,” according to the firm.
Three office/apartment towers,
about 35 stories each, are arranged
not too casually around a shopping
mall and public gardens. The
cement and sky-blue reflective
glass of the geometrical shafts is
intended to defer to the Interna
tional Style tradition that forms a
strong part of Tel Aviv’s architec
tural heritage, but it could be
argued, as well, that the buildings
belong to the Late Modernist phase
of architecture for which the U.S. is
known....Don Smith, who until
recently was managing partner of
SOM in New York, has retired and
is joining up with Dan
Friedman in a new firm called
CORE
Environmental in
Hartford,
Connecticut.
Meanwhile, back at
SOM, Marilyn Taylor has been
made the managing partner.

Change of Name
We’re not talking just about
changing a firm name because of
arriving or departing partners.
We’re talking about changing the
firm name as the result of an
architect changing his own name.
It may sound peculiar, but Peter
Michael Marino recently legally
became Peter Michael Marron.
You may ask why? Because of the
other Peter Marino, who is also an
architect. “It just got to be too
confusing,” says Peter Marron.
“Even the IRS got us mixed up.”
To make it worse, (the other) Peter
Marino is quite well known for
designing and renovating buildings
such as the new Barney’s in
construction on Madison Avenue,
and for lavish residential interiors
that are published in the ultra-smart
decorating magazines, as well as
shops, offices, etc. When Peter
Marren, as Peter Michael Marino,
designed the Norma Kamali store
on West 56th Street, which was
published all over the place, he soon
found out everyone thought it was
by the other Peter. “The confusion
became particularly awkward,” he
says, “when we designed the lobby
and renovated the facade for the
Architects & Designers Building at
150 East 58th Street, which was
published over the place, the
other Peter Marino has his office.”
After trying to work it out under the
name P. Michael Marino, Marran
finally threw in the towel. How did
he pick “Marren”? “I wanted the
same number of letters, and to keep
the rhythm of the previous name,”
he replies. The firm is now called
Marren and Newman Architects,
with Margaret Newman as the other
principal. The office is currently
designing an orthopedic medical
center in Long Island, and a 35,000-
square-foot showroom for Cygne
Design at 1372 Broadway. So don’t
even think it was designed by Peter
Marino....

Big Jim and the
Americans
by Suzanne Stephens
“The American Tribute to Sir James
Stirling,” masterfully conducted by
Stirling’s longtime friend and
colleague Richard Meier, took place
on the morning of November 19 in
the light-filled rotunda of the
Guggenheim Museum. It was an
appropriately magisterial occasion.
In attendance were not only Mrs.
Stirling and the two daughters, but
also partner Michael Wilford,
Stirling’s friend and supporter Coín
Rowe, and a number of New York’s
architectural community.

Considering that 17 speakers
paid tribute, including the event’s
ten “sponsors,” the affair proceeded
expeditiously and smoothly. (Much
of the credit should go to Meier’s
organizational skills, which
evidently included a fair amount of
pre-production browbeating of the
speakers about time limits.)

With all that said, can we talk?
The ten sponsors included Meier,
Philip Johnson, Paul Rudolph,
Cesar Pelli, Harry Cobb, Charles
Gwathmey, Peter Eisenman,
Michael Graves, Jaquelin Robert,
and Robert Stern — ten well-
known Americans, who incidentally
form a core group that has for years
met over black-tie dinners at the
Century Association. In fact, it was
at one such August occasion that
they learned about Stirling’s
untimely death while he was re-
covering from surgery on June 25,
whence came the idea for the
American tribute.

Sponsors justifiably might want
to speak at such an occasion, since it
meant forking over some money for the event (including a post-memorial lunch, natch, at the Century). But memorial services being what they are, usually only very close friends of the deceased speak. While a good many sponsors were close to Stirling (including Rudolph and Pelli, who as deans at Yale had been instrumental in Stirling's teaching there), others had not been necessarily closer or more intimate than some of those sitting quietly in the audience. Thus the tendency could be detected among certain speakers to prove their unique rapport with Sir James by way of enlightening human interest stories. The trouble with such stories is they get to sound a little competitive. After the reminiscences that one American architect met

Mary Stirling  James Stirling

Stirling in nineteen-ought-eight under the most unusual and revealing circumstances, you expected the next one to stand up and say, "Well, I bore his child." In the face of these men claiming such, the comments by his daughter Kate, an architect with Koetter Kim in U)ndon and by way of enlightening human interest stories. The trouble with such stories is they get to sound a little competitive. After the reminiscences that one American architect met

Kate and Sophie Stirling

each of the sponsors thought about Stirling's oeuvre and the influence (or lack thereof) of his architecture on their own efforts. Both Johnson and Stera did focus on the architecture in their brief speeches, but because of the balance of others' comments, the architecture was shortchanged. If Stirling had only designed the houses he built, his contribution to the creation of great works of built architecture would be considerable. They showed the depth of his knowledge and sensitivity to the making of architecture, to its materials, its mass, its form, its plan, its circulation. They showed the power of his transformative genius with the full range of architectural vocabulary, whether it belonged to a modern, industrial vernacular or traditional, classical language.

Indeed Stuttgart, inside and out, embodies the story of architecture on so many levels and from so many perspectives.

Even Stirling's less accomplished buildings had a vibrancy and strength in honoring, but not being shackled by, invention or tradition. If some of his more experimental designs didn't quite come off, they were instructive and fascinating: they contained the seeds of greatness that linked us to architecture's past and to its future. Everyone dies too young, and like Louis Kahn, Stirling really did die too young. He had at least two more great buildings in him and a dozen more that could still teach us something.

Bard Awards Presented

The 1992 Bard Awards, sponsored by the City Club of New York, were presented November 24 in the Board of Estimate room of City Hall. This year's awards, co-chaired by Raquel Ramati and Lester Korzelius, proved to be diverse in range. Some were predictable, others not necessarily so. Honor awards included the Winter Garden at the World Financial Center by Cesar Pelli & Associates; Transitional Housing for the Homeless on eleven sites in four New York boroughs by SOM; the Ellis Island Main Building by Beyer Blinder Belle; H.E.L.P. Homes permanent housing in Brooklyn by Cooper Robertson & Partners; the Seamen's Church Institute by James Stewart Polshek and Partners, and Bethelite Institutional Baptist Church by Theo David & Associates. Citations were given for Hostos Community College Allied Health Complex by Voorsanger & Associates; Two Times Square by Mayers & Schiff Associates; Ballplayers Refresh­ment Stand by Buttrick White & Burnis; and Carnegie Hall Tower by Cesar Pelli & Associates. Special awards were given to Joan Davidson and Senator Daniel Moynihan for their various efforts in historic preservation, environmental protection and neighborhood improvement, and the sponsorship of quality architecture on local and state levels. In presenting the awards, the jury—composed of Lew Davis, Gordon Davis, Sally Goodgold, Hugh Hardy, Suzanne Stephens, and Mortimer Zuckerman—had some comments to make. About Two Times Square, Hugh Hardy asked, "Can a ten-story bottle of Coke be architecture? Answer: yes, if it's on Times Square." About the Bethelite Institutional Baptist Church, Gordon Davis observed that it has "a rising new facade that seems to strut in praise and a new roof that ascends like hands raised in joyful prayer." Lew Davis joked that he was getting tired of giving awards to John Belle for Ellis Island, "and not once has he given one to me." He also said, "This museum facility expresses the relationship and the tension between the old and the new, and it suggests through architectural means that liminal state experienced during the facility's heyday."

OBITUARY

Mark Lowe Fisher, a senior project architect with James Stewart Polshek and Partners, died of AIDS-related illness on October 29. Fisher, whom Polshek calls a "brilliant" architect, worked on a number of well-known office projects after joining the firm in 1987. They include the Home of the National Inventors Hall of Fame in Akron, Ohio, the Brooklyn Museum expansion, and the Clarke County Civic Center in Athens, Georgia.
Ferry Terminal model, south elevation, winning scheme by Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates and Anderson/Schwartz

by Suzanne Stephens

Last month was earth-shattering in the history of competitions for New York City buildings. Both the results of the Whitehall Ferry Terminal competition in Lower Manhattan and the Police Training Academy in the Bronx were announced. In both cases the competitions were revived from the remains of previously aborted attempts at competitions, and in both cases the winners and the runners-up are known names with reputations for design. In fact, in the two cases many were the same names....

The Ferry Terminal

As anyone who hasn't been camping in Outer Mongolia through the late fall knows, Venturi, Scott Brown and Anderson/Schwartz won the Whitehall Ferry Terminal invited competition on November 6, with a scheme that includes a 120-foot-diameter (or ten-story high) clock downtown at South and Whitehall streets, facing the harbor. Already their scheme is controversial. The clock is too big. More about that later. Meanwhile, the runners-up were James Stewart Polshek and Partners, Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, Rafael Vinoly Architects, Skidmore Owings & Merrill, and Aldo Rossi Studio di Architettura with Anschutz, Christidis and Lauster. Sponsored by the city's Economic Development Corporation, the two-stage, RFQ and short-list competition attracted a notable roster of entrants.

Now the question is, How was the scheme chosen? First, it was done by a rather large jury that was chaired by Arthur Levitt Jr., chair of the EDC, and included MAS's Kent Barwick; Robert Campbell, the architecture critic for the Boston Globe; Maureen Cogan, chair of Art and Auction magazine; deputy mayor for planning and development Barbara Fife; Mildred Friedman, the exhibition consultant; Cesar Belli; Thomas Krens of the Guggenheim; commissioner of New York's DOT, Lucius Riccio; commissioner of New York City's Department of Buildings and director of the Mayor's Office of Construction, Rudolph Rinaldi; chair of the City Planning Commission, Richard Schaffer; chair of environmental design at Parsons, Susana Torre; and Carl Weisbrod, president of the EDC. Bill Lacey was the competition advisor. The interesting twist was the decision for the judging not to be anonymous. Indeed, the six finalists presented their schemes in person to the jury and had their proposals on view in a public exhibition during this period.

Considering the range of interests and professions of these representatives and the diversity of the architectural responses to the program, it is surprising to hear the jury's decision was unanimous. But one source, who asked not to be identified, explained that one of the considerations was how to accommodate the complex loading and unloading of people from two levels of the ferry during peak traffic hours. Many entrants had not fully addressed this issue, and the Venturi, Scott Brown and Anderson/Schwartz scheme at least showed the "promise of resolving it." A more general concern was the "homogenization of public space" that has taken place in the U.S., where so many different types of buildings look just alike. The jury, the source noted, seemed to be looking for the "unique experience." As Levitt told the New York Times, it should be "a signature...another landmark."

With regards to the remarked-upon, high nostalgia quotient in the Venturi, Scott Brown and Anderson/Schwartz scheme, the feeling seemed to be that all the proposals were nostalgic about something — whether it was a nineteenth-century train station, a 1930s airport, or even a 1950s bus station.

The jury's unanimity evidently did not mean there weren't a lot of favorites among the other entrants. Rossi's proposal was thought by at least one juror to...
have been a more unique public building, and Polshek's a more successful urban space. Since the six finalists had their proposals on display during this time, the interested public had its preferences, too: The head of the Bowling Green Association, Arthur Piccolo, mounted an energetic campaign for the Skidmore Owings & Merrill design and has since been vocal as an anti-clock partisan; and a poll by the Staten Island Advocate came out in favor of the Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer proposal.

The $112 million dollar terminal, expected to be completed by 1998, is being sponsored by the Transportation Department as well as EDC. Although the ferry building was originally to be part of the South Ferry Plaza — a competition won by Fox & Fowle and Frank Williams in 1986, which included a high-rise — the winning proposal went out with the 1980s. But a fire in 1981 has made it imperative to replace the scuzzy, 1950s zero-architecture ferry building. Venturi's green metal and green-tinted glass building, with its 125-foot-high barrel-vaulted waiting room plus restaurant, has to be a more pleasurable and memorable place than the existing one. On the water side, not only is there the clock, but the panels are painted with a full-scale rendering of the Beaux-Arts facade of the Battery Maritime Building next door — a bow to the contextualism that existed up until 1954, when the ferry building was renovated into banality.

As far as all the controversy goes, the answer will be clearest when the thing is built. The actual design and execution of the clock face (how it is lit, etc.) could well matter more than its size. The scale does matter, of course, and it might prove to be one that would work better 50 stories up. The very idea of it seems to frazzle the nerves of architects and lay public alike. Too bad they never get so exercised about new, 70-story, banal high-rises. As for the rest of the building, that too depends on materials, details, and execution.

Whether the Grand Central–terminal type is more appropriate for a ferry terminal than one of the other edgier designs is also open to question. It is, after all, a terminal for ferries — a form of transportation used as far back as the River Styx. Granted, ferries are now driven by engines, but they are not airplanes or manned spaceships. Why should this terminal express futuristic modes of transportation when it is not meant to accommodate them (at least now)? More important, really, is the quality of the space and the place for pedestrians. If the team of Venturi, Scott Brown and Anderson/Schwartz can survive all the threats to the creation of a great space between now and 1998, then we can see what they offer.

**Police Academy**

The Police Academy competition — first announced in November 1989 and then put on hold shortly thereafter — was revived this year, for a site in the Bronx on part of the Old Penn Central Mott Haven train yard, which is depressed some 25 feet below street level on the Grand Concourse at 153rd Street. Winner and runners-up were announced on November 18, with the joint venture of Ellerbe Becket and Michael Fieldman and Partners taking first place. Design principal for Ellerbe Becket is Peter Pran; Michael Fieldman is the architect for the Police Academy model, winning scheme by Ellerbe Becket with Michael Fieldman.

Like the ferry terminal competition, the process involved a two-stage RFQ and short-list selection. The short-list, it should be noted, was kept from the first go-round, and the jury evaluation was anonymous. Runners-up included Richard Dattner and Associates in second place, although initially the submission included Davis Brody & Associates; Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates with the Grad Partnership; and Anderson/Schwartz Architects in third place; and an honorable mention going to Rafael Vinoly Architects.

The jury that selected the schemes was composed of architects and city officials, with architect Mark Hewitt as the competition advisor. The design professionals included Stan Eckstut, of Ehrenkrantz and Eckstut, who was the chair of the jury; along with Linda Jewell, chair of the department of landscape architecture at U.C. Berkeley; James Ingo Freed, of Pel Cobb Freed and Partners; and James Doman Jr., of Doman & Associates. City officials were deputy mayor Barbara Fife; City Planning chair Richard Schaffer; General Services commissioner Kenneth Knuckles; and deputy police commissioner for management and budget Joseph Wuensch.

According to one of those involved in the selection process for the invited competition, the jury was most impressed with the winning scheme because it seemed to be a "beacon" and a building that would have a "high profile" in the neighborhood. The final decision was made between the more traditionally-designed proposal by Dattner and the zootier, transparent form from Ellerbe Becket/Michael Fieldman. The latter won because the jury felt the scheme would better enliven the Bronx with a sense of newness. "Not only did it have a cutting edge aesthetic, but it solved the program [to train 2,600 police officers] brilliantly," reported the observer. Other schemes also impressed the jurors, it is said. The Vinoly part, which called for putting a running

**Police Academy**

The Ferry Terminal and the Police Academy competitions have turned up winning schemes that belong to distinct architectural camps. Neither designs are without detractors; both have supporters (in addition to the juries). The models tell a lot, except what might happen on the road to realization.
track on the roof of the 475,000-square-foot building, was considered technically brilliant, "but such a megastructure might have bankrupted the city." The Ellerbe Becket/Michael Fieldman scheme had buildability and didn't seem as if it would "threaten anybody," According to the observer, this was not a "wild and crazy jury." Construction for the $230 million, steel-frame, glass- and precast panel-clad building is expected to begin in the spring of 1996 and be completed in late 1998.

It is fairly easy to agree with the scheme's selection for several reasons. Its sculptured form addresses the corner site dynamically and smoothly, while tucking a number of different programmatic elements in the rear. The transparency of its glazed elevations — and particularly the corners — suggests a ready accessibility of the structure in a building type that sounds so forbidding. For this reason, the Dattner scheme — which evokes an armory, looks familiar, and fits in with a building typology of similar (military) uses in New York — could be argued to be too stalwart and fortress-like for the surrounding community. The politically-correct decision (admittedly this does sound jaded) was a more transparent building such as the Ellerbe Becket/Fieldman scheme that says, "This is what we do; get to know us." Now, will it work? Symbolically and aesthetically it is another wait-and-see situation. There are a lot of compromises that could kill the vision between now and the time of the building's completion. Also, even more than with the ferry terminal, such an evanescent and smoothly contoured structure with intricate elevations demands excellent construction and materials that look impeccably joined and immaculately maintained. It didn’t happen with the last academy training center (on East 20th Street in Manhattan). Will it happen here? Stay tuned.

**A Word About Competitions**

**Interview with Bernard Tschumi**

Oculus: What was the first competition you won and the most recent one?

Bernard Tschumi: The Parc de la Villette in Paris in 1983 was the first, and the competition for Le Fresnoy [National Center of Contemporary Arts, Tourcoing, France] was the most recent. That happened last February.

Oculus: How many have you entered?

BT: My office has entered 16, and won four. After La Villette, we came in second or third on every one we did. Some we knew we were not going to win for various political reasons, but some we naturally hoped to get.

Oculus: Do you think it’s worth the time and effort?

BT: Yes, in the larger picture the quality of architecture is vastly improved in most cases. And for younger architects it is the only way to get large-scale work (although some disagree that the young should get it).}

Oculus: Did you enter the Ferry Terminal and the Police Academy competitions?

BT: We weren’t asked. I have been living here for 15 years and have never been invited to enter one, although I am regularly invited to enter competitions in Japan and Europe.

Oculus: What about the Nara Convention Hall competition in Japan, which was won by Arata Isozaki? It was an open competition in the first phase (when 2,918 applicants signed up), and then five teams (including Scott Marble/Karen Fairbanks and Robert Livesey from the U.S.) were selected to compete against five invited "names," which included Isozaki, Tadao Ando, Hans Hollein, Mario Botto, and Christian de Portzamparc.

BT: We had just done a competition and were not interested. The Nara competition provided a chance for a debate, and it was great to have it at MoMA in November. Competitions offer an opportunity to debate attitudes toward architecture. They should be as public as the process at Nara was. Everyone knew what was going on, who was on the jury, who was competing, etc. With the New York City competitions, none of the jury members were announced in the papers ahead of time, and the juries did not necessarily have the most distinguished architects of the profession on them. You should have the majority of jurors be architects of international distinction. The Nara competition had James Stirling, Richard Meier, Kisho Kurokawa, Kazuo Shinohara, and Hiroshi Hara, among others. And you should want to invite younger firms to participate.
The AIA New York Chapter Design Awards Program is open to all registered architects practicing in New York City offices. Submission of work completed after January 1, 1989, is welcome in the following categories: Distinguished Architecture; Interior Architecture; Architecture Projects; and Health Care, a special category for 1993. All work will be reviewed by a unified jury consisting of W.G. Clark, Ralph Hawkins, Teodore Gonzalez de Leon, Thom Mayne, Adele Santos, and Brigitte Shim. Health Care entries will receive a technical review by Mr. Hawkins prior to review by the full jury.

Entry forms are due in our old offices at 457 Madison Avenue by 5 pm on January 22, 1993.

Submission Binders are due in our new offices at 200 Lexington Avenue by 5 pm on February 2, 1993.

Awards will be announced in conjunction with a panel discussion by the jurors sponsored by the Dialogue Committee. This event is scheduled for 6 pm, February 5, 1993, at 200 Lexington Avenue. There will be an admission charge of $10 ($5 for Chapter members and students with I.D.). For reservations or information, please contact Judy Rowe at (212)838-9670 or by fax at (212)754-6358.

ENTRY FORM

1993 DESIGN AWARDS ANNUAL PROGRAM
AIA New York Chapter
457 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022

First submission $100
Additional submissions $80 each

Please mail registration numbers to:

Name

Firm

Address

City/State/Zip

Phone#

I/We plan to submit ________ entries.

Enclosed is our check for ________ to cover the entry fee(s).

I/We understand that the final submission deadline is 5 pm, Monday, February 2, 1993.
Happy New Year!

AIA New York Chapter

January 1993

6
Wednesday
SEMINAR

26
Tuesday
EVENT
Preservationist Night. Sponsored by OLGAD. 8:00 pm. Gay and Lesbian Community Services Center, 208 W. 13th St. 475-7652.

27
Wednesday
SEMINAR
Water Penetration is Preventable. Sponsored by Glen-Gery. 11:30 am. Glen-Gery Brickwork Design Center, 211 E. 49th St. Reservations 319-5577.

28
Thursday
TOUR
The City and Surroundings: Afternoon at the Carlyle. Sponsored by the 92nd St. Y. 3:00 pm. 996-1100. $40.

13
Wednesday
PROGRAM
Strategic Staffing Options. Given by Tom Edwards. Sponsored by the Society of Architectural Administrators. 6:00 pm. 1251 Ave. of the Americas, 45th Floor. Reservations 489-4747. $15 ($10 AIA members).

TOUR
The City and Surroundings: Inside the Rainbow Room. Sponsored by the 92nd St. Y. 3:00 pm. 996-1100. $20.

DEADLINES

JANUARY 11
Application deadline for the Brick in Architecture Awards Competition. Contact the American Institute of Architects awards department or the Brick Institute of America.

JANUARY 15
Submission deadline for the Early Education Excellence in Design slide program. Contact the AIA Early Education Slide Program, 1735 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20006-5292.

JANUARY 22

JANUARY 30

CONTINUING EXHIBITIONS


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Tuesday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AIA NEW YORK CHAPTER MEETING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Facilities Committee, 4:30 pm. The Urban Center, 457 Madison Ave. 838-9670.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Saturday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LECTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Ardennes Landscape</em> by David R. Coffin, sponsored by the Metropolitan Museum of Art. 4:00 pm. 1000 Fifth Avenue. 570-3849. $10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Wednesday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PROGRAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Computer-Aided Practice: The Design Industry in the Twenty-first Century</em>, given by Jerry Laisseria, sponsored by the Society of Architectural Administrators. 6:00 pm. 1251 Ave. of the Americas, 45th Floor. Reservations 489-4747. $15 ($10 AIA members).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Thursday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LECTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Shape of the City: Open Spaces</em>, Elizabeth Barlow Rogers, William H. Whyte, and James Wines with Paul Goldberger. Sponsored by the 92nd St. Y. 8:00 pm. 1395 Lexington Ave. 996-1100. $16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Friday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LECTURE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban Center Books' Top 10
As of November 24, 1992

2. Stanford White's New York, David Ciarrard Diwe (Doubleday, cloth, $45.00).
4. Cyberspace, Michael Benedikt (MIT Press, cloth $27.50, paper $15.95).
8. Edge City: Life on the New Frontier, Joel Garreau (Doubleday/Anchor Books, paper, $12.00).

Rizzoli Bookstores' Top 10
As of November 19, 1992

1. Spanish Splendor: Palaces, Castles, and Country Houses, Juan Jose Junquera y Matos, photos by Roberto Schezen (Rizzoli, cloth, $125.00).
2. Mother's House: The Evolution of Vanna Venturi's House in Chestnut Hill, (Rizzoli, cloth $50.00, paper $35.00).
3. The Wright Style, Carla Lind (Simon & Schuster, cloth, $50.00).
4. Barn, Eric Enderby, Alexander Greenwood, and David Larkin (Houghton Mifflin, cloth, $50.00).
5. Ethnic Interiors, Dinah Hall (Rizzoli, cloth, $37.50).
7. Morocco, Landt Dennis (Clarkson Potter, cloth, $45.00).
8. Period Finishes and Effects, Judith and Martin Miller (Rizzoli, cloth, $37.50).
9. Morphosis: Buildings and Projects, Peter Cook and George Rand (Rizzoli, cloth $50.00, paper $35.00).

Late Calendar Entry:

Tuesday
January 19
AIA NEW YORK CHAPTER EVENT
The Americans with Disabilities Act: A Review of the First Year. Sponsored by the AIA New York Chapter Building Codes Committee. Panelists will be Katherine Collins, the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey; Terrence Monkley, Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association; and Robert Marine, John Ellis and Associates. 6:00 pm, 200 Lexington Avenue, First Floor. 838-9670. $10 ($12 non-members).
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SCOPE
Peter Slatin

Waterfront Plan
Developers and real-estate "machers" seem so frustrated by new city zoning proposals that they are ready to take a dive off their prime-view, waterfront high-rises and sink in the offshore soil of the underwater land transfer rights they are afraid of losing. They are claiming that these and other proposed zoning changes for waterfront development — such as new height and density requirements, as well as mandates for public access and views to the waterfronts — will bring a slew of regulations that will effectively sandbag profitable residential development.

The object of their disgruntlement was unveiled on a sweltering August day from a pier near the South Street Seaport. With their backs to the river but their sights straining to take in the entire city, Mayor David Dinkins and City Planning commissioner Richard Schaffer released New York City’s Comprehensive Waterfront Plan: Reclaiming the City’s Edge (Oculus, October 1992, p. 10). Titled a "discussion document" by the Department of City Planning, the plan lays out a blueprint for reshaping, rezoning, and regulating the city’s 578 miles of waterfront to spur both development and conservation efforts. Following a series of public meetings that began in the fall, the Department will begin taking the document through the ULURP process early this year.

While architects and developers have been examining the report’s zoning provisions and its proposals for shaping waterfront property and public spaces, less attention has been paid to the one component of the plan that literally sets the stage for the action to follow. This concerns water treatment and wetlands conservation. New York City is in the early stages of a $5.6 billion, 15-year clean-up effort for its sewage treatment plants and waterways. Provisions include upgrading 14 sewage treatment plants, alleviating combined sewage and storm outflow that overwhems stagnant water bodies such as Flushing Bay, initiating programs to catch the thousands of pounds of solid debris that float into the waterways each month, and carrying out landfill enclosure programs to prevent hazardous runoff.

These programs are being spurred by the Department of Environmental Protection’s need to comply with the federal government’s Clean Air Act. Clean water, says Douglas Wehrl, deputy director of DCP’s division of waterfront and open space, is a stimulus to waterfront development, which is why the federal government has allocated monies nationally for cleaner harbors that will result in cleaner beaches and other waterfront recreation areas attractive to developers. (The measures also constitute an upgrading of the state’s Coastal Management Program, adopted by the city in 1982. Ironically, says Wehrl, the state, which is now revamping those guidelines, is using the four divisions in the city’s plan — natural, working, public, and redevelopment waterfronts — as a model.)

Wehrl says this message is implied throughout the plan, which makes every attempt to show that development and preservation are not mutually exclusive for New York’s waterways. He notes that the plan works with the "fortuitous relationship between natural and built-up areas" along the city’s waterfront. According to Ron Hine, director of the Coalition for a Better Waterfront, a Hoboken, New Jersey, advocacy group that has carefully studied the New York plan, "They have done a lot to preserve environmentally sensitive areas."

Wehrl is quick to add that the plan’s environmental sensitivity should not keep out industrial and maritime uses. "The plan strongly wants to protect the port’s maritime and industrial uses. There is no intent to gentrify the waterfront, because the city’s economic health is dependent on maritime commerce," says Wehrl.

John Shapiro, a planner with Abeles Phillips Preiss & Shapiro, which submitted recommendations for some aspects of the plan in the mid-1980s, agrees, especially with the city’s promotion of quasi-industrial activities such as marinas and boat-repair facilities.

But back to the course of developer heebie-jeebies. The plan’s initiatives to preserve a natural and working waterfront along with a public and residential waterfront provide the basis of a proposed change in the city’s 1961 Zoning Resolution. Geared to a general-use, citywide format, the plan divides the waterfront into 22 study areas, or "reaches," which, says Shapiro, "defines the future debate on a site-by-site basis, to good purpose."

Along with setting the course for a new chapter to the Zoning Resolution, the DCP wants the plan to provide a context for map changes along the waterfront. These could occur as developers make proposals for various sites, says Wehrl, or "the city could make a determination to try to go forward with some of these itself" — one of the bargaining chips the city will hold as it confronts unhappy real estate interest groups that are already expressing strong disappointment with the public access, design, and density proposals in the plan. "The city should do environmental analysis," says Joseph Rose of the Citizens Housing and Planning Council. The comprehensive
nature of the proposal serves as a "disincentive" for developers interested in small parcels, by placing the burden of the environmental impact review on the individuals.

One of the critical areas revolves around height and bulk restrictions for waterfront development. For example, current zoning allows buildings in R6 districts (with a maximum FAR of 2.43) to go as high as 15 stories. While these buildings are not typical, since most are three to twelve stories and require large lots, they can exist and only cover 16 percent of the lot. Under new height factor regulations, shorter buildings with larger floorplates would be the zoned alternative, so that buildings using 97 percent of the FAR would be about nine stories high and cover 26 percent of the lot.

Michael Slattery, senior vice president of the Real Estate Board of New York, is more emphatic about the dangers and the "radical departure" from past zoning he sees in the proposal. Along with the loss of underwater transfer rights, Slattery decries what he calls "the imposition of mandatory public access to private property, and the limited number of development sites on the waterfront coupled with stringent requirements for limiting building height and bulk configuration."

While Slattery lauds the plan's intentions of transforming former manufacturing sites to "more contemporary uses," he says that these height and bulk requirements "raise questions about whether development will be feasible," because, he argues, they will remove the traditional luxe appeal of the waterfront towers with views. "The city's got to back up and take a look at the proposed zoning, and come up with building forms or regulations that recognize the need to have views of the water, and which are economically efficient." He adds that waterfront development is typically more expensive due to environmental and access issues, and that the new regulations should allow for form and density factors that can "mitigate the economic impacts associated with waterfront development and mandatory access." These proposed zoning limitations, he says, "will not generate a sufficient return or marketability to support those added costs."

"There's a presumption in planning and development circles that waterfront equals value for housing," responds John Shapiro, "In luxury neighborhoods, waterfront views can add 100 percent to unit values. But in less expensive neighborhoods, the value added could be as little as six percent." In those cases — the majority — "the waterfront amenity doesn't do much." Shapiro also says that the bulk and view provisions of the plan that developers find so onerous because they cut down the number of premium apartments at the waterfront, while not universally applicable, should create a residential path to what was once a forbidden zone, thus actually expanding the "waterfront" to blocks moving away from it. That expansion then enhances the value of the neighborhood, rather than placing all the value in the shorefront buildings.

As might be expected, provisions the developers find too stringent are insufficient for others. The Parks Council, which has been campaigning for a comprehensive waterfront plan for two decades, has lauded the increased public access proposals but suggested specific modifications at an October public hearing. These included wider esplanades for high density zones than the 25-foot minimum esplanades the plan specifies, as well as safeguards that zoning lots for private developments be physically and visually accessible to the public. "Overall," said board member Jeanette Bamford, "the proposed plan is a major step to a vital, diverse, accessible waterfront."

The process of folding the waterfront plan into the Zoning Resolution is likely to remain fractious. Along with issues such as new ferry service to some of the large developments planned in the outer boroughs (such as Hunter's Point), there are also rail-cargo links under consideration. In addition, community boards can be expected to be very much part of the fray. The Brooklyn Borough President is expected to appoint a planning agent to assist Community Board 1, encompassing Greenpoint and Williamsburg, in developing a local comprehensive waterfront plan. That plan is part of a 197A plan the community board is developing, one of several ongoing around the city.

If these community-based plans pass the City Council, says Doug Wehrle, they will take precedence over the city's plan which, he adds, "aligns itself with much of the work being done throughout the city....In order for this new zoning to achieve its purpose, it has to be complicated, because the current Zoning Resolution never dealt with the waterfront," says John Shapiro. "So by definition, it has to be Rube Goldberg-like. But because they've given it so much thought, it is probably going to become one of the better sections of the resolution."

Waterfront Plan: Learning from New Jersey

by Craig Whitaker

The Department of City Planning has finally produced New York City's Comprehensive Waterfront Plan, a document that addresses the entire 578 miles of city shoreline. The idea was first suggested almost 25 years ago, but no matter, it is finally here, and for that we should be grateful. The plan has many obvious goals. It seeks to protect natural areas and waterfront jobs. It shows we will always need places to transfer our garbage and make other necessary connections between land and water.

However, when the Department does some actual physical planning — when it suggests how to treat new development areas, particularly residential ones — it falls down badly. Where possible, the Department has suggested a 25-foot-wide public walkway. However, it has "forgotten"
energy was now focused on keeping the public out of the backyards. Roc Harbor in North Bergen has a sign on an overgrown and weed-filled path saying, “Notice! Public Walk, Proceed at Your Own Risk.” Riva Point, a residential pier project in Weehawken, has a public park down the middle of the pier with gates at the front end that would do credit to the security system at Buckingham Palace. Several walkways are now in litigation, others are closed off completely from the public, and none seem open or inviting.

It is a remarkably simple notion, yet one missed time and again by designers and planners. Front doors are where we meet the mailman, wait for a taxi, and where we put most of our architecture. Back doors are where we put the trash, have family get-togethers, and read the Sunday paper. Front doors are public, and back doors are private.

Front doors create life, activity, and security because they face a street. Therefore, if one wants to increase activity and security at the waterfront by having more front doors, it means creating more streets. Specifically, it means putting a street between the front doors and a waterfront walkway.

On reflection, an intervening street is the common denominator for most of the world’s great waterfronts. The typical section for each has front doors on one side of the street and the waterfront on the other. This is true on Chicago’s lakefront, at the Copacabana in Rio de Janeiro, and on Riverside Drive in New York. The street can be quite narrow, as it is on Miami’s South Beach or at the Vieux Port of Marseilles, but it is always vehicular.

There are exceptions that prove the rule. The riverwalk in San Antonio, at one level below grade, has front doors opening directly onto walkways on both sides of the river. No street is necessary because there is a second front door to each building upstairs at street level. The Brooklyn Heights promenade has no street adjoining it, but the walkway, built with highway dollars, is half a level above the adjoining backyards.

More frequently, as at Brighton Beach or Atlantic City, the absence of a street along the water means perpendicular cul-de-sac streets ending up at trash containers for businesses on the boardwalk that have no street access. It also means long stretches of uninteresting waterfront, populated with buildings that have front doors on vehicular streets, where the owners make every effort to keep the public from gaining access to the buildings from the boardwalk.

Jane Jacobs implicitly pointed out the strange irony about the need for streets in The Death and Life of Great American Cities (1961). She realized Greenwich Village was more interesting for pedestrians than other parts of New York because there were more corner stores. What she didn’t say was that more corners mean more streets, a conclusion borne out by Greenwich Village’s distinction of having the highest percentage of gross area dedicated to vehicular streets in Manhattan.

The only real difference between the Department of City Planning’s walkway and the one in New Jersey is that New Jersey’s is five feet wider. To avoid the problems caused by New Jersey’s walkway plan, the Department should map narrow vehicular streets behind the waterfront walkways now to save us all the headache of trying to solve the mess later.
own slides, Scully proceeded to explain why “the space between the buildings is not just a plaza but a directional corridor to the sea,” creating a pressure between land, sea, and sky, “a cosmic corridor.” The grove is a palpable object on the site, he said, sucked in by this pressure, and thus reveals the tension on the site. “By choking the grove with buildings, you cut off the land from the water....The court is like a bellows, and you are cutting off its air.”

Steven Holl pointed out that the approach to Kahn’s buildings is like music in three movements: “Going into the courtyard, the crunching of the gravel underfoot sets up the first movement. That is the last place you should put an addition. Keep the corridor open; don’t put a cork in the bottle.”

Until her visit to the Institute as a student, Susana Torre said she “didn’t know you could do that — relate the wind, sky, and the sea in that way. The building taught me something new.” She pleaded on behalf of all students of architecture, “Do not destroy this relationship. The narrative [of movement through the grove to the central court] is part of how we look at the building.”

Two general alternatives were suggested by architects and members of Kahn’s family. Scully and Anne Tyng, one of Kahn’s associates, recommended turning the buildings 90 degrees and pushing them farther apart to maintain a cohesive view of Kahn’s buildings. Said Tyng, “Someone who is not a great architect could do these buildings and still be okay.”

Ken Frampton commented that the Anshen and Allen proposal is too predictable and respectable. He, Carles Enric Vellhonrat, and Alexandra Tyng, Kahn’s daughter, suggested putting the addition somewhere else on the 27-acre site. Vellhonrat asked Salk to “keep the building as it is in our memory. If you must, find an architect who has a fear in God,” and build far away from Kahn’s design. Still, Salk was calmly adamant about the chosen location. “I want this building to be integral with the existing ones,” he said.

The audience’s response was a reminder that the importance of the Institute’s architecture to the architectural community is just as significant as the importance of the Institute’s research to the scientific community. Bart Vooranger noted that since so few of Kahn buildings were built, one should consider his work sacred and worthy of preservation in its pure form.

Esther Kahn provided the closing remarks: “At the Salk, the grove of trees was his green entrance.” She reflected on the buildings as “legendary, rising out of the mist, something one never forgets....If you go through these new buildings, you lose the uniqueness, and it will be an experience lost forever.”

On the responsibility of the architect, Kahn once said, “If the magic is lost, the most precious instinct that we possess goes with it.” With groundbreaking past — it took place after the meeting, on November 12 — and a completion date slated for 1995, one should list a trip to La Jolla as the number one resolution for the New Year.

Kathy Chia is a designer with Prentice & Chan, Ohlhausen.

In defense of Salk...

Interview with David Rinehart

by Kathy Chia

After he unveiled the design for the proposed addition to the Salk Institute, Dr. Jonas Salk found himself enmeshed in a highly charged controversy. A deluge of criticism has claimed it would destroy one of the ten great buildings of the twentieth century. Often implicit in these accusations is the suggestion that the architects of the addition are not “great architects” (“mediocre,” in fact) and that their misinterpretation of Kahn’s intentions and principles has resulted in a simplification involving mundane buildings. In a telephone interview one week after Dr. Salk’s visit to the League, project architect David Rinehart of Anshen and Allen responded candidly to the criticism.

Along with project architect Jack MacAllister and several members of the addition’s design team, Rinehart worked in Kahn’s office during the design and construction of the Institute, and MacAllister was the project architect for the original building. Rinehart and MacAllister eventually formed a partnership in San Diego and continued their relationship with Salk for over 20 years, the last three of which have been spent discussing and designing the proposed addition. Their stake is personal as well as professional. “We didn’t design this lightheartedly,” said Rinehart. “The Institute has great importance to me. When I need to contemplate, I go to the Institute.”

According to Rinehart, the importance of the grove site has been exaggerated, and perceptions of the project have been biased as a result. “The paved court is the place of conscience for the Institute,” not the grove, he stated. “Although people feel the grove is a part of it, it was not in the initial intention and has been misinterpreted as a sacred place on the site. He reminds skeptics that the building permit filing for the Institute’s master plan indicated the grove as one area for future expansion. According to Rinehart and MacAllister, building in the grove “was on Kahn’s mind at the time.” Soon after the completion of the Institute, Kahn said to MacAllister, “One day we will build the other facade,” implying the grove side.

Salk and Rinehart both argued that locating the project somewhere else on the 27-acre site would destroy the community of the Institute, and the cost of the resulting parking garage would be prohibitive. When asked about suggestions to turn the proposed buildings 90 degrees or to pull them farther apart, Rinehart said, “It just doesn’t work for the Institute....One of the most compelling parts of the project is the relationship to the court. Everything relates to it. The people housed in the addition must relate to it or they will feel like second-class citizens.” Rinehart believes that the placement of the addition accommodates this balance and allows everyone a connection to the court. A swath of space between the two proposed buildings still allows the visitor to enter the space before entering a building.

In responding to critics who advocate finding “a great architect” for the design, Rinehart says of himself and his design team, “The people who worked with Kahn, they are the ones who know. We feel very strongly that we have designed appropriate and responsible buildings that reflect Kahn’s teachings. The beauty and magic will be cherished, and the original buildings will remain untouched.

“The design does have the potential to change; it’s all part of the process,” he added. “We are constantly looking for ways of improving while designing around principles which have to do with all of Kahn’s work.”

A point of contention that Rinehart has with the critics is that they have skewed the perception of
how the Institute should expand and, more significantly, how Louis Kahn would have wanted the Institute to expand.

Perhaps this is where the real dilemma arises in a project that must satisfy a complex range of growing functional needs as well as maintain the "immeasurable," profound inner peace that makes it an architectural masterpiece. Kahn once said of his work, "I believe the concept should be equal to that of planting a seed in which the concept, that is, the result you

Salk has mentioned that this is a laboratory, not a public building in the same category as a museum. Yet even museums such as the Kimbell Art Museum and the Guggenheim have had to grapple with the same issue — and with the same lack of resolution.

Alas, the particular function of the building or the nature of the audience doesn't absolve the client of a certain responsibility to a work of great architecture. Such great works are so rare. For Jonas Salk, the situation is rather like that of a parent and sitting play in one's experience of the architecture itself. Too often it is assumed that the appreciation of the original object will not be diminished even if the space around it is encroached upon. Witness the Guggenheim and its new tower addition.

Kahn, as is so well known, thought about space and light and its alchemical reaction with form and material. He knew architecture had to be perceived kinesthetically by people on foot. In this case it means walking through a grove of eucalyptus trees, then being able to take in the Salk in one panoramic sweep of the eye, and having the sense of being drawn through its court toward the ocean and infinity. Kahn may have had his own ideas about adding onto the building later, but as stated in the Kimbell debate at the Architectural League in February 1990 (Oculus, September 1989, p. 10; March 1990, p. 5), when any building is initially given boundaries, its success depends on the gestalt shaped by those original boundaries and the surrounding landscape. People at the Architectural League debate on the Salk kept referring to the spiritual quality of the space. They meant the building and the space around it.

The third and perhaps the trickiest issue involves who should be the designated heir to carry on the great master's work posthumously — particularly with the difficult task of adding onto a masterpiece. When an architect seems to believe he deserves to be the one because he worked with the master, is that enough? When a mediocre addition is sited to destroy so flagrantly a sequence of spaces integral to the perception of a building, are we to take that claim seriously? For the same architect, Jack MacAllister of Anshen and Allen, to label as "embarrassing" the very reasonable compromise proposed by Anne Tyng, who also worked with Kahn, only demonstrates unconscionable hubris.

Anne Tyng's solution, shown here, seems the best compromise, since it allows Anshen and Allen's expansion to be built in the general vicinity of the firm's original proposal. It simply means turning the buildings 90 degrees and placing them on the sides of the grove, with an underground auditorium and lobby linking them, so that the experience of Kahn's architecture is not destroyed perceptually and kinesthetically. The Anshen and Allen proposal is not about "evolution", it is about erosion.
Two architects who have designed hotels for Disney told the Chapter recently how hospitals might take advantage of principles intrinsic to "hospitality" environments.

The Hospitality Approach for Hospitals

by Barbara A. Nadel, AIA

Is the use of American vernacular imagery an effective design approach for a resort hotel? What can health facility designers derive from a thematic interpretation of hospitality, American style? These were some of the issues addressed in a program entitled "Hotels, Hospitality, and Hospitals," sponsored by the Health Facilities Committee on November 24. Paul Whalen, AIA, partner, and Alexander Lamis, AIA, associate, of Robert A. M. Stern Architects, presented Disney hotels in Florida and France.

The concept of hotels, hospitality, and hospitals is no oxymoron. Health facilities are borrowing ideas from hotels to attract people who are shopping for a place to have their next surgery. Major medical institutions see the value in providing dramatic public spaces and attractive rooms. Disney's hotels and parks are a life-size collage of visual elements. It is an approach that, says Lamis, "provides a filtered version of history and culture, as told by a movie company."

The historical references for Disney's Yacht Club and Beach Club Resorts in Florida are based on Shingle Style New England resorts and the Stick Style of the New Jersey shore. The interiors of the hotels' public spaces skillfully reiterate the vocabulary established on the exterior. From the restaurant's nautical motif, inspired by the New York Yacht Club, to the polished brass handles on the guest rooms, there is an attention to thematic detail. Each room has a balcony that Lamis says "adds depth and three-dimensionality to the facade."

Where else but in Disney's world could you walk outside a New England hotel into a lush grouping of palm trees? "Contradictions are to be encouraged," says Lamis. The indoor-outdoor patios and arcaded spaces are often used as a transition in scale between major multi-story elements.

This attention to breaking down architectural elements to human scale is the underlying design theme uniting these four hotels. It is successfully employed here, and is perhaps the most universal message for health facility designers to note.

According to Whalen, the Newport Bay Club at Euro Disneyland is meant to be "scenographic and experiential." In true Disney fashion, all rooms face south toward a "forced-perspective lawn," which relates to a "skewed axis line for views of the hotel upon arrival." Euro Disneyland's Hotel Cheyenne is a cleverly disguised series of two-story concrete buildings transformed into a western town housing 5,000 people a night. In addition to using balconies and window rhythms to break the scale, explains Whalen, there is a "change in color and roof pitch so that one building looks like several small storefronts."

By using inexpensive, repetitive structures, outdoor public spaces, and visual elements, there is a small-town, human scale. It is, envisions Whalen, "an environment for people which is functional, pleasant to be in, and which people will want to come back to."

Will Disney enter the health care arena? Is a joint venture between Disney and Humana that far in the future? Tune in next week....

Barbara Nadel, AIA, is the former chair of the Health Facilities Committee. She has her own practice specializing in programming, planning, and design of health and institutional facilities.
Bright Marketing Ideas: Effective Business Planning
by Jean Copelin
“IT shall follow as the night the day...” is Shakespeare’s contribution to a discussion of what goes into a successful marketing plan; the most effective ones follow after solid business plans have been developed. For this reason — and to deal realistically with the current state of the economy — the Chapter’s Marketing and Public Relations Committee invited business consultant Richard Wurster, president of the LePartner Management Group, to a recent how-to session. These excerpts are some of what Wurster suggested:

• The process of business planning — logical and lacking in mystery — creates a road map that ideally should be drawn annually, checked monthly, and monitored quarterly.

• You do a business plan because there are so many variables — demographic, governmental, macro- and micro-economic changes. Too often plans are not set up for the same reason (“Why bother?”).

• Each business needs a corporate vision that is shared throughout the firm, and a mission statement that is empowering. Questions to answer include: Why are you in business? What makes you different from the rest? Where are you in the life cycle of your business (e.g., start-up, more mature, with a specialty)?

• In order to implement the marketing plan — along with the financial plan, the most important by-product of a business plan — you have to do a fair amount of research.

• Include in the marketing plan how you’re going to market, who’s going to help you, what segment you’re going after (including region and demographics), and some realistic goals for what you can achieve. You may need help with this analysis, which is difficult for those not trained in market research.

• Write this all down, even if you are a sole practitioner and you don’t expect anyone else to see it — although, if you are seeking additional financing, banks will want to see your business/marketing plans.

• The marketing budget is traditionally given as four to eight percent of the gross revenue, but Wurster wouldn’t use any percentage. Some small firms put 15 percent of their gross revenues toward marketing, and some large firms use only three to four percent.

• If a partner wants to be “out there” marketing 110 percent of the time, encourage him or her to do what he or she feels comfortable doing. Principals forced into marketing positions where they are totally ineffectual are not producing anywhere.

• The downside: The turnaround is quite a few years out. It’s five to seven years for real estate. There will be public work, although that serves engineers better than architects. Banks want to see the equity first — and it is much more difficult for banks to lend to the service industry, even with good financials and a strong business plan.

• The upside: “If you have a good plan that you follow, and have excellence in your staff and in your partners, there is an opportunity to get work and to manage it effectively; so that you produce a profit when the day is over. I’ve seen it done.”

“Bright Marketing Ideas” is a service of the Marketing and Public Relations Committee.

Details

by Lenore M. Lucey, FAIA

• Watch for coverage in February of the reception hosted by Turner Construction Company to honor Oculus. The Oculus sponsor receptions are among the Chapter’s non-dues fund-raising initiatives, and Turner generously provided a commitment of $25,000. Our thanks to Turner and attending Chapter member firms for making this event a huge success.

• AIA is seeking nominations for its new program recognizing “exemplary commitment and contributions to internships in their development as professionals” through the 1993 IDP Outstanding Firm Award. Firms may be nominated for providing exemplary support, promoting mentorships, and encouraging educational activities. Nominations must be received by March 3. For additional information, contact Irene Dumas Tyson at 202-626-7436.

• Return your Azon Corporation postcard! It was not made really clear, but the New York Chapter is the “local” beneficiary of Azon Corporation’s commitment to pay $1 for each returned card — and every bit helps. If you did not receive a postcard, lost it, or just tossed it, call 800-847-9374.

• Check the address label carefully on this issue of Oculus and let the Chapter know if there is an error.

With the new One Point dues system as well as the change to bulk mailing for Oculus, it is imperative that your address be correct in our data base. Please let us know even if you have already informed AIA and AIA New York State — we should be your first call if there is any kind of mailing problem.

• A Marketing and PR Committee task force is working on the 1993 Directory of New York Architectural Firms. Beginning in January you will receive announcements and forms for your firm. This edition will include firms from all five boroughs of AIA. We hope to make this edition even more successful than the 1991 edition, and we need your help in identifying potential advertisers. Please fax suggestions (including firm, contact, address, and phone number) to the Chapter.

• Chapter committees are hard at work planning programs for 1993 and preparing for 1994. If you have not yet signed up for a committee, call the Chapter to obtain a faxed Committee Selection Form (or check the wrapper of the September Oculus). The meetings and discussions provide educational and business opportunities, and your participation is needed to make programs and events successful.
"Last Friday the job market got more competitive. Twelve of your friends learned CADD at the CFA/CADD TRAINING CENTER. Now it's your turn to catch up."

Why Consulting for Architects, Inc. for CADD?

- **Multiple Softwares Taught:** AutoCAD® Rel. 11 & 12; Intergraph MicroStation PC® Rel. 4.0; and many others.

- **Flexible Schedule:** Morning, afternoon and evening sessions at our classroom facility or at your office.

- **Minimized Down Time:** Every Monday, intensive 20-hour, 1-week course on construction documentation and design; 2D & 3D basic – advanced.

- **Small Class Size:** Taught by architects for design professionals; Limit 4 students per class in high-quality learning environment.

- **Three Months Free:** Each class includes practice time in our computer lab; Prepare a project for your portfolio.

- **Custom Training:** We teach your staff our curriculum, or train them, by the hour, on your projects.

- **Other Services:** In-house CADD production packages; Job placement of CADD personnel; CADD hardware and software consultation.

VISA, MasterCard & Discover accepted. Payment plan available. Discount for unemployed professionals.

Call the CFA/CADD TRAINING CENTER at 212-532-4360 to reserve your classes.