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ENVISIONING THE FUTURE OF NEW YORK

In upcoming months, New Yorkers will make decisions that should change this city’s future in ways we can now only imagine. The zoning resolution is slated for revision, and a strategy for redeveloping the west side of Midtown is under discussion.

Two things are up for grabs: the rules for development and the process that will be used for granting approvals. The role of communities—which can of course be self-serving and obstructive, or civic-minded and creative—is at stake.

Joseph B. Rose, who is chairman of the New York City Planning Commission and director of the Planning Department, laid groundwork for changes when he announced plans to update the zoning code, in April (see p. 10 and list at right). The International Foundation of the Canadian Centre for Architecture (IFCCA) was already holding an ideas competition for a three-million-square-foot swath of midtown Manhattan. And at around the same time, the Hell’s Kitchen Neighborhood Association (with the Design Trust for Public Space) began its own planning initiative for an adjacent zone of Manhattan’s West Side. Now the fruits of these efforts are on public display—or are about to be. IFCCA projects are showing at Grand Central Terminal, and next month, the neighborhood association’s initiative will be on exhibition at StoreFront for Art and Architecture, in Soho.

In subsequent issues, OCULUS will report on these exhibitions. And we will record key moments at the September zoning conference sponsored by the AIA New York Chapter and the Metro Chapter of the American Planning Association. But, in this issue, we recount a series of summer discussions (organized by the Architectural League of New York) on the history and potential of planning and zoning in the city. Robert Sargent reports on a recent national conference on the New Urbanist movement, and we describe the effort by Community Board 2 and the Van Alen Institute to plan a park for Pier 40.

OCULUS coverage is intended to prepare readers to become involved. Architects should participate in the brainstorming and the policy-making now underway. We will be bound by these laws, and the consequences of change will be far-reaching. Let’s make our voices heard.
Planning Streetscapes
by Nina Rappaport

Black-and-white photographs of nearby landmarks are being installed on the streets of Lower Manhattan, along with orientation signs and maps, as part of the Alliance for Downtown New York’s Streetscape Plan. Granite markers in the sidewalk will identify historic ticker tape parades. Incorporating the Lower Manhattan Pedestrianization Plan of 1997 (prepared by the departments of City Planning and Transportation), the new scheme by Cooper, Robertson & Partners provides pedestrian guides and traffic signs. Trash cans, street furniture, new lighting, and reconstruction of Broadway sidewalks and curbs will be phased over a five-year period.

Columbia University recently published Columbia University in Morningside Heights: A Framework for Planning. The 300-page analysis of history, preservation, development, and landscape on campus includes recommendations for preservation and development in the surrounding Morningside Heights community. The project was produced by preservation architect Beyer Blinder Belle, preservation consultant Higgins & Quasebarth, landscape architect Thomas Balsley Associates, public garden designer Lynden B. Miller, lighting designer Howard Brandston, and historian Andrew Dolkart.

Ehrenkrantz Eckstut & Kuhn has been selected to design the master plan for Houston’s Main Street corridor, a 7.5-mile stretch. The “Bayou to Bayou” plan diverts traffic from part of the street and creates a new ten-block-long city park called “Stampede Square,” with arcaded buildings for entertainment use on the perimeter. The firm was selected from among five finalists in an invited competition sponsored by Making Main Street Happen, a non-profit group established to raise funds for the design and planning of the revitalization project.

Implementation of the master plan developed by Jambhekar Strauss Architects for Buffalo Inner Harbor has recently begun. It promotes transportation, economic development, and waterfront access at a 12-acre parcel on the Buffalo River. The plan reorganizes an existing light-rail intermodal transportation system, with a Transit Plaza linking pedestrian and vehicular circulation. A continuous esplanade will accommodate the public at the water’s edge, other plazas will create places for entertainment, and new boat basins will spur maritime activity. Additional consultants on this Empire State Development Corporation project include Flynn Battiglia Architects and Mathews Nielsen Landscape Architects.

Jambhekar Strauss is also preparing a redevelopment plan for the area around the transportation hub in Jamaica, Queens. And, after having developed a plan for the City of New Rochelle, the firm is developing guidelines for the town’s North Avenue, with RG Roesch Landscape Architects.

The Delacorte Theater, in Central Park, was renovated by Kapell and Kostow Architects in time for this summer’s Shakespeare in the Park performances. The architects replaced cedar siding, repaved walkways, increased accessibility for the disabled, installed new seats, replaced stack-decking, upgraded the electrical systems, added passageways for the actors, and constructed three built-in stands for concessions (to replace the free-standing ones).
Building Bridges

Two new pedestrian bridges designed by women suggest novel ways of forging connections. To link buildings located on different blocks, architect Wendy Evans Joseph’s bridge for Rockefeller University will join the Scholars Residence on one side of 63rd Street with the Weiss Tower on the other. Faculty and students will soon walk to work from University-owned apartments, without crossing a busy intersection. At the same time, the link will enable the University to connect the residential buildings to the University’s economical steam plant.

Joseph’s clever, lightweight design derives directly from the peculiarities of its site at the verdant Rockefeller campus, which is between York Avenue and the FDR Drive, overlooking the East River. But the thinking behind her bridge could have implications for other institutions that need to spread over more than one city block without disturbing the scale of a traditional neighborhood.

The cantilevered main promenade, which forms a Y in plan, preserves the view corridor to the river and even reflects the color of the morning sky. It is supported by a 90-foot-high V-shaped tower (in elevation). “The V was the only configuration,” Joseph explained, which would “precisely resolve the gravitational and horizontal forces.” The main structural span is only 16 inches wide, and utilities (communications lines, fiber optics, steam) run below the deck, through perforated stainless steel pipes.

The Scholars Residence and the Weiss Tower will be prepared to receive the bridge. The tower lobby has been redesigned with new vestibules and monumental stairs to a suspended mezzanine, where the bridge enters. The mezzanine leads to a plaza that has also been renovated—along with the lobby of the adjacent Rockefeller Research Building.

A consistent palette of materials ties the new work together. The painted steel of the large structural members is carried into Weiss Tower, and the stainless steel used for interior detailing reappears in the canopies and railings on the plaza.

Joseph collaborated on the project, which will be completed this fall, with structural engineer Weidlinger Associates, mechanical engineer Jaros Baum & Bolles, and landscape architect Thomas Balsley Associates.

In Lower Manhattan, Claire Weiss is working with a different team on plans for a lacy pedestrian bridge that will connect Exchange Plaza and Morris Street with the southern tip of Battery Park City, where the Hudson River Park will terminate. Tourists and residents of the neighborhood will be able to use the two-part bridge to cross West Street. The bridge begins at the subway stop and entrance to the Battery Tunnel garage. It will lead to the triangular convergence of streets south of Rector Place, and connect Battery Park City with Wall Street, the Staten Island Ferry, and the subway system (a 1/9 station is right there).

It is conceived as a landscaped connection to a new park which will run along the east side of Battery Park City. The idea is to make the bridge landing an extension of the park with grassy patches and paved areas, a stone plaza on top, and trees turning the whole curved truss bridge into a kind of arbor. A handicapped-accessible ramp will run along the north side under a planted arbor, while on the south side, a series of steps will form something like theater seating. A lawn will tilt down to the green space near Third Place, the Museum of Jewish Heritage, the riverfront esplanade, and the apartments in the South neighborhood of Battery Park City.

The design team for the Bridge Landing and the Marginal Street Park master plan is composed of Weiss + Yoes, Olhausen Dubois Architects, landscape architect Ken Smith, transportation consultant Sam Schwartz, and staff members of the Department of Transportation and other government agencies. The Battery Park City Authority commissioned the design study which led to the scheme.

These two bridges will not only make life easier for people on the scenic edges of Manhattan, but they also suggest models for connecting fragments of the cityscape which are particularly scattered on the waterfronts, where development is expected to occur. —F.M.

Bridge structural detail, Wendy Evans Joseph Architect
THE IFCCA IDEAS COMPETITION

With his plan for a gigantic park running from Eighth Avenue to the Hudson River, Peter Eisenman won the $100,000 prize in the first-ever Competition for the Design of Cities, sponsored by the International Foundation of the Canadian Centre for Architecture, of Montreal (IFCCA). Every three years, a similar ideas competition will be held for an urban site in a different city (Oculus, March 1999, p. 5).

On the winning mixed-use scheme, Eisenman Architects worked with David Childs and Marilyn Taylor, of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill; Craig Schwitter, of Buro Happold Consulting Engineers (structural); landscape architect Laurie Olin, of the Olin Partnership; Dan Baer and Tom Jost, of Edwards and Kelsey Engineers (transportation planners); and Michael Rushman, of Land Strategies development consultants.

Eisenman would build a new office complex near Eighth Avenue, an underground replacement for Madison Square Garden, and a stadium jutting into the river. Other competitors' schemes also contained morphic, continuous forms, but Eisenman's fluid plan was the easiest to read. It unifies a network of public, commercial, and transportation facilities in a grand new east-west park between 30th and 34th streets. Transit connections would be improved in the three-million-square-foot zone where immense public projects have eaten away the urban infrastructure.

The winning concept combines integrated spaces for diverse uses, with additional roads that would diverge from the grid. The Number 7 subway line would be extended under 33rd Street to connect the Center with Times Square. New structures function at multiple levels—from below grade to rooftops. A pedestrian path leads from the Hudson River to Eighth Avenue, where a new office development is to rise on the current site of Madison Square Garden. A new Garden arena, a media center, and an extension to the Javits Center are located underground. And, in an area beyond the scope of the competition, a sports stadium (which could be used for the 2012 Olympics) is to be built over the Hudson River.

Along with the winning scheme, proposals by the other four architectural firms which were invited to compete for the prize—UN Studio, Van Berkel & Bos, Amsterdam; Morphosis, Santa Monica; Cedric Price Architects, London; Reiser+Umemoto RUR Architecture, New York—are being exhibited at Vanderbilt Hall in Grand Central Station from October 5 through 20. The architects are also presenting their schemes at an all-day colloquium on October 8, in the Great Hall at Cooper Union. —Nina Rappaport
RESHAPING HELL’S KITCHEN SOUTH

Grassroots planning for a long-forgotten part of central Midtown has been taking place New York-style. Some of the best design talents in the country have been working with community activists, while the IFCCA competition superstars (and a few young New Yorkers) were re-envisioning the area just to the south.

With Javits Center officials, Community Board 4, and the Port Authority, the Hell’s Kitchen Neighborhood Association has been at work for five years on programs intended to give residents a voice in the redevelopment of the area. Their storefront “nerve center,” at 458 West 37th Street, exhibits historic photographs, contemporary maps, oral histories, and a site model.

On June 11 and 12, the Hell’s Kitchen Neighborhood Association and the Design Trust for Public Space held a conference at the Javits Center. Workshops brought together designers, members of the community, and representatives from city agencies, the Port Authority, and the convention center. In the weeks that followed, invited design teams from these conference workshops developed the ideas further with the firm Design + Urbanism, producing “concrete, viable, and creative recommendations for the site that can inform the community’s discussions with the city and private developers.” Those schemes will be on exhibition at StoreFront for Art and Architecture in November and will become part of a document Community Board 4 may actually use in planning for future development.

The conference, “Hell’s Kitchen South: Shaping our Neighborhood for the Next Millennium,” began with a walking tour of the area bounded by 34th and 42nd streets, between Eighth Avenue and the Hudson River. Offices, manufacturing industries, artists’ studios, ethnic restaurants, and brownstone apartments currently coexist there with abandoned rail yards and terminals for trains, buses, and commuter rail.

A performance of young people’s responses to the neighborhood, led by architect Mojdeh Baratloo (and enacted by children ranging from 7 to 17) dramatized the value of living with the cacophony of the city and the importance of keeping housing and schools adjacent to depots, convention facilities, tunnels, and tourists. The presentation inspired insights on how cities work for five years on programs intended to give residents a voice in the redevelopment of the area. Their storefront “nerve center,” at 458 West 37th Street, exhibits historic photographs, contemporary maps, oral histories, and a site model.

A performance of young people’s responses to the neighborhood, led by architect Mojdeh Baratloo (and enacted by children ranging from 7 to 17) dramatized the value of living with the cacophony of the city and the importance of keeping housing and schools adjacent to depots, convention facilities, tunnels, and tourists. The presentation inspired insights on how cities work for five years on programs intended to give residents a voice in the redevelopment of the area. Their storefront “nerve center,” at 458 West 37th Street, exhibits historic photographs, contemporary maps, oral histories, and a site model.

The president of the Convention and Visitors Bureau, Fran Reiter, talked about the need for expansion of the Jacob Javits convention center to make New York a more desirable city for conventions. She said the major hotel chains such as Marriott, Hilton, and Sheraton will not commit to New York without expansion. Reiter sees opportunities for a temporary exhibit space, given the availability of Pier 94, as well as potential for the use of the western half of Farley Post Office when Penn Station expands. She thinks it would be great to have conference facilities adjacent to trains;
she emphasized that the City hopes to utilize an existing building.

The president of the Hell’s Kitchen Neighborhood Association, Leni Schwendinger, said she hopes her group has put a “different face on the word community activist.” The neighborhood group is not adverse to development but is concerned with how and where it happens. Pollution and traffic from the numerous parking areas for buses and trucks affect this community nestled in the “noodlescape of the Lincoln Tunnel roadways.” She said that there are really no landmarks in the neighborhood which she feels has become invisible as a result of large projects at its edges, such as Penn Station, Madison Square Garden, the Javits Center, and the Port Authority.

The president of the Pennsylvania Station Redevelopment Corporation, Alexandros Washburn, who has been working on the proposed new Pennsylvania Station for a number of years, discussed the plan’s current status and showed a videotape of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill’s design (oculus, September 1999, p. 7).

In the discussion following the presentations, Genevro asked what role City Planning has in the coordination of these projects. Reiter said the real leadership had to be political—but with a vision that can pull together all the different interests. In a discussion about other large infrastructure projects, Reiter said that the Train-to-the-Plane won’t work; no one will take it except for those who commute to JFK from Long Island. But she said the Hudson River Park could become the front lawn of the Javits Center and the whole West Side could be reconnected through new projects.

When, in the question period, Suzanne Stephens asked Lerner what IFCCA architects in the competition received for background information (in terms of program), he said they were given the zoning and introduced to the community. “Their first task was to produce a program which had to address their own vision of the city.

A PARK FOR PIER 40

While the invited teams of architects were creating schemes for the IFCCA competition and neighborhood-based groups were working on a nearby site, another community design workshop was taking place. The workshop to reconceive Pier 40 as a park grew out of an open competition that the Van Alen Institute and Community Board 2 held earlier this year (oculus, March 1999, p. 5). Two winning teams from that competition, Sebastian Knorr Architects, of Germany, and Majid Jelveh & Christian Joiris, of New York, worked with P3—The Pier Park & Playground Association—on ways to transform this 15-acre former passenger ship terminal west of Houston Street into a multiuse (and revenue-producing) park. The other winner, Brandi & Partner with GTL Landscape, also of Germany, did not participate.

The architects volunteered two months of their time to test their ideas, setting up temporary offices on the pier. They interviewed local residents and made hundreds of community presentations; in mid-July, the community planning board approved the designers’ scheme.

The proposed redevelopment, which comprises the largest single chunk of the Hudson River Park, reuses the existing concrete structure on the pier. An unusual three-level park with baseball and soccer facilities is to be inserted (there are both indoor and outdoor sports fields), although most of the facades and some of the floor slabs have been removed to allow extensive river views. This sports deck, carpeted with artificial turf, rises above the existing pier and projects its canopy over the roadway to the east of the structure.

A massive pergola for flowering vines would separate passive and active uses. The river’s edge would be accessible to pedestrians and boats, and there would be a sandy beach for sunning, a diamond green at the center of the structure, and an income-generating beer garden. A half-mile boardwalk, a running track, a play street, docks, and water-filled playgrounds with filtered river water provide for other activities. There are also enclosed spaces for a boathouse, meeting rooms, and concession areas, while a high-tech state-of-the-art parking system would contain the 1,800 cars that now park at Pier 40.

“The pier is transformed from a closed box into an open system,” explained Van Alen Institute director Raymond Gastil. “The architects’ research showed that they could renew the open, flexible system that the structure was designed to be. They could successfully organize the park into layers, both horizontally 800 feet into the Hudson from the city edge, and also vertically—from a fully open ground level, to a mix of programmatic elements, and then on open decks above. They could take the solid, reinforced-concrete “bones” of the structure and humanize them with surface materials, from wood to sand to grass. It is a park that is fully urban in the best tradition of New York’s great public parks.” The next step is to gain approval from the Hudson River Park Trust.
any New Yorkers weren’t around for the writing of the 1969 Plan for New York City, so a discussion at the Architectural League provided historical context for upcoming debates about proposed changes to the current Zoning Resolution. Although the 1969 plan itself was never legally adopted, things we take for granted—community boards, scattered-site housing, rehabilitation (instead of new housing construction), special districts, the embrace of density in some areas—grew out of that planning process.

In her introduction, Maxine Griffith—the former planning commissioner, recent HUD official, and current Columbia University planning professor—explained what came before the 1969 Plan. “The nineteenth-century City of New York was formed primarily by commercial interests. Toward the end of the century, the era of what planning historian Donald Truffenberg [has] called ‘the culture of planning’ began with an emphasis on scientific efficiency, the City Beautiful movement, and reform politics (reform was based on the idea that blight might spread).” Griffith added a fourth cause of her own: “the automobile—the internet of its period—after which everything becomes different.”

She went on to explain that in 1916 it took an event not unlike the current crisis precipitated by Donald Trump’s 72-story apartment tower near the United Nations, on First Avenue between 47th and 48th streets, to provoke the creation of New York’s (and the country’s) first zoning code. When the Equitable Building rose over lower Broadway in 1916, it cast a seven-acre shadow.

“The amazing thing was that by 1919, a plan for New York was backed by the Russell Sage Foundation and other business interests,” Griffith said. “Although we all cite the 1969 Plan, the 1929 plan was really the beginning of the Regional Plan Association and organized planning. Then big-government came along with the Public Housing Act of 1933. The message was, ‘We’ll fund it, but only if you do it our way’—and one of those ways, thank God, was planning.” The rule was that you had to have a workable plan which saw the city as a mechanism with housing, transportation, and other workable parts.

Although some places had comprehensive plans earlier—Cincinnati’s was adopted in 1925—the sixties was when federal money started to flow. At that point, cities across America started serious work on plans and created planning departments; city planning programs developed in universities at around the same time.

A PLAN ABOUT PROCESS

The New York Plan of 1969 was different, according to panelist Donald Elliott, a lawyer who was chairman of the Planning Commission from 1966-73; It “was not a master plan or a physical plan. Its concern was the processes of city growth and the role of government,” Elliott explained. “At that time communities had figured out how to stop things but not how to create.”

The basic assumption of the plan was that private (not public) investment should be the primary engine of the city. Subsidies would not be appropriate in the downtown. Though other cities used Title I funds for downtown development, in New York that money went for housing—30,000 units in all. The planners believed government expenditures should encourage spin-off investment to improve neighborhoods. And, they believed renovation should become the hallmark of the housing program—an
idea that was contrary to conventional wisdom at that time.

Other critical issues that absorbed the planners also went against the grain. They saw New York as the nation’s center and “concentration as the genius of the city—at a time when other cities were tearing down buildings or worrying about traffic jams and crowded sidewalks. They thought the center should be strengthened and believed the main purpose of planning was to stimulate development. Their tools included expanding transportation (such as the Second Avenue subway line, subway stations inside new buildings), urban design initiatives, and provisions such as incentive zoning, transfers of development rights, and special districts.)

The forward-looking planners even wondered how to create job skills for the high-tech needs of the future, criticized the welfare system (but believed increased spending could fix it), expressed concern about schools (especially about the centralized administration), and created the Health and Hospitals Corporation to fund public hospitals.

Two other issues considered in the plan were community development (which was called “the environment”) and government (which was deemed too centralized). The scattered-site housing program from the ’69 plan—though it proposed alternatives to alienating oversized projects—was so controversial that the next administration realized it would be politically impossible to turn the entire plan into law. Still, the ideas lived on.

The next speaker was Elliott’s successor, John Zuccotti, who described the “difficult times” that followed. His commission realized it “wasn’t worth the price to adopt the plan…what was important was the process.” He talked about how much they learned as neighborhood residents spoke out. “A lot of the things in the plan were done. Battery Park City is probably the greatest urban project of the twentieth century. Third Avenue was rebuilt. And a new concept for dealing with housing for poor people was put into practice,” he said. “The plan set the stage for future development and dialogue. It established the parameters. The convention center wasn’t built on 48th Street, but it was built in another location.

Zuccotti ended the panelists’ presentation on an upbeat note. “In my view New York City has achieved what was hoped. We are today the greatest city in the world in finance and in intellectual power. New York attracts young people from everywhere.”

WHAT IS DIFFERENT NOW?

In the question-and-answer period, two planning commissioners expressed frustration with the change in atmosphere since the speakers’ glory days. Present commissioner Brenda Levin asked, “Does anybody in New York think we’re doing planning these days?”

“There’s a feeling among my colleagues that there is a despair about planning these days—whereas in the ’60s there was an excitement. What is different now?” commissioner Amanda Burden asked.

Zuccotti said, “Mayor Lindsey was interested in these kinds of things. He wanted to have urban design offices and architecture. And The New York Times was editorially on top of it. Everything was on page one, and The Daily News under Mike O’Neil was interested. “For a significant period of time, Ada Louise kept track,” Elliott added.

THE CITY’S PROPOSED ZONING REFORMS

Although the chairman of the planning commission mentioned dozens of proposed reforms to the zoning resolution, at his April 20 press conference, almost all the ensuing debate has focused on only one question: Should waivers from the new height-and-bulk rules be granted in cases of “exceptional design?” The response has been skeptical—even in the architectural community, where one might expect instilling “the quest for beauty into the economic drive of this city’s powerful real estate entrepreneurs” would be enthusiastically greeted. Most architects who responded to the Architectural League’s request for comments on the “beauty bonus” proposal wondered how design would be judged, and who would do it (what was said can be found at the league website—www.archleague.org).

Clearly referring to Donald Trump’s east midtown tower (see
OCULUS, Summer 1999, p. 10), Rose said, “Most of us agree that a
tower 900 feet tall is far too much for a residential community, but
achieving consensus on what should be permitted is not always
easy. Sound new zoning should balance the flexibility to allow
innovative design with a respect for community character. It must
also permit developers to build profitably.”

NOT COLONIAL WILLIAMSBURG

And though he criticized many aspects of modernist zoning,
the chairman also said “we must be careful to avoid becoming a
city that celebrates context over innovation.... New York’s elites
and civic groups have embraced a historicist aesthetic a little too
enthusiastically. This is not Colonial Williamsburg, and the world’s
greatest and most dynamic city should be a hospitable environ-
ment for bold new structures. It would be a tragedy if our unified
bulk regulations were to suppress the next generation of great
buildings.”

The hard part will be deciding how to reverse what he called
the “fundamentally flawed” provisions of the 1961 tower-in-the-
park zoning (and the maze of conflicting amendments later
imposed to ameliorate the flaws). Rose said that within the next 18
months he hopes to move through the public review process these
proposals to institute “a new, unified set of bulk regulations for
middle- to high-density development wherever the 1961 rules
apply” and to “establish clear height limits for all zoning districts
outside the central business districts.”

He wants the provisions to “address how buildings relate to the
street,” because he believes “the visual disorientation of urban tow-
ers needs to be ameliorated by a well-designed base that relates to
the traditional cityscape.” Rose wants to discontinue incentives for
providing public open space on private property, especially in res-
idential areas, and he expects the reforms to reopen manufactur-
ing zones to hospitals and other institutions (where they aren’t
allowed now). This would restrict their encroachment on residen-
tial neighborhoods, where they must now be located. He plans to
simplify commercial-use regulations, focusing mainly on uses with
adverse impacts, and to open industrial zones to more commercial
activity (though a similar effort to introduce big box retail in these
zones failed several years ago).

Why shouldn’t zoning be comprehensible enough that “any
reasonably intelligent individual should be able to understand the
range of possibilities that zoning permits on a given plot” of land?
It’s hard to quarrel with many of the things Rose said he wanted to
change in the existing 900-page zoning resolution (the text of his
speech can be found at www.ci.nyc.ny.us/html/dcp). Who would
not want the policy to be predictable enough that “similar cir-
cumstances produce similar results.” Rose added, “That does not
mean all buildings should look alike or that all uses should be uni-
form.” Instead, zoning should “accommodate growth and change”
and “respect the urban fabric and protect the quality of life.”
Finally, it’s reasonable to say that “we must be realistic about the
regulatory burden we impose on our economy and on those who
must enforce our rules.” (The Department of Buildings does the
enforcing.)

THE PARKING PROBLEM

The most problematic recommendation would add parking
requirements for residential developments in urban areas
(already served by transit) that are now car-choked. Rose argues
“New York is the only American city . . . that does not permit
downtown residences to provide parking .... In much of
Manhattan, new developments may not exceed one space for
every five new apartments . . . . Our rules were introduced in 1982
to reduce the number of cars entering the central business
district.” He concluded, “It didn’t work. The number of parking
spaces is down ten percent while car use and ownership are
up . . . . We have decided to adopt a more realistic approach that
continues to discourage automobile commuter parking but bet-
ter reflects car-ownership patterns in dense neighborhoods. We
will also update our parking requirements in lower-density areas
to insure that auto-oriented businesses like movie multiplexes
provide enough parking to avoid having their patrons cruise
around adjoining residential areas.” —J.M.
HASHING OUT ZONING REFORM

I have a few fantasies of what the New York City of the future might be like, and I’m wondering how they relate to yours," Michael Sorkin said to Joseph B. Rose. As chairman of the City’s Planning Commission, Rose can bring even the most powerful developer or architect to her knees—or at least make her sweat for a while. But during a June 22 Architectural League discussion of the chairman’s proposed zoning reforms, it was Rose himself who was on the hot seat. He sat center stage, between Princeton professor Christine Boyer, who provided historical perspective, and Sorkin (the moderator) who argued that the proposed reforms are too focused on the problems of the present.

Sorkin cut right to the quick of the trouble with Rose’s proposal. “Matters of quality, artistic production, and the like are embraced by a system that doesn’t know where it’s going.” The criticism was one Rose had anticipated. When he announced plans for reform on April 20, he said: “It might be worth pausing . . . to respond to those who will inevitably mouth the cliché, ‘New York’s problem is that we confuse zoning with planning.’ . . . New York City didn’t emerge as the economic and cultural capital of the world overnight, or by accident. . . . No other city in history has spent as much time and effort trying to understand itself or create infrastructure and adopt policies to provide for future prosperity.”

But there is clearly a difference between adopting policies that promote prosperity and developing a larger vision of what the city might be like in the best of all possible worlds. One reason zoning is emphasized over planning is that, in New York—as in few other places—the same person chairs the planning commission, along with the Department of City Planning. The commission is charged with enforcing the zoning code, while the planning department is supposed to develop long-range goals that zoning is intended to achieve. Since petitions for approval just keep coming, it’s easy to see how visions for the future might get buried in the pile.

“I AM SUSPICIOUS THAT AT THE SAME TIME THAT ‘DELIBERATE EXCEPTIONS’ ARE PROPOSED TO T

PROFESSOR BOYER’S HISTORY

At the Architectural League’s June 22nd discussion on proposed zoning reform, Princeton University’s Christine Boyer explained that not much has changed since planning problems were initially identified at the end of the nineteenth century. Though no East Coast city has ever passed a comprehensive plan like those frequently employed in the West, New York City produced the first comprehensive zoning plan in the United States, in 1916. That code, with its five different height districts, was intended to alleviate congestion, relieve inconvenience, and prevent disasters like the Triangle Shirtwaist fire. Forty percent of Manhattan and two-thirds of the rest of the city were designated residential with no industries, public stables, or garages allowed.

“Zoning was [then] a technical solution to separate conflicting land uses, enhance home ownership, and promote speculative development,” she said. As a result, single-family housing was concentrated in the outer boroughs, while office towers rose in Manhattan. Of the 377 skyscrapers in the United States, 188 were built in New York City.

“Before 1960, there were very few regulations,” Boyer noted. But the zoning ordinance of 1961 added a host of complicated new provisions. Taking the Seagram building as a model, the ordinance encouraged towers on plazas. A system of bonuses offered additional bulk (18 instead of the usual maximum 15 F.A.R.). This approach, which she called “the carrot rather than the stick,” awarded bonuses for adding apartments, theaters, and shops to office buildings. Then, to facilitate historic preservation (initially at South Street Seaport) developers were allowed to transfer development rights (TDRs) to other sites. The provision was used to preserve the Tiffany Building on Fifth Avenue, Carnegie Hall, and the Villard Houses. However, a combination of TDRs and other bonuses equally permitted an F.A.R. of 21.6 for the Trump Tower.

The attempt was made to write a new zoning ordinance in the 1970s, but “it somehow disappeared,” Boyer said. By the eighties, people were beginning to get tired of all the negotiated deals that bonusing required. She explained that there was a clamor for more approvals to be “as of right,” so an elaborate system of sky exposure planes was created. Also, to encourage development on the West Side (where it was occurring slowly) F.A.R.s were raised there and simultaneously lowered on the East Side.

Boyer mentioned some of the problems posed by the proposed reforms: “Who decides what ‘architectural excellence’ is [if it’s used as the basis for development]. How do we mediate between zoning for development and historic preservation. How do we find enlightened developers like the Bronfmans? What about the all-important waterfront?” She added, “Some of the younger architects are extremely interested in zoning,” citing the recent publication FARMAX by the Dutch firm MVRDV (OCULUS, May/June 1999, p.16). And a glance at the young audience proved her point.

SORKINVISION

Michael Sorkin also voiced a number of Boyer’s concerns, but he emphasized that the one “undiscussable” thing is “taste.” “The only way taste can be addressed is by quantification,” he said, summing up the philosophy of the current resolution.

“The bonusing system,” he said, “has a structural contradic-
tion: what is being given is something bad, so the city is trading something that is not in the public good for something that is in the public good.”

Sorkin described the areas singled out for reform as: height-and-bulk; the question of the automobile (“the proposal says a realistic approach is to acknowledge it and increase facilities for its maintenance”); relaxing zoning restrictions to allow schools, hospitals, and other institutions in industrial zones; easing restrictions on small businesses so they can locate in residential areas; and the idea that zoning should be logical and enforceable. He said none of these goals compensates for the lack of long-range planning.

“The issue of vision really impacts the question of the automobile. New York City needs to move in the direction of a post-automotive society. By 2030 we should have overcome the automobile as the primary means of movement, not only because it is a filthy and lethal technology but because the greatest areas of our collectively-held public space—our streets and highways—are devoted to it,” he said. Without planning, Sorkin thinks it difficult to recover green space and undertake the city’s “last great project—the waterfront—unless we can imagine the waterfront not as an edge but as part of the neighborhoods it surrounds.”

He mentioned architects’ opinions solicited by the League and published on the Web, calling particular attention to Caples Jefferson’s suggestion that bonusing might encourage a series of environmental measures to move the city in a more sustainable direction.

Planning is necessary to “secure the character of our neighborhoods,” he argued. “The content of the city—both lifestyles and modes of production—are changing. People are living differently and doing different kinds of work. Finessing the remix of the city while defending the character of a neighborhood will be difficult.”
The New Urbanism Under Fire
by Robert Sargent

proclaiming to the audience that he—rather than Rem Koolhaas—was the true reformer, Andres Duany recently said he wrote codes, not books, because the people who really built America didn’t read books. This past spring, a spirited Harvard conference focused on the New Urbanism and exposed deep conflicts in American culture—between modernization and nostalgia, between community and individual fulfillment—though at times it turned into a joust between star proponents of different persuasions.

Have the New Urbanists changed their stripes—or won over critics? The melancholy answer to both questions is a resounding no, though the impasse at the meeting certainly showed where the lines are drawn. The New Urbanist movement was briefly a hot topic after the popular media discovered Seaside, Florida, in the early 1990s. The movement’s relevance for cities was debated at an ANY magazine conference focused on the New Urbanism and exposed deep conflicts in American culture—between modernization and nostalgia, between community and individual fulfillment—though at times it turned into a joust between star proponents of different persuasions.

Just three years ago, The New York Times architecture critic Herbert Muschamp wrote that the New Urbanism was the most important architectural movement in the United States since the end of the Cold War, but he believed it would not play a significant role in center cities without a change in the ideology. In 1998, the opening of Disney’s Celebration (a New Urbanist village near Orlando) and the satirical film The Truman Show (which was staged in Seaside) briefly reignited discussion. Locally, the Buell Center at Columbia and the National Academy of Design sponsored well-attended lectures on the subject. And in January of this year, Duany Plater-Zyberk held a charrette to design a neighborhood on a brownfield site in Jersey City. The local planning department, the Lieberman Melting Partnership, and a host of other architects and planners (OCULUS, September 1999, p.16) also took part.

Currently, several times each year, the faithful convene to offer each other mutual support and attract converts to their cause. But the conference “Exploring (New) Urbanism,” at Harvard’s Graduate School of Design in March, was the most thorough and balanced discussion to date.

The proceedings—now available on CD-ROM and in an edited transcript—were organized by Alex Krieger, a critic of the movement and chairman of the Department of Urban Planning and Design at the GSD. His format gave the movement’s founders—architects Peter Calthorpe, Andres Duany, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Elizabeth Moule, Stephanos Polyzoides, Dan Solomon, and Seaside’s developer Robert Davis—a strong head start in the debate. But they quickly squandered this opportunity, with their rambling accounts of theory and projects. High points included Pittsburgh architect Ray Gindrez’s detailed discussion of low-income housing in the suburbs, and University of Pennsylvania landscape architect Anne Whiston Spirn’s passionate attack on New Urbanism’s static view of Nature. But generally the discussion was too elementary and evangelical for the audience, and criticisms were not adroitly dealt with.

Critics on the second day—SCI-Arc professors Margaret Crawford and John Kaliski; Rutgers geographer Neil Smith; and architect Michael Sorkin—pounded relentlessly on the perceived weaknesses of the movement: limited diversity in its communities and an emphasis on style rather than planning.

If modernism’s stress on the building-as-object and on separating uses resulted in empty and chaotic cities, New Urbanists said their emphasis on the public realm and mixed uses would reestablish lively and ordered communities. But critics charged that the homogeneity of New Urbanist projects runs contrary to the movement’s stress on critical regionalism, revealing its purpose of controlling behavior by mandating style and taste.

When Plater-Zyberk argued that New Urbanists’ place-making codes help to create good communities to raise children, Crawford said that she was not opposed to mothers and children but to confusing the neighborhood with the whole public realm. “The New Urbanism left out democracy, citizenship, and struggle.”

Proponents of New Urbanism tried to explain that they believed “individual architectural projects should be seamlessly linked to their surroundings. This issue transcends style.” And they submitted, with some justification, that there was more variety in their projects than had been recognized. (Finally, in frustration, Duany shouted that the reason for controlling style through codes was to make palatable a mix of building types and income levels. Whether he believed this or was trying to shame his crit-
ics—implying that their concern with social diversity was no more than lip service—his announcement shocked the audience. He won the argument by turning it inside out.)

**The Duel**

A Friday evening debate between Duany and Koolhaas, on the subject of “Urbanism(s),” was billed as the main event, though it almost did not take place because Duany objected to the bracketing of the word “(New)” in the conference title. He felt, correctly, that this called the validity of the word into question. Koolhaas, who was in residence at Harvard, was ready whatever the conference was called. (Other critics liked the plural form “urbanisms.” They used it throughout the conference as a flag. As Sorkin put it, “We need a thousand urbanisms.”)

Koolhaas repeatedly taunted Duany with, “What do you think of 42nd Street?” He urged Duany to abandon his “role as missionary” and his commitment to the “utterly regimented.” If Duany would leap, he had the power to “navigate the New Urbanism to a critical position on the New 42nd Street.”

But in saddling Duany and the movement with the Disneyfication of New York, Koolhaas was unfair. He might have used the Second Stage Theatre at Eighth Avenue and 43rd Street (which Koolhaas recently completed with Richard Gluckman) to illustrate his conception of urbanism: the recycling of buildings, temporary and relates it to the European avant-garde of Corbu and Oud.” He said Koolhaas’ infiltrated books show he needs “the bodyguard of graphics” (presumably referring to the gigantic 1995 S, M, L, XL, not the wistful 1978 Deirous New York).

Despite the fireworks between Duany and Koolhaas, many thought the event was a bust. Robert Campbell, the Pulitzer prizewinning critic for The Boston Globe, compared Koolhaas’ tactic to Ali’s ropa-dopa in the Foreman fight (by hanging on the ropes, Koolhaas hoped to wear his opponent out). Koolhaas may have been more cynical than he appeared, Duany less so. Dressed in a sky blue suit (and with a twinkle in his eye), the European architect mourned the disappearance of pornography in Times Square, whereas the American Duany, all in black, declared, “Hausmannization was greeted as we are.”

On the last day of the conference, the New Urbanists invited the audience to attend future “traveling road shows” planned for the University of California at Berkeley, Seaside, and the seventh New Urbanist Congress, in Milwaukee. Crawford wondered: why attend, since “this level of discourse has been exhausted.” Smith suggested that a new program with “more imagination and less technical details” needed to be formulated.

The elected officials at the conference (mostly moderate Republican or New Democratic mayors of mid-sized cities) objected to the grunge and pornography favored by the “old” urbanists (Sorkin called for “wanton acts to be obligatory”), although they were equally appalled by Duany’s contempt for ordinary Americans and civic decision-making. Mayor Jon Norquist, of Milwaukee, and U.S. Congressman Earl Blumenauer, of Portland, Oregon, are long-term members of the New Urbanist circle. Both presumably like the rules the movement provides, because rules are easily explained to constituents. But they were justified in complaining that the conference—and the movement—paid little attention to economic issues, especially job creation.

The real problem with the movement (and with this conference title) is that it offers sound altrnatives to sprawl, it provides no new ideas for urban areas. The lessons it seeks to teach are already embedded in the existing fabric of older East Coast cities and towns.

Cincinnati Mayor Roxanne Qualls made a fitting request: “We need...a better alternative.” Organizer Krieger responded, “Conversations collide and will continue.” In the end, though, the direction (which he had set) prevailed. The subject of the conference proved to be New Urbanism and its history, not “urbanism for a new millennium.”

Robert Sargent, Ph.D., a professor of English at Hofstra University, wrote a master’s thesis on the New Urbanism in the graduate program in architecture and design criticism at Parsons School of Design.

The proceedings of the conference, on CD-ROM, can be obtained from the Harvard Graduate School of Design; an illustrated transcript, edited by Todd W. Bressi, is available from The Seaside Institute, P.O. Box 4730, Seaside, FL 32459, by E-mail (institute@seasidel,com), or by calling 850-231-2421.

**Emerging Voices at the Architectural League**

In the annual Emerging Voices lecture series, a consciously balanced diversity of architects highlights differences between winners’ practices. And, it shows how the various places they practice affect the work they produce.

Phoenix architect Wendell Burnette and New Yorker Evan Dougis spoke on the same evening, and the contrast was dramatic. Burnette, is largely self-trained (though he spent some time at Taliesin West and worked for Will Bruder). In 1996, Burnette opened his practice and has since designed a number of minimalist residences and commercial interiors that are distinguished by his interest in construction. For his own studio residence, where he also acted as general contractor, Burnette suspended a double-height glass facade between two austere concrete walls. Its minute support system allows the glass planes to apparently coalesce into one pure surface.

Burnette’s sensitivity to the craft of construction distinguishes his minimalism from that of many of his contemporaries and relates it to that of Mies van der Rohe. But where Miesian work floats above the landscape, Burnette’s is deeply rooted in it.

Dougis’ work, however, is based in theory. The installations he has designed as director of Columbia University’s architecture galleries since 1995 often illustrate the show’s subject. For “The Oblique Function: A Collaboration between Claude Parent & Paul Virilio,” Dougis designed diagonal planes based on the hypothetical spaces on view. Dougis’ work is most interesting when he treats
architecture as an investigative process. In a studio he taught at Pratt several years ago, a cocoon-shaped latex bag was suspended from a warehouse ceiling on the Red Hook piers, to explore "a free form concrete casting technique which could be used at a whole series of scales for very different programs." Bound with various wires, it was filled with concrete so the pull of gravity could deform the resulting into erratic bulbous forms.

Another Night

On the evening Kevin Daley and Chris Genik, from Los Angeles, and Bostonian Brian Healy lectured, the differences in direction were less dramatic. Both firms incorporate theorizing in their process. The principals of the firm Daley, Genik began their lecture with an image of a plane called the Flying Buppy. Its silhouette swells like a tic to accommodate additional cargo, and the plane exemplifies of the balance the architects try to strike between the improvisational and the analytical in their work.

The Buppy often appears unexpectedly in their projects. At the center of a house in Los Angeles, Daley and Genik inserted a large pod containing the entire program, freeing the surrounding space to be used at will. In a residential renovation for a retired couple wanting places to display their antiques collection, the architects designed a series of sculptural interventions—self-contained cabinets that seem to sail through the rooms, and a fireplace sheathed in aluminum scales—to redefine the existing space.

Rather than peer inward to interiors, Healy looks to a structure’s surroundings. He seeks a more-expansive understanding of context that includes the evolution of the landscape, "to engage what is already there in an attempt to be a part of that place and what that place is becoming." Healy captured this moment best in a combination children’s day care center/pool hall sited in a transitory and marginal landscape at the edge of a rural highway. Healy’s volumes slouch against each other, and the exterior is peppered with local artifacts—propane tanks, an exhaust pipe, and exterior stairs. Although meticulously crafted, the day care center/pool hall appears slapdash—poignant in a landscape where buildings look like flotsam.

Michael Bell and Asymptote

by Jayne Merkel

The range of architectural concerns today—from the relationship between virtual space and urban space, to the building of city houses economically—was on the roster in April when Lise Anne Couture and Hani Rashid, of Asymptote, spoke along with Michael Bell.

Bell, who was teaching at Houston’s Rice University at the time, has recently accepted a post at Columbia. He is also an editor, with Sze Tsung Leong, of the 1998 book Slow Space (Monacelli Press, 480 pages, 7 1/4 x 9 3/4, 380 illustrations, paper, $55). Many of Bell’s houses, which remain unrealized, were designed for exhibitions or private clients.

One of his chief interests is "the notion of depth in pictorial space and the flatness of an eye trying to see space." Another concern is mass-production and how to build economically enough in the city to begin to reverse the growing housing shortage (though he admitted that he "struggles between wanting to work within the avant-garde tradition and within the constraints of the economy").

His design for an 890-square-foot house, which was included in the MoMA “Un-private house” show (OCULUS, Sept. 1999, pp. 10-11) measures only 32x47 feet, and Bell claims it can be built for between $50 and $55 per square foot. The facade consists of a half-dozen sets of off-the-shelf sliding glass doors. Gables hold the walls in place. People thought he was "crazy," the architect said, to build a transparent house in a low-income neighborhood. But he liked the idea of a faux version of the Miesian American dream, and wanted to “push limits” both aesthetically and economically.

For a 4.5-acre site outside Santa Fe, Bell designed the Double Dihedral House for an art collector. It is actually two buildings in one—a residence and “a kind of gallery.” Two L-shaped forms surround a courtyard, turning the house inside out. Here the architect was trying "to add a topographical complexity while dealing with a description of the horizon."

Asymptote

Lise Anne Couture (she teaches at Parsons) and Hani Rashid (he founded the Paperless Studio at Columbia) use electronic technology to extend and activate architectural space. Though they practice out of a live-work loft in Soho, their practice is fully international.

A transparent, polygonal, tensile-frame structure for the Theater Festival in Århus, Denmark, had walls that melded with the city and made-visible the medieval core. A continuous membrane stretched over the gridded elements was activated by colored lights in the evening.

In the same city, a scheme for the Århus Museum of Modern Art, on a green space
in front of Arne Jacobsen’s City Hall, uses the site to “link the urban infrastructure and the park on its edge.” The foyer is an extension of the street plan, while the interior system of ramps, based on the architects’ earlier design for a Yokohama Passenger Ship Terminal, "creates constant references to the space of the city, with views through the structure [and] to the park,” Couture said.

For a biennial celebrating paper as a material, in Düren, Germany, the architects video-taped paper being manufactured. Then, using light and sound, they “made a three-dimensional entity out of it.” The idea was to test the limits of materiality and explore the effect of digital technology on environments.

The name Asymptote denotes lines that come infinitely close together without ever actually touching. Yet the firm’s most recent project—for the New York Stock Exchange—represents a total convergence of interests in culture and communication, virtual reality, and architectural form. The project consists of both a computer-generated environment and a dynamic wired space which newscasters are now using as a backdrop for broadcasts—instead of the adjacent grand classical trading floor. The architects are also designing a virtual Guggenheim Museum, the Kyoto Research Park, and the Edutainment and Multimedia Center, in Kyoto.

The Body Electric—The Young Architect’s Competition

by Adam Griff

Surprisingly, the winners of the Architectural League’s 1999 Young Architects Competition tackled this year’s theme of “scale” while subverting the jury’s interest in the topic.

Scale in architecture touches on issues ranging from urbanism (how does the overwhelming size of skyscrapers affect the city) to representation (how does a scale model compare to the actual building). What interested the competition’s jurors was how cyberspace—a limitless and immeasurable terrain—would affect our understanding of scale. But in reacting against the implications of the “virtual world” (even I cringe to use those words) the winners were intent on restoring a sense of scale based on the body’s presence and dimensions.

In the project titled “Femme Pissoire,” Sunil Baldwin and Yolande Daniels, principals of the New York firm Studio Sumo, designed a stainless steel urinal that allows women to urinate while standing—just like men. Tittering aside, the Femme Pissoire typifies the winning entrants’ work. Whatever further liberation women gain from this contraption, only those wearing skirts can use it (an obvious regression). To overcome the contradiction, Baldwin and Daniels designed a pair of pants with a zipper going from belly button to the small of the back.

Sharing a fascination with bodily functions, Edward Mitchell created a figurative map of New Haven loosely related to human anatomy. As part of a planning study commissioned by the Neighborhood Association of Cedar Hill, Mitchell teased out a series of associations with the liver. Referring to ancient Roman cities, he asked, “If the city could be scaled by divining a liver, what would we learn about the city’s systems from the present divinations of one of the city’s residents?”

Culling episodes from New Haven’s history, such as the rise of watering holes during industrialization, Mitchell brushed an impasto of historical references onto his map. But his allusions are overgrown and thick: the Quinnipiac River becomes both urinary tract and industrial-waste pipe. Although the usefulness of his clever flights of free-association may be doubtful, Mitchell did return in this project to a classical understanding of scale, where architectural dimensions originate in the proportions of the human body.

Skeptical of the classical conception of the body, Omar Khan and Laura Garafolo projected text and images onto a Lycra tent sheltering a performer in their 1997 installation Body A(r)mour. “The tent tightly enveloped the performer, so that the fabric and the performer’s skin became synonymous,” they explained.

While projecting text on the body has already become cliché, it does express a truth observed by art critic Rosalind Kraus. The body has ceased to be seen as a vessel holding our insides (or our souls) and has become instead a sensing skin, a screen for the registering of impressions. Even more, the tent resembled a womb, and one could sense the performer’s struggle for some kind of birth against the barrage of images.

Winning entrants refused to prognosticate about how the sense of our bodies will evolve and affect our sense of scale in the age of the internet. Some assumed a reactionary pose, resurrecting old ideas. Vrinda Khanna and Robert Shultz incorporated the system of Vastu Shastra—the Indian equivalent of feng shui—into their architecture. But maybe Douglas Pancoast’s multimedia theater for the Cranbrook Institute of Science spoke most eloquently about the uncertainty. To enter his minuscule egg-shaped theater, visitors walk through hanging drapes that act as projection screens for a multimedia show. Audience members loose themselves in a sea of images.

\[\text{AT THE PODIUM}\]

Body A(r)mour, Liminal Projects, Omar Khan and Laura Garafalo, Ranavav, India, Vrinda Khanna and Robert Shultz.


Watering Hole, Edward Mitchell

Cranbrook Institute of Science, Douglas Pancoast
Technology for Designers

Lately this past spring, the AIA New York Chapter’s Computer Applications/Information Technology (IT) Committee hosted the first of a series of sessions focused on preparing architects to design information technology-intensive buildings. More than 85 professionals attended the event held in the training facility at J.P. Morgan’s 23 Wall Street location.

After an introduction, committee chairman James Brogan, AIA, of Hardy Holzman Pfeiffer Associates, introduced the gathering. John Howell, AIA, a member of the Computer Applications Committee and an architect/technologist at J.P. Morgan, opened the discussion. Howell pointed out that there has been a shift in how businesses are defined, as network and technology infrastructure now define many of them.

Bill Sewell, a Registered Cable Distribution Designer (RCDD), facilities technologies specialist at Sverdrup architects and engineers, (RCDD is a relatively new specialty within the field.) Sewell discussed present and future technologies, stressing that clients will continue to ask for flexible, expandable, maintainable, and secure high-speed networks. Bob Eastman, an RCDD, with Shen Milsom Wilke Telecommunications brought examples of a dozen of that firm’s projects. These included the wiring of the Rose Main Reading Room at the New York Public Library, a large law firm, a typical school classroom, and technology-focused office buildings. He showed plans and sections demonstrating the integration issues surrounding architecture and IT infrastructure. Sewell also discussed PBX/server room locations, cable raceways (and the best ways of handling them), access flooring, and integrating data, power, and other sources, with a focus on various project requirements.

For a videotape of this session, contact the AIA New York Chapter. The committee’s schedule of events, highlights of past meetings, and contacts (as well as more information about the Computer Applications and Information Technology committee) can be found at the “Members” section of the chapter’s website: www.aiany.org

Objets d’Architecture

by Kira L. Gould

There was much to see at the International Contemporary Furniture Fair held this spring, when ideas for the workplace and the home overtook the halls at Jacob K. Javits Convention Center. As it has for more than a decade, this year’s fair sponsored by Metropolis magazine served both as a spec-writer’s mecca and testing ground for experimental ideas.

Of course, New York architects comb the displays for products, ideas, and trends, but this year there were also a number of architects—local and otherwise—who showed wares at the fair. With his wife (graphic designer Judy Hudson) New York architect Stuart Basseches began making furniture for his own needs. (What architect doesn’t know the frustration of searching high and low for the perfect chair or the just-right light?) At the fair, Basseches and Hudson exhibited lighting and stacking tables. Floor lamps were sleek cylinders featuring custom-colored, powder-coated aluminum bands.

Silky to the touch—even at the joints—handcrafted wooden tables, chairs, and bookshelves by Brooklyn-based architect

Jonah Zuckerman’s company, City Joinery, revealed Zuckerman’s architectural aesthetic and attention to quality of materials and craftsmanship. With a similar spirit, New Yorker

David Bergman’s company, Fire & Water, introduced his OhGee table. The piece draws on midcentury modernism, with its tabletop of clear or recycled glass set on a base of blackened-steel rods.

Alongside sculptor

John Christakos, Minneapolis-based architect Charlie Lazar and Chicago architect Maurice Blanks work as a team called Blu Dot. Their reasonably priced furniture has gained notice since first appearing at the Fair in 1997. This year’s introduction, the clean-lined Modu-licious cabinets, are square or rectangular units that can be configured in multiple arrangements—storage with style, as it were.
BOOKLISTS

Rizzoli Bookstores’ Top 10
As of August 1999


2. Lofts, Francisco Cervera (Watson Guptill, cloth, $75).


8. Lofts, Marcus Field and Mark Irving (Gingko Press, paper, $40).


10. San Francisco Guide To Recent Architecture, Peter Lloyd (Kunemann, paper, $5.98).

Urban Center Books
As of August 1999

1. Renzo Piano Building Workshop Complete Works, volume 1, Peter Buchanan (Phaidon Press, paper, $29.95).

2. Ted Williams/Billie Tsien Works, 2G Editors (Gustave Gilli, paper, $37.50).

3. Hip Hotels, Herbert Yocom (Thames & Hudson, paper, $29.95).


6. FARMAX: Improve on Density, Richard Koch, Winy Maas, and Jacob van Rijs (0110, paper, $56).

7. Folds, Bodies & Blobs, Greg Lynn (Los Angeles, paper, $27.50).

8. Move, Ben van Berkel and Caroline Bos (Gooze Press, paper, $34.50).


10. OMA/Rom Koolhaas, (EJ Coppen 17.595 revised omnibus volume, cloth, $89).
DEADLINES

November 16
The National Building Museum’s Apgar Award of Excellence recognizes contributions of individuals whose observation, interpretation, and evaluation of America’s built environment heighten public awareness of excellence in building and urban design, development, community revitalization, or city and regional planning. Nominees can be authors, producers, critics, educators, practicing professionals such as architects and developers, or others. Nominations should be submitted as a brief written statement giving background and justification for the nomination. Include relevant support materials. Self-nominations are not accepted. The Apgar Award recipient will receive a $1,500 honorarium. The winner will be announced before the end of 1999 and publicized in the Museum’s publication, Blueprints. Send materials to: Apgar Award, National Building Museum, 401 F Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20001.

December 1
The exhibition marketing agency Exhibitorgroup/Giltspur invites design students to enter its ’99 Launch Your Career in Exhibit Design competition. Winners of the first, second, and third prizes will receive tuition scholarships (of $7,500, $5,000, and $2,500 respectively) for the study of design. Each of the three winners will also receive a paid internship at one of Exhibitorgroup/Giltspur’s 17 production facilities in North America. In addition, the winning entries will be showcased at the year 2000 Exhibitor Show in Las Vegas, Nevada. The competition is open to design students who will be sophomores or juniors enrolled at an accredited college or university in the 1999-2000 academic year. To receive a Poster-and-entry form, email name, address, telephone number, name of school, and current year in school to: Launch Your Career Competition ’99, launch-career99@e-g.com or mail name to: Exhibitorgroup/Giltspur, 201 Mill Rd., Edison, N.J. 08817-3801.

ANDERSEN® Windows give schools every opportunity to succeed.

- Local, dedicated commercial project professionals
- Estimating, shop drawing, and installation services available
- Specializing in commercial, institutional, multi-family and industrial projects
- Visit www.andersenwindows.com/commercial for complete product information
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HAVERFORD SYSTEMS
Home Of HavaVision DISPLAYS™
Design and installation of presentation, meeting and entertainment facilities

Visit one of our demonstration facilities to see and learn about the latest technologies available

call Hugh Richards @ 1-800-486-5276
www.haverford.com

K + A Design Consultants
33 Queens Lane
New Hyde Park, NY 11040
516-365-4722
Architectural Lighting Consultation Analysis Design
John Katinaros IALD AIA IIDB

Anteak of Downingtown
Please visit anteakstore.com to see our 12,000 sq ft showroom full of solid teak handmade, handcarved indoor and outdoor furniture

MAGGI SEDLIS, AIA
The Office of Margaret J. Sedlis
36 East 23 Street, 7th floor
New York, NY 10010
phone: 212-777-5598
fax: 212-979-0923
e-mail: maggis@aol.com
Consultants to architects and designers providing services related to: project management contract management practice management

Select Interior Door, Ltd.
2074 Perry Road, P.O. Box 178
North Java, New York 14113
1-800-535-9335
FAX 716-535-9923
www.sidil.com
Manufacturers of custom interior and exterior solid hardwood doors and millwork
AROUND THE CHAPTER

Ornamental Metal satisfies more design goals than any other decorative material. And its abilities to enhance and embellish transcend the pure aesthetic to create tangible value in a property. From distinctive, sleek entranceways, to gracious, intricate railings and stairs, Ornamental Metal offers uncommon durability, design flexibility and enduring appeal. For quality you can feel and beauty you can touch, Ornamental Metal is the singular choice.

Exhibitions

September 28 - October 23
The Waterfront

Through October 5
The Un-private House

October 5 - 20
ICCA Prize for the Design of Cities
Vanderbilt Hall, Grand Central Terminal, 42nd St. at Park Ave. 212-799-5515.

October 5 - 30
Bethlehem Steel Photographs by Andrew Gorn

October 7 - November 13
A Way Station by Mabel Wilson and Paul duffee Kariuok
Staten Island Art and Architecture, 97 Kenmare St. 212-431-5795.

October 9 - February 13
Forgotten Gateway: The Abandoned Buildings of Ellis Island
The Museum of the City of New York, 1220 Fifth Ave. 212-534-1672, est. 212.

October 10 - January 2
Minimala: An Italian Vision in Twentieth-Century Art
PS 1 Contemporary Art Center, 22-25 Jackson Ave., at 46th St., Long Island City, Queens. 718-784-2084.

October 13 - 30
Investigating Where We Live

Through October 16

Through October 16
Ten Rooms for Sex
Henry Urbach Architecture, 526 West 26th St., 212-626-1097.

October 18 - November 19
Memorial for the Murdered Jews of Europe: An Exhibition by Eisenman Architects
The Cooper Union, Seventh St. at Third Ave. 212-353-4220.

October 21
"Guggenheim Museum Day," The building's 40th birthday celebration
Guggenheim Museum, 971 Fifth Ave. 212-423-3500.

October 21 - November 20
Approach
Henry Urbach Architecture, 526 West 26th St., 212-626-0974.

Through October 24
The Actors Place Riots: Looking back 150 years
The Museum of the City of New York, 1220 Fifth Ave. 212-534-1672, est. 212.

October 27 - Dec 3
Munch Covers

November 7 - January 2
Children of Berlin
PS 1 Contemporary Art Center, 22-25 Jackson Ave. at 46th Ave., Long Island City, Queens. 718-784-2084.

November 18 - December 31
Other Urbanisms: Proposals for the Development of Hall's Kitchen South Bath/Room Art and Architecture, 97 Kenmare St. 212-431-5795.
Online Courses
Along with the AIA, Virginia Tech’s College of Architecture and Urban Studies, Division of Continuing Education and Institute of Distance and Distributed Learning, is sponsoring Building Technology for Architects, a series of online courses for practicing architects and interns. Visit http://files.arch.vt.eduCourses/structure/ for information.

Richard Perry, AIA, was the winner of the Membership Task Force Survey raffle. He received two tickets to the 1999 Heritage Ball, at the Waldorf-Astoria on September 22.

Career Moves
Box Beyer Blinder Belle Architects & Planners welcomes three new associate partners: Don Lasker, AIA; Patrick M. Orrico, AIA; and Michael Wetsone, AIA.

James S. Polshek, FAIA; Joseph L. Fleischer, FAIA; and Timothy P. Hartung, FAIA, have named Duncan R. Haward, AIA; Richard M. Olcott, FAIA; Susan T. Rodriguez, AIA; and Todd H. Schliemann, AIA, in the renamed firm, Polshek Partnership.

Kenneth C. Brown has joined Skidmore, Owings & Merrill as president. Brown comes from General Electric, where he was a corporate vice president and president of GE Southeast Asia, in Singapore. At SOM, he will oversee marketing, finance, information technology, legal, and human resources functions. The architects have also hired Allison Hecht as director of firmwide marketing.

Michel R. Franck, AIA, has joined Fox & Fowle Architects as a principal in charge of the firm’s interior design studio. Rodney VenJohn, AIA, has been named a senior associate and Michael Stark, an associate.

Swanke Hayden Connell Architects has welcomed Cynthia Kraeauer, AIA, as director of special projects. Howard D. Leist, AIA, has joined the firm as a senior associate, and Robert Vail Cole, AIA, has become a senior associate and director of preservation design.

The New York office of Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum has appointed Bill Palmer as principal and director of planning and landscape architecture.

Butler Rogers Baskett has hired Diana F. Blum-Lapis as an associate and studio leader. Also, the firm has moved to 475 Tenth Ave., 5th flr., New York, NY 10018.

Perkins & Will New York has hired Frank Lupo, AIA, as an associate principal and director of design; Thomas Sansone as an associate principal and director of design for interiors; and Veda N. Solomon as a director of marketing.

Timothy Johnson, AIA, has joined NBBJ’s New York office as a design principal.

Einhorn Yaffee Prescott has promoted Matthew Barhydt, Kent Johnson, and Murray Levi to senior associate. Richard Einhorn has become an associate. The firm has hired Jack W. Caloz as director of information and technology systems.


At William B. Tabler Architects, Eric M. Ohr has been named a principal, and A. Sultan Sayani has been promoted to associate.

The partners with Sidnam Petrone Architects—Coty Petrone, Bill Petrone, and Eric Gartner—announce the new name of their practice: Sidnam Petrone Gartner Architects.

Ruth Desdner, AIA, has become a senior associate at Horowitz/Immerman Architects.

The Hillier Group’s New York office has promoted Wayne Cohen to senior associate and Maria Suri, AIA, to associate. The Group welcomed new employees Busakorn Chantaravornmeth, Susan Romano, Karen Singh, Rod Hammer, and Ibi Yolas.

Manuel Mergal, AIA, and Joseph Singer have been named senior associates at Ferguson Shamamian & Rattner Architects. Stephen T. Chrisman has been promoted to associate.

Gillian Frost has joined Ted Moudis Associates as manager of business development and marketing.

Ralph A. Ottaiano, a founding partner of Smith Ottaiano Architects, has established Ottaiano Architects. The move to reorganize his ten-year-old firm stemmed from the departure of C. Jane Smith, AIA.

C. Jane Smith, AIA, has joined Olaf Harris to create Harris Smith Design.

Berger Rait Interiors promoted Jeffrey Knoll to be director of design and welcomed Charles Lester as an associate and director of project management services. Edward C. Higgins has begun serving as director of CADD services.

Lockwood Greene has named William F. Schacht, AIA, to be director of commercial architecture for its New York office.
In June, the International Union of Architects (UIA) held its twentieth World Congress in Beijing—the first such meeting to take place in Asia in the 50-year history of the organization. More than 6,000 architects attended the triennial gathering and keynote speakers included Kenneth Frampton, Ricardo Legorreta, Jean Nouvel, Kenneth Yeang, Charles Correa, and Moshe Safdie.

The weekend before the Congress, through the support of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the AIA New York Chapter and the Chinese University of Hang Kong collaborated on an environmental design charrette in the southern Chinese city of Zhongshan. Professionals from the U.S. and from Hong Kong joined local Chinese government design-and-planning officials, faculty members, and students to create sustainable solutions for a waterfront site where two rivers meet at the Pearl River Delta.

More than 70 participants in this interdisciplinary design workshop explored issues of urban planning, environmentally responsible architecture, and development—their aim being creation of a framework for sustainable planning processes that can be adapted in other rapidly developing Chinese cities.

The charrette started with visions shared by two vice-mayors. One showed the city of Zhongshan’s attempts to promote smart growth, and the other introduced current plans in design and construction. Participants then visited traditional water villages and a modernized bazaar. Over a day of intense discussion about the site and its possibilities, the language barrier fell away, as conceptual diagrams and drawings began to convey ideas. Eventually, the six teams presented design solutions with site models. Each considered how to integrate transportation and the environment—providing water, vehicular, and pedestrian access.

Incorporating sustainable traditions from the past (and integrating appropriate technologies of the present) participants generated ecologically friendly design ideas. Low- and high-rise housing prototypes fronting canals emphasized daylighting, cross ventilation, and local traditions. Composting and organic sewage treatment became themes for the eco-park, where renewable energy applications would be introduced. And an ecology center plus an expanded navigation museum would make the site both socially and economically sustainable.

Chinese Central Television promoted the charrette in a national broadcast, and positive signals from the municipality suggest many ideas will be adopted. When the results were shared at a subsequent UIA seminar, delegates predicted this international effort, which combined outside knowledge with in-house expertise, could help lead the way to a participatory planning-and-design process in China. But perhaps the best yardstick for the charrette’s success was the number of inquiries from audience members asking how the workshop could be emulated in their towns.

Joyce Lee, AIA, chairs the Chapter’s committee on the Environment and will join the Board of Directors in 2000.
AIA New York Chapter
The Founding Chapter of the American Institute of Architects
200 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10016

Mr. Lee S. Jablin, AIA
Harman Jablin Architects
228 East 45 Street
New York NY 10017

For updated calendar information, visit the Chapter's website, at www.aiany.org