

PERSPECTIVES

On the Professions

A periodical of the Center
for the Study of Ethics in
the Professions (CSEP),
Illinois Institute of Technology

HUB Mezzanine, Room 204, 3241 S. Federal Street, Chicago, IL 60616-3793
Tel: 312.567.3017, Fax: 312.567.3016, email: csep@iit.edu

Vol. 3, No. 4

December 1983

"Architects and their Clients"

Fay Sawyer, Editor, CSEP,
Illinois Institute of Technology

This issue of "Perspectives on the Professions" is itself a new perspective on "Perspectives." Six accounts follow of varying kinds of experiences had by various sorts of clients with architects. My own main editorializing consists in this one fact: all of the italics in the articles were inserted by me.

As one consequence of many years of teaching a course called "Moral Issues in Architecture" at Illinois Institute of Technology. I have come to feel that when things go wrong about buildings and charges of moral and character defects are made, the true cause of the transgressions was a radical failure of communication. Such failures, especially when they occur between design professionals and their clients, have two characteristics. First, the vocabulary of architecture and design is ordinarily not familiar to lay clients and the design professional seldom realizes this or takes the time to work out with his/her client a common vocabulary. Second, and rather more seriously, some architects do not wish to make their clients co-workers in the planning and seemingly prefer an autonomous,

arbitrary and often arrogant mode of "designing for" the client. This mode and this attitude contribute not only to the general ignorance about the built environment, but also to a widespread mistrust of architects.

Failure to make the client a kind of co-worker and planner implies a lack of respect for the client. Such lack of respect, especially when coupled with the performance of actions which significantly affect that client, at once defy the fundamental principle of Kantian morality (respect for persons), and break a major rule of Bernard Cart's (don't injure). But it often happens that insults and injuries are caused, at least in part, by ignorance. It is to alleviating such ignorance about client-architect interaction that this issue (as well as some projected future issues) of "Perspectives" is directed. *In the meantime, I eagerly solicit more such accounts as well as Letters to the Editor.*

"Architects and Residents of Public Housing"

Devereux Bowley, Attorney,
Legal Assistance Foundation

Public housing in the United

States recently had its 50th anniversary, but there were no celebrations. It has been an experiment that few people have been happy with, including the residents. The basic flaw with public housing in this country was the decision to isolate low-income families in developments containing only other poor families. The great irony is that the social reformers who were the most dedicated early supporters of public housing, failed to foresee the social consequences of what they were creating. Of almost equal importance for the failure of public housing was the physical design of the projects, and much of the blame for that must be laid at the feet of the architects who designed them. A brief review of the history of public housing may be helpful when thinking about the forces that influenced the architects in their designs.

Chicago makes an ideal site for a case study of public housing. Incorporated in 1633, it is one of the youngest of the major cities, its entire development having occurred during the post-Industrial Revolution period. It has long been an innovator in the technology of building, and is unexcelled in the overall quality of its architectural design. It has the second largest public housing system in the country, and the largest public housing project, Robert Taylor Homes, a two mile long string of twenty eight

identical 16 story buildings containing 4,300 apartments and about 25,000 residents.

The early developments built in Chicago were relatively well designed and to this day remain the most popular among the residents, as shown by the fact they have waiting lists of five years or more for admission whereas later high-rise projects have empty units going begging. The first of the PWA projects, with 1,027 units, was the Jane Addams Houses constructed in 1937 on a 24 acre site two miles west of Chicago's Loop. It consists of 32 structures, mostly three- and four-story apartment buildings, with some two-story row houses.

The Jane Addams buildings are constructed of brick and although bereft of architectural detail, they are built to a human scale, in keeping with the low-rise character of the neighborhood. As with other PWA projects in Chicago, the design was by a large temporary association of architects, in this case ten in number, brought together to fulfill the obligation of providing maximum employment. Three similar projects were constructed in other parts of the city prior to World War II, and then an extensive acres of temporary and permanent developments for war workers and later returning veterans. Most took the form of clusters of rental row houses.

The high-rise phase of public housing in Chicago alerted in 1950 with the construction of Dearborn Homes on the Near South Side, adjacent to the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology. Although its buildings are only six and nine stories tall they set the precedent for the tidal wave of projects that

followed. The reason given for going to elevator buildings was that land coverage could be reduced 10 per cent or less at a time of scarcity of vacant property in the inner-city.

The rationale does not withstand analysis, however, when it is remembered that the earlier low-rise developments had 75 to 80 per cent open land, and none of the problems of elevator living for masses of children. The more likely explanation of the use by the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) of elevator buildings is that the staff, commissioners and architects got caught up in the high-rise apartment fascination of the period, and failed to recognize that housing which might be quite acceptable for single people or childless couples, may not be at all desirable for poor families with several small children.

The concept of Dearborn Homes and the larger developments that followed clearly reflects the influence of LeCorbusier, the Swiss-born architect who published a number of plans in the 1920's and 1930's, especially Villa Radieuse (1935), showing high-rise apartment buildings in park-like settings. The International School of Architecture from Europe maintained a tremendous influence, of course, on American architects and the universities that educated them from that period all the way to the 1970's. By 1955 the "bold" land planning then in vogue was employed by CHA at Grace Abbott Homes, constructed on a "super block" comprising 10 standard city blocks, but without streets running through it. Later came the massive Green project, where former Mayor Jane Byrne visited for two weeks to observe public housing first hand, and

Robert Taylor Homes.

The design of public housing in Chicago, as elsewhere, is bland and unimaginative. It generally consists of dreary rows of barrack-like dwellings, physically better than the tenements they replaced but not very attractive compared to the majority of private housing. When considering the forces that created such results it must be remembered that economic factors played a major part. There was concern to keep the housing comparatively modest in cost, and physically very durable. That objective was basically met in Chicago, except in regard to the matter of elevator maintenance.

Economic considerations were by no means the entire picture in regard to the design choices that were made. Although the reasons for those decisions are now somewhat a matter of conjecture, it is possible to isolate certain factors. 1) In the understandable concern for quickly replacing some of the terrible slums that existed, too little attention was paid to the aesthetic and social implications of this new type of housing. The major emphasis was placed merely on "safe and sanitary" housing. 2) The federal and CHA officials responsible for the projects knew little about architecture. 3) A conscious effort to make the buildings modest in many respects, to blunt public criticism that poor people were getting something for nothing from the government, also assured that public housing would not compete with the private housing market. 4) The overly detailed specifications formulated by the governmental bureaucracies inhibited creativity. 5) There was a lack of public pressure on CI-IA to produce well-penned and

designed housing.

The question remains; was there any meaningful resident input into the designs of public housing? The answer is simply no. The clients of the architects designing such housing were, of course, the local public housing authority and the federal agency which put up the funds, not the tenants. One of the problems inherent in public housing is that its philosophy is paternalistic. Although the social reformers who were the leaders in the early public housing movement were genuinely concerned about the living conditions of the poor, they evidently felt that they (the reformers) knew what was best for them (the poor). The residents have been treated like children, and the tragedy has been that for some it has been a self-fulfilling prophecy; they have come to act like children and be satisfied to have public housing and welfare policies control their lives.

Another important factor that tended to isolate public housing residents from architects who designed such housing was the absence of market forces that are present in the private market. In that market if a design is unacceptable to too many people the building will have a large vacancy rate and not be repeated. The thing that keeps public housing occupied is the acute shortage of affordable housing for poor people and its low rent structure. The average rent of CHA family units, many of which have three bedrooms, is still below \$100 per month.

It is impossible to know what would have happened if public housing tenants had been consulted about the design of new projects. It would be naive to

assume they would have had the answers that everyone else lacked, but it is likely that the outcome would have been somewhat different. *The strong and continued preference that the tenants have shown for row houses and walk-up apartments, if it had been paid attention to by the decision makers and architects, at least would have avoided the debacle of high-rise family public housing. That would have been no mean accomplishment.*

"The Northern Cheyenne and American Architects"

Anne Straus, Anthropologist

A great deal of building has been done to¹ American Indian people. Historically captives in their own country, Indians have become "wards" of the federal government which acts as their trustee and, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, makes or approves most tribal decisions and activities. Building is among the many activities regulated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Acting too often on the premise that the solution of the "Indian problem" and of problems for Indians was assimilation, the BIA has in part sought to fulfill its trust responsibilities by providing the trappings of the American Way in hopes that its tenets might become more attractive. This policy is evident in housing provided for the tribes by the Bureau.

The History of Cheyenne House Forms²

Traditionally, these Indians of the Great Plains lived in tipis, a house form well suited both functionally and symbolically to their lifeway. The conical shape of the tipi allowed it to withstand the high winds of the Plains, where unprotected flat-roofed buildings like those at Agent John demolished school, might well be demolished. With its interior buffalo hide lining, the tipi was warm in the cold winters: with the lining removed and the cover rolled up some from the ground, the tipi was cooled by circulating air in the hot summers. The tipi was large enough to house the large extended families of the female owners while its height alleviated any sense of crowding. Importantly, moreover, for these nomadic hunters, the tipi was portable. The buffalo hide cover could be rolled up and secured on a travois formed from the tipi poles. The women whose job it was to put up and take down the tipi did so many times during the yearly round as they followed the nomadic buffalo. Only in the summer, when the buffalo convened in large herds supported by lush grasses, did the Cheyennes camp together as a tribe and remain for many weeks in the same location.

The tipi was functionally well suited to Plains life. It was also a symbolic reflection of Plains Indian culture—a microcosm of the natural, social, and personal world³ as conceived by those Indian people. Like so much of Plains life, the organization of the tipi replicated that of the medicine wheel, a circle in four parts, oriented towards the cardinal directions which are understood to originate in its center, the source and summation of its power. A medicine wheel was the outline of a prayer, the

stone formation used to mark and direct the prayers of those fasting in the hills, seeking guidance and power. Such formations are still used today on Bear Butte, South Dakota, sacred mountain of the Northern Cheyenne people.

The tipi itself was a kind of prayer. The (scratched) bare earth on which it sat afforded continuing contact with the source and sustenance of physical life. The circularity of its plan reflects what is defined as nature's perfect form. At its center is the fire which heats and holds all within its radius, and immediately above it is the smokehole through which prayers/smoke pass to the Spirit World. Around the fire, each inhabitant has his own place, the circular space of the tipi being divided into four sections roughly equivalent to the four stages of life as defined by the Cheyenne people. The entrance of the tipi always faced east in the old days, though later orientation was sometimes towards Bear Butte. The Four Winds or Powers associated with the Four Sacred Directions fixed the tipi as they fixed the medicine wheel, orienting the inhabitants in the cosmos.

The division into four, the circle and its center were the essential elements of Plains Indian world view. The tipi as a home thus provided an education for life. It also provided a refuge and support to those who were seeking, confused, deviant, by providing a space within which to reorient oneself, to reaffirm in one's own experience the order of the world.

Most Plains Indians brought their tipis with them to the reservations. When the buffalo were gone, they used canvas to fashion covers. They did not feel deprived of

proper housing. But the BIA, seeking to improve living conditions, pushed hard to replace the tipi with the log cabin, symbol of the white frontier.

The First Log House

The chief who had agreed to try out the new structure never considered living in it himself, but thought it might provide good shelter for his animals. Gradually, however, the log house became common reservation housing. It was in many ways inferior housing. Indians with "roofs over their heads" experienced for the first time the fact that roofs leaked. Insulation became a problem as the inevitable wind blew between the logs, and summer circulation of air was minimal. The log house did not move: families were separated in ways they had not before known. The log houses were also smaller than tipis, admitting fewer family members and, with the low roof, giving even those a sense of crowding unknown in the tipi.

But these and many other "functional" shortfalls of the now-prescribed log cabin were nowhere near so destructive as the redefinition of house form. The circle, nature's perfect form, was replaced by a square which has no center and thus no common focus. Orientation towards the Four Directions was often ignored and sleeping arrangements no longer ordered. There was no place of honor for respected elders when the door did not face east: where were they to sit? The home was discordant with the rest of life; it did not echo the great camp circle with its eastward opening which encompassed all the bands of the tribe, bringing them into relationship with each other through their relationship to the common tribal center. It did not

reflect the individual himself, whose behavior was understood as governed by a central heart and four spirits, each associated with one of the Four Directions. The square, squat log house signaled and symbolized change which their inhabitants resist by trying to arrange them as though they were tipis, putting the stove in the center, surrounding it with beds, and using the "corners" as storage or a kind of dead space.

The Coming of Privacy

The one room log cabin gave way to government housing which was larger, less substantial, and divided into three or four separate rooms. Separate bedrooms meant, in practice, that the old people were separated from the rest of the family at night. The stories end traditions which were told and retold at night as the children went to sleep in the same room with their grandparents were silenced and ultimately lost. There are Cheyennes today who see this loss as directly associated with the new sleeping arrangements. Privacy had never been an issue for them: they sought solitude in the hills and did not feel the presence of family and friends as imposing.

Recent improvements in BIA housing include advantages which most of our society never questions: indoor plumbing, increased size and structural basements. These improvements have, however, brought new problems to the Northern Cheyennes. Indoor plumbing is indeed warmer in the cold winters (when it works, that is). But having an indoor toilet brings inside excretions which by cultural tradition must be kept away, especially far away from medicine people. Indoor plumbing is not always a convenience, then;

it brings its own new problems. The new, larger houses have more rooms and are two stories high, removing the inhabitants even farther from the comforting and spiritual connection with the earth. To dig a basement into the earth is a striking example of cultural transgression, since digging in the earth is considered a kind of sacrilege here. ("These are the same people who opposed coal development on their small reservation at least in part on the grounds that tearing up the earth was unthinkable.) Even natural caves, caverns and other holes in the earth are considered dangerous, and often thought to be inhabited by threatening and anomalous beings.

The story continues. The federal government seeks to provide improved housing for Indian people and in so doing sometimes unwittingly hastens the breakdown of traditional culture. Reservation houses are not homes in the same sense as traditional houses; they are shelters which cannot provide real refuge and support to their inhabitants. As shelters they are functional but as dwellings they are no longer meaningful. The organization of domestic space, like the organization of the world is meaningful and the value of domestic structures depends upon that meaning. The tipi reflected and explained the world as defined by those who lived in it: it provided strength and security through proper symbolic order. The new housing can give none of that.

The old homes of the Cheyennes, the Hopis and the Navajos, like those of other Indian people have persisted in their function as "temples" (see *The Temple and the House* by Lord Raglan;

Routledge and Kagan Paul, London 1964). The Sacred Hat and Sacred Arrows of the Cheyennes live in tipis. Traditional ceremonies are carried out in tipis and those who participate or attend such ceremonies camp in tipis or tents in the old camp circle with its opening to the east and its place for every tribal member. Hut as "temples" the old homes are more than nostalgic symbols of a lost past. They are consistent and appropriate dwellings within which to relearn and reassert "right relations"⁴ in the contemporary world.

Community buildings as well as individual homes have been built for Indian people. On the Northern Cheyenne reservation the settlements at Muddy Ashland, Lame Deer and Bushy have each a federally funded community hall—along rectangular tin building to be used for community functions. As it turns out, however, the halls are seldom used for dances or meetings; they are not comfortable facilities for such activities. When they are used, circular space is created by surrounding the central drums. The greatest use of these buildings is for playing winter hand-game, a popular Indian gambling game in which two sides line up and face each other. The shape of the building is well suited to this community activity.

Some new community structures are much more elaborate. At Black River Falls near Tomah, Wisconsin, a great deal of effort went into the construction of a dance arena for the Winnebago Indians who lived there. The structure was dug into the earth much like a Greek amphitheatre with benches surrounding and above the arena itself. The dance

area is used, but according to the director of housing there, people do not feel comfortable in it. Sharing the common Indian apprehension about caves and other underground openings, the Winnebago do not feel right being below in a hole carved out of the earth. Having learned this, the director of housing opposed plans for brim housing at Black River Falls, despite the obvious insulation value.

So far we have considered the unfortunate and ill-planned building done to American Indians by the federal government and other private and religious organizations. Examples could be drawn from every reservation and every tribe to illustrate the cultural impropriety of such buildings and the cultural insensitivity of the architects and others responsible for them. But there are some striking examples to demonstrate that it is not always this way.

Sensitive Indian Architecture

Building for Chicago Indians is in some ways more complicated than building on reservations, since there are a hundred different cultural traditions. It is also more crucial. Chicago Indians live and work in other people's buildings and have not been highly visible as an urban ethnic community. Many Chicagoans do not even realize they live in a city with 25,000 Indian people. Whether recently arrived or city born, Chicago Indians seek their own, urban identity. Despite persistent tribal affiliation, they seek as well the company of other Indians whose experience in the city and more generally what they call the "dominant" society is familiar.

The American Indian Center of Chicago is the nation's oldest urban Indian center, established

for the purpose of assisting newly arrived Indian people in finding jobs and housing especially after the Indian Relocation program of 1952 designed to encourage Indians to leave reservations for cities where they would find work and participate in the broader American society. In 1969, using \$100,000 donated to the organization the Center purchased a Masonic Lodge on Wilson Avenue. That purchase made the American Indian Center the first and until very recently the only urban Indian group to own property⁵, to have a place with which to identify.

Land and place have always been critically important to the Indian people. Traditionally, land was viewed as an integral and inalienable part of tribal history and community, not as a commodity to be owned. (Indeed, the concept of land ownership was essentially unheard of by those Indian people involved in treaty making with immigrant whites during the period of conflict and conquest. The absence of connection with an identifiable place as well as the alienation from the land itself exacerbated the personal and social confusion of urban life for Indian people. The American Indian Center provided Chicago Indians with such a place. The building and grounds as well as the organization itself became very important to Chicago Indians and to Indians elsewhere who always had a place to go if they came to the city.

But the building itself was old and there was little money to keep it up. Over the years it has been the source of many problems: plumbing, heating, ventilation, inappropriate layout, and so on. About five years

ago, the (largely white) fundraising arm of the Center began a major effort to improve the facility. The engineers and architects whose opinions were solicited agreed that the wisest approach would be to sell the property and look elsewhere or demolish the existing building and begin again.

The Indian board acknowledged but would not accept those recommendations. The building was to be renovated, not demolished, even though it seemed impractical economically and architecturally. The building itself had meaning and importance to the Indian people of Chicago. *Somewhat miffed by the failure to appreciate the assistance of their technical expertise, the fundraising group was eventually convinced that Indian people had to make decisions concerning the Indian Center.*

To begin with, of course, there was no money, and provisional plans were necessary before they could even begin to look for grants to accomplish the renovation. Ted Morningstar, a young white architect sympathetic to the situation and the Indian community generally, agreed to draw up plans without fee so that funding could be sought. He would be paid if that funding were found. This was certainly an unusual and a risky arrangement for the architect.

Eventually, they found money to establish a Senior Citizens' Center in the building, and the first major building project was underway.

A Senior Citizens' Center operated by another Indian organization had been previously operating but had lost its funding. *One of the architect's first steps in*

designing the new area at the Indian Center was to visit with people in that program, both the clients and the directors, all of whom were Indian. He hung around long enough to get a feel for his clients, for the kinds of activities and interactions which were important in such a program. He learned, for example, that an arts and crafts program was critical and that the area in which it took place must be enough lighted to allow older people to do small work such as beadwork and quilting. Indian crafts help Indian people to identify with their own cultural traditions, especially in the confusion of urban life. They also allow older people to contribute in various ways—through sale, through teaching, through raffles and give sways—to the Indian community. With the limited (c. 6500 square feet) rectangular space allocated to the project, Ted Morningstar worked out preliminary plans and went over them carefully with program directors and other Indian people, asking for their input, listening, being aware that he might be wrong, seeking to establish an identifiably Indian "place" out of a Masonic lodge/public school building.

The resultant center has been a great success. Overseeing the work himself, Mr. Morningstar used Indian workers, six to twelve of them at any one time. He feels that this helped to establish a good feeling about the new center and to support his determination to make it an identifiably Indian place for those who would use it. The heart of the center is a large common area used for dances, dinners, card games, meetings. Three small "living rooms," distinct but not closed off come off this central area. Clients can sit in small groups if they wish,

but still retain a sense of contiguity with the whole place, with all the clients. This is important since there are both personal and tribal preferences and prejudices yet the Center is for all Indians. With no corridors and no closed off areas except the administrative office, the private room problem described move has not appeared here. The central area itself is sort of T-shape, so designed to maximize the amount of natural light in the area of the greatest social interaction. If he had been able to work it out within the confines of the space and light he had to work with and the budget he had to draw upon, the architect states that he would have chosen a more "natural" shape such as a circle for the central area. Interestingly, when asked why he felt the natural light so important over artificial lighting, he was not sure how to answer: it just seemed to "feel" right for the people who would be using the center, perhaps because of a general feeling for the natural world and a sensitivity to the environment.

In decorating the center, the architect consciously planned to use bright colors which he felt would appeal especially to Indian people, based on his own experience with them. He also retained and carefully restored murals and hanging artwork by Indian people previously stored or displayed in the building in order to emphasize the sense of continuity and of Indian-ness.

When work on the Senior Citizens Center was completed, the clients and staff of the center held a traditional dedication ceremony led by native Medicine people. The people of the community made the Center their own. *It was*

not a copy⁶ of any native structure. It was an urban center designed by an architect who took time to ask and to learn from his clients, and to realize that a building for Indian people would be successful only if it had some relationship to their Indian-ness.

Government policy has changed, but federal housing continues to reflect the same insensitivity. With all good intentions of providing comfortable, civilized, efficient, modern housing for reservation Indians, architects employed by the federal government have succeeded in turning "temple"/homes into housing units, in diminishing the value and interrupting what may be the most important function of the home—the provision of security and support to its inhabitants. Every home has a cultural community context as well as a personal end family one. Space, direction, design are meaningful and their meanings vary cross-culturally. A home which is comfortable is one which addresses those meanings. *The architect, then, must make an effort to appreciate cultural variation and valuation of architectural space. Such meanings may be very difficult to discover. They are quite often unconscious, surfacing only when they are offended or opposed in some way.*

This accounts for the somewhat vague explanation by a sensitive architect that something simply seems to "feel" right for his clients. We cannot, of course, expect all architects to have the kind of long term commitment to and association with the client community that Ted Morningstar has with the Chicago Indian community. We cannot expect the

architect to be an anthropologist, though we might expect that he consult with one. We also cannot expect the architect to be native to the community in which he works, although that might produce the most successful buildings since both conscious and unconscious valuations are then the most likely to be shared. What we can and must expect of the architect is that he be made aware of the power of his own cultural blinders and thus made sensitive to the existence of differing cultures, differing evaluations of space, direction, design. With this awareness the architect is prepared to learn from his client and thus to build for him rather than for some distant audience.

Footnotes

1. Preposition suggested by the editor.
2. This account is based on comments by Rubie Sooktis of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe.
3. For discussions of this see Straus, "The Tipi," in Bulletin of The Field Museum, 1980.
4. Momaday, N. Scott. The World of the American Indian, National Geographic Society, Washington, D.C., 1974.
5. NAES College now owns a campus in Chicago.
6. Copies are generally unsuccessful. They are experienced as built by the wrong people for the wrong purposes, mixing frames of reference, however earnest in their intent.

"When the Client is a Developer"

John W Baird, Chairman of the Board, Baird and Warner

I. One thing I have become convinced of is that plans must be carefully reviewed by our management and marketing experts at the earliest possible stage to avoid what may be costly problems.

Let me give you just a few examples of where this has not been done or mistakes had not been caught.

I recall one building where unfortunately I had an interest as developer where the elevator cab was so small that it would not accommodate families moving in with ordinary-size sofas and davenport. It was necessary for us to rig up a sling underneath the cab in order to get this furniture up to the tenant's apartment.

Another case involved a building in which the entrance to the powder room was off the living room in such a manner that those sitting in the living room were forced to look into the toilet. Obviously, these apartments were difficult to rent.

Another instance I recall where the architect was given a duty of selecting the carpet for an apartment building. He acted a plain carpet, which I must admit looked very good, but had to be removed around the elevators and the entry way after about 30 days because it showed the dirt so badly, even though it was a dark, natural hue. It is essential from a management point of view to have a patterned carpet in these areas.

Still another example is a building we managed which had a fresh chute with a compactor at the bottom. The door swings and entrances to the compactor room

were of a size it was impossible to get the carts through. It was necessary to completely reconstruct this wall.

In still another building, the architect's plan showed adequate garage space to meet the zoning requirements, but when the building was built, nowhere near the proper number of cars could be gotten into the space, even though they were Volkswagen Bugs.

II. Another point I feel quite strongly about is that architects in many respects are like doctors—they have their specialties. They, themselves, don't recognize this as much as doctors do, and when you select an architect who is not experienced in one type of building, you may run into very serious problems.

Examples of this I have run into involve, first of all, a shopping center that was designed and built by an architect who had an outstanding reputation as a residential single-family house designer. The center was a disaster! The fire walls were misplaced. The commercial space was difficult to subdivide to meet retail tenants' requirements.

Another example is an office building we managed. It was built circular, like Marine City. The office spaces were, therefore, pie-shaped. Office furniture is rectangular. Therefore, the spaces could not be laid out to make efficient, satisfactory offices.

I recall as a broker, offering a loft building, well located, particularly with respect to public transportation and good light, to an art school. They selected an architect to advise them who had

a reputation of being unsympathetic to rehabilitation and adaptive re-use. The architect convinced them that the project was not feasible, and then subsequently built them a new building at greater cost.

The concept of specialization, not only applies to types of buildings, but types of tenants who may use the buildings.

I am reminded of an apartment building built for low-income families where the architect used the typical long corridor-type apartment with some offsets in a corridors and exits and entrances at both ends. The vandalism in these corridors from teenagers was excessive and far greater than would have been the case had the building been designed with separate entrances off of small balconies, servicing a few apartments.

III. One other distasteful experience I have had is where the architect sets himself up as the arbitrator over the cost of change orders—between the owner and the contractor. The more frequent type of change order generally arises out of some ambiguity or missing information in the plans and specifications. It is therefore an anomaly in these cases to have the architect act as arbitrator in these instances where responsibility or cause of the necessary change is a result of his work.

IV. I also have great difficulty in agreeing to architectural fees that are related to the cost of construction. It can therefore escalate up if change orders are incurred. Most frequently change orders may result either from items which I mentioned above or other conditions which in no way

relate to the work of the architect. It seems improper to me then that his fees should be increased because of these conditions. Generally I try to negotiate a fixed fee for the architect's services.

"Architectural Review Boards and Architects "

Patricia S. Eldredge, Member
Hudson, Ohio, Architectural
Board of Review

Interaction between architects and design review boards does not have to be an adversary relationship. That it is viewed as such is due more to the expectations and attitudes of architects than those of review boards. Architects tend to anticipate either total approval, in the best case, or confrontation, in the worst; boards come to the table anticipating cooperation at best and compromise at worst. There is an almost universal irritation on the part of architects with the necessity of coming before a review board in the first place. The board is seen as a group of muddling meddlers, unqualified to comment on, much less to criticize a work of artistic inspiration. At the very least, it is a third entity with which to deal, when dealing with the client is difficult enough. Nevertheless, a number of years on the Architectural Board of Review in Hudson, Ohio, has taught me that interaction between architects and architectural boards can be both creative and beneficial, depending on the attitudes which each brings to the relationship.

Hudson is a small town between Cleveland and Akron, which retains a surprising amount of the New England character bequeathed to it by its Connecticut founders in the early 19th century. Hudson's central core surrounding the village green was Ohio's first National Register Historic District. Until recently, farms edged the town's perimeters, but now it has become more an exurban bedroom community.

The Village of Hudson has had an Architectural Board since 1982. It is charged with consideration of plans for new structures, as well as additions, alterations, fences and signs. That consideration is perhaps only secondarily to assess plans as individual projects. Much more important is the charge to review plans as they relate to and impact on the character of the village as a whole.

Although there are strict standards when altering older buildings in the Historic District, contemporary architecture for new structures is not discouraged. It is merely that designing a contemporary building that fits into the 19th century character and residential scale of the village is more difficult. Indeed, most architects opt out and prefer to spit back imitations and derivatives. Architects who understand the board's view of its charge from the village, who make an honest attempt to study the village rather than designing a building as if it had no neighbors and no responsibility to the community find enthusiastic cooperation when they come to the review table. *If, in addition, the architect spends the extra time and effort to come to the board with preliminary drawings, and if*

the client is included at this initial stage, the interaction is most likely to be both pleasant and profitable.

The client's input is important. Although the inspiration may be the architect's, it is the client who will have to live in, work in, or administer the result. It is he who will have to get along with the neighbors or make his living in the community. So the client is likely to accept the relationship of his building to its surroundings, serving the interests of the board. On the other hand, the client's interests are sometimes served by the identification, in this initial meeting, of problems or features which had escaped him. *It is not easy to project a three-dimensional actuality from plans and elevations, particularly if this is a first experience.* He may not have realized that his addition will mean an old oak will have to go or that the master bedroom with the abundance of wall space he had required will be a dark tunnel, or that, in climate noted for its cold and cloudy winters, the only kitchen window faces north. Too often a client has not made his real concerns clear. Sometimes it seems to be only in the atmosphere of a three-way conversation—Board, client and architect—that the client dares to differ with his own architect.

Two Case Studies

Recently plans were brought in for major alterations and additions to an existing house. The building was approximately twenty years old, roughly "colonial" and stood in a neighborhood of similar houses. The plan included a tower over the front entrance, the use of four different exterior building materials in an avowed attempt to evoke the image of an

English cottage, and a wide stone chimney facing the street with a stained-glass window at its heart. The tower seemed to make the building too high in relation to its neighbors; the different building materials jarred with the relative simplicity of the "colonial" houses around it; the gimmick of the chimney seemed entirely out of keep with the character of a simple age.

The Board's first view of the plans was with the architect alone. He insisted that this was what his client wanted. A three-way meeting, including the client, was arranged and surprising things happened. It turned out that the client had actually preferred an alternate sketch with a greatly modified tower, but in his words, "Our architect thought the other was best." The client was quickly able to see the board's concern about the multiplicity of building materials and agreed to be less exuberant about their use. And, when asked why a family which collected restrained Federal furniture wanted to have a stained-glass window in the center of their chimney, the client replied that it was their architect's idea; they just wanted to have a fireplace in the den. Perhaps their reluctance to express their own ideas and opinions was due to an uncertainty about their own tastes, particularly vis-a-vis those of an artist and professional. Sometimes it takes a third party to give the client confidence.

It would have been better, however, if this three-way conference had taken place at a much earlier point in the design process - a point at which less time, money and ego were likely to be involved. A preliminary conference at this stage gives the

and the opportunity to point out some very basic concepts, which are impossible to include when hard-line drawings are completed. Nineteenth century buildings in Hudson, for instance, were designed to fit the topography and shape of the lot. If the lot were 90 feet wide and 150 feet long, the building would be longer than it was wide. Once a five-bay "Colonial" with attached garage has been designed for the lot, it is too late to suggest that it misses the concept.

One example of the happy results of a preliminary conference between architect and architectural board in Hudson involved the rehabilitation of the village's 1878 Town Hall.

Early in 1978, both the village and township of Hudson passed a bond issue to enable them jointly to buy a wedge-shaped piece of land near the village green which had been abandoned by the Penn-Central Railroad. The plan included removing the fire station from one corner of the green to the new land and enlarging it, the construction of a flood-control lake on the property and the building of a new community center on its banks. Part and parcel of this was the refurbishing of the former Town Hall, facing the green, which had most recently been used as police headquarters and a few township offices. The large upstairs room which had originally been the public meeting room was being used as a theatre, while the Council and other public bodies met across the green in a large, rented chamber above a block of stores. The idea was to restore the Town Hall to its original function of meeting place for town bodies and offices for town officials. However, at the

preliminary meeting between the architectural board and the architects hired by the village, it was clear that no consideration had been given to the architectural restoration of the building itself.

The plans called for the upstairs theatre room to be divided into offices, while wells were to be removed on the first floor to provide a Council room. A new entrance at the side would give access both to the offices and the Council chambers. The original front entrance, then, became only secondary, used for night access to the Council chambers and to meet the fire code regulations. This front entrance opened on a small vestibule with twin staircases leading right and left to the second floor theatre room. Since only one stair was required by the code, the architects' plan called for the removal of one of the twin staircases, to be replaced by a glassed shaft where plants would be hung.

When the board asked why it was necessary to remove an original staircase, the architects reacted with surprise. The twin staircases rose against the front building wall end, at one juncture, ran across two major windows. The architects had assumed the stairs were later additions.

The first order of business was then to take them on a tour of 19th century public buildings in town, stopping particularly at the Chapel of Western Reserve Academy, built as part of Western Reserve College in 1834. The central door of the Greek Revival building enters onto a vestibule with twin staircases leading, left and right, to the sanctuary on the second floor. At one point, the stairs both run directly in front of two large

windows. Although the Town Hall was almost fifty years later, it was obvious that the two local builders credited with its design were greatly influenced by the Chapel, which, as the College's most revered building, was surely one of the town's most important. A few moments in the simple, New England elegance of the sanctuary and it was not difficult to persuade the architects to reconsider their plans for the Town Hall.

The next sketches showed the Council chamber on the second floor, where it had originally been located. Both stairs were retained and, by the removal of two closets built under them, their original upward sweep was restored. By this time, the architects had become enthusiastic. They found ways to save the pressed metal ceiling in the Council room. They asked the board to investigate period paint colors and suppliers for reproduction hardware. They specified reproduction electrical fixtures.

By the time the architects and the architectural board had finished working together on the Town Hall, there was an amiable and profitable working relation. When the plans for the enlargement of the fire station and for the new Community Center came in, there was a remarkable cooperation, and when an objection was raised over one or two features by other village bodies, the board went to bat in support of the architect's plans. At this point, they understood the board's objectives, and the board understood theirs.

That this interaction is a success story is largely due to the fact that, although plans and elevations had been drawn at the time of the

first meeting, the process had not gone so far that it could not be reversed. In a sense, too, the client was present and vocal since the client was the Village Improvement Board of Hudson and the architectural board is an arm of the village. Most importantly, after the tour of public buildings the architects took the time to study the village itself and related their subsequent plans to it. The board then became an ally, and the interaction was not one of confrontation, but of cooperation.

"H.H. Richardson and the Glessners: An Architect and His Clients"

Elaine Harrington, Curator of Glessner House and
Kevin Harrington, Assistant Professor of Architectural History

In May of 1885, John and Frances Glessner of Chicago solicited a design for a new dwelling from H. H. Richardson, an architect with his office in Brookline, Massachusetts. As Richardson was then the most prominent and highly regarded architect in America, and is today generally considered the greatest American architect of the 19th century, the innovative house he designed for the Glessners in the last year of his life, at the height of his inventive power, is usually interpreted as illustrating and confirming that excellence. The distinctive qualities of the design—clarity, organization, repose, privacy and independence—have been recognized from the outset and

have been the basis both for the acclaim and occasional criticism it has received.

While Richardson received praise for his design, the Glessners were assumed to be complaisant patrons willing to grant a great architect his opportunity. *With the availability of the Glessners' journals and other materials it is possible to show that client and architect were equally prepared and informed in their joint effort to create a durable, commodious and beautiful house.* The Glessners began seriously to consider the importance of design in their family life in the 1870s when they formed a professional and personal relationship with Isaac E. Scott, an architect and designer in Chicago. Scott designed a great deal of Eastlake styled furniture for the Glessners for their house at 261 West Washington Boulevard in Chicago. [See Figure 1]. In addition to these activities, he also aided the Glessners as they developed their taste. Frances and John read actively in the contemporary literature on architecture and the decorative arts.

Further, the Glessners had established habits before they hired Richardson. Their two previous Chicago houses were on corner sites, as is the Prairie Avenue House, and their bedroom was on the first floor on West Washington as well as on Prairie Avenue. The Glessners ate well. They gave musical evenings, necessitating, on West Washington, taking down their bed for more space for this sort of entertaining. In 1871 they began "a collection of bric-a-brac," and by the time they moved to Prairie Avenue they owned many prints

and 2,800 books. *The Glessners had established the patterns of their life, and this would be clear and detailed when they spoke to an architect. One of the central aspects of the preparation to commission a house was that John and Frances took an equal interest.*

Before engaging Richardson. John Glessner took what his wife described as "walks among the architects." On a trip to New York, he interviewed, among others, McKim, Mead and White, R.H. Robertson and William Potter. The Glessners even ordered plans from Potter, which arrived in Chicago at the same time that they were interviewing Richardson. When Richardson's plans were compared to Potter's the latter were rejected. Mrs. Richardson wrote of Potter: "his plans have given us some disappointment-not so convenient or so artistic as we had expected."

Contributions to the Design

The innovative is of the design-L-shaped bull on a corner site yielding a private courtyard, minimally windowed well along tile side street, intentionally simple and subtle ornament, remarkably clear and flexible plan-emerged as the result of the coincidence of Richardson's mature design ideas and the Glessners' clear understanding of what they wanted. After their first interviews in Chicago, at Richardson's hotel, their home on West Washington, and in a visit to the site, Richardson asked the Glessners "Have you courage to build the house without windows on the streetfront?" and when he went on to ask how they wished the house planned, Glessner responded, "Oh no, Mr. Richardson, that would be me

planning the house." Clearly, each respected the other. Client and architect cooperated in an interesting way when Richardson, spotting a photograph of Abingdon Abbey in England on one of the Glessners' mantels, asked them if they liked it. He asked to borrow it, saying it would be the keynote for the design. The photograph of the Abbey he used is similar in character and feeling to the 18th Street facade of the house.

In April 1885, just prior to the rounds of interviews, Mrs. Glessner had read Viollet-le-Ihtc's *The Story of a House*, which had first been published in English in 1874. One observation in the book seems to have had direct influence. Viollet-le-Ihic wrote

Underground kitchens ere unhealthy for their occupants, are difficult to look after, end spread their odors through the ground floor. We will place it then, on the same floor with the dining-room, but not having direct communication with it, so as to avoid the smell and the noise.

The Glessner kitchen is on the first floor, separated from the dining room by a coppersinked butler's pantry. Later, when the Glessners were reviewing Ricahraon's plans in his office, Frances Glesaner observed that the servants' bedrooms lacked closets. Richardson declared, "Well, Madam, you don't need to have it that way," quickly adding closets (while distressing the Glessners as his sketch was made directly on the beautifully drawn plans). Richardson had originally specified a rough cut pink marble for the exterior, but even here the Glessners thought better of the proposal, substituting a gray

granite with a pinkish cast. Once John Glessner suggested that a contingency fund be planned for the budget of the building, but Richardson assured him that it would not be necessary, since he and his contractors were sufficiently experienced not to need a cushion of that sort. This was quite correct; the house came in precisely on budget.

As the two families became acquainted during the course of developing the design they became friends. In Boston the Glessners accompanied Richardson on a tour of his buildings there. While sitting in Trinity Church, a commission Richardson had won in competition in 1872, he observed that the congregation seemed pleased with his work. "Buttheyought not to be be,"hesaid. Think what I could do now." Richardson gave the Glessners photographs of his own library, located in the office wing of his house, where the Glessners often talked with him about their own house. [See Figure 2.] Richardson also introduced them to his neighbor, the landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted. Mrs. Glessner gave a gemstone to Richardson's son because of their shared interest.

John Glessner once wrote, "Richardson was a big man physically, mentally and in every other way. He was built on a generous, big scale: his height about six feet, his weight three hundred and seventy pounds, his brain as large in proportion to his body. He enjoyed thinking and doing things, but was big enough to embrace the small also. Before employing him I had heard that he would not build anything less than a monumental building, and when

I told him so he said, 'I'll build anything a man wants. I build a chicken coop, even, if I em wanted to. That's the way I make a living for my family.'" (from an unpublished manuscript by John Glessner, 1914, the Chicago Architecture Foundation).

The end of the project grew bittersweet. Richardson knew he was dying, and when he noted the location of the lighting fixtures for the Glessners he said to them, "If I were to live five years longer, that is the last thing I would do for your house: my part is finished." They were in Richardson's bedroom in Brookline, where his nephritic disease had finally confined him. Three weeks later, 28 April 1886, the Glessners received the telegram "Mr Richardson died last night work will be carried on as before." It had been sent by George Shepley, who with Charles Coolidge and Charles Ruten, formed Richardson's successor firm, carefully completing his projects.

Richardson and the Interior

The influence of Richardson's example and firm was also felt on the interior of Glessner House. As in other projects where they designed furniture, Charles Coolidge designed the arm and side chairs for the Glessners dining room. He designed the Glessners' large library table to resemble Richardson's own, including several large print drawers for the Glessners' collection. [See Figure 3.] Richardson himself had specified a cork lined alcove off the library to aid the Glessners in their habit of putting up and looking at prints before making a final selection for purchase. The mahogany case for the Glessners' Steinway piano was designed by Francis Bacon and

made by the A. H. Davenport firm of Boston. Both were recommended to the Glessners by Richardson.

On shopping trips to Boston, the Glessners were often accompanied by members of the office. Back in Chicago in December 1886, Shepley went along to advise when they selected rugs at Marshall Field's Department Store. One of these was the handsome William Morris carpet placed in the first floor living hall (and now in the collection of the Art Institute of Chicago). In the initial decorative scheme for the living hall the Glessners used a William Morris fabric known as Peacock and Dragon for the portieres. Richardson had used the same pattern for the portieres in his library. In fact, Richardson had visited Morris in 1882, when he was on a European tour. It appears that Richardson's interest in the arts and crafts movement, especially as articulated by Morris, encouraged the Glessners to use Morris things throughout their house. Thus included fireplace tiles, fabrics for furniture, windows and doors, carpets wallpapers, furniture, and at a', east one lamp. Close examination of the photographs the Glessners had made to document their West Washington Boulevard house reveal many pieces by Scott but nothing by Morris.

In subsequent years, when surfaces needed to be renewed, the Glessners continued to use Morris patterns, sometimes the same, sometimes different, showing that the Glessners, through their association with Richardson, had established the pattern for their future domestic

life. As Viollet-le-Duc stated in *The Story of a House*,

the dwelling ought to be for a manor his family, a garment made to measure; and that when a dwelling is in perfect accordance with the manner and habits of those who are sheltered beneath its roof, it is excellent.

"A Private Client of Today: The Fultzes" Jean Fultzes

Five years ago this month we finished construction on a house in Northwest Indiana. Altogether it was quite an enterprise. I suppose that almost anyone who builds a house for himself is prey to doubts and anxieties and we were no exception. We did like the design our architect proposed however and now, five years later, see no reason to change our minds. It has turned out to be a peculiarly satisfying place for us to live.

The actual construction, however, turned out to be something of a problem. As the house has strong elements of high tech in its design, we hoped that it might be put together in record time, but thus, alas, was an expectation not to be realized. Instead of the four to five months originally envisaged, it took fourteen long months before we could finally move in. The house, designed by an architect, certainly does have a very strong stamp of originality in its conception and requirements. All of its details are "different." In consequence, workmen who

declared initially that they *could* do it easily enough, found that although they could do it, it took longer than the more standard design construction they were doing elsewhere. So they went elsewhere where they could finish their job more easily and hence more profitably and came around to us when there was time left over.

To clarify the situation perhaps I should briefly describe to you what the house is like. It is one story and built of steel and glass on a 36' x 36' slab of concrete which is ground to resemble terrazzo. Its details include 26 sliding doors which separate bedrooms and closets from the rest of the house; a kitchen island containing all the kitchen appliances was custom built and required eight men to bring in; Hope windows from New York whose frames had to be welded onto steel uprights and a solid masonry core of Hanley glazed brick. Everything except for the ground concrete came out very well, but it took more time to do than the usual and probably accounts for the constant delays. Also, there is the fact that there was a construction boom at that time in Northern Indiana and contractors and subcontractors had frequently much more work than they could handle.

Aside from thus our experience has been satisfying and rewarding. Our initial discussions with the architect concerned the basics-i.e. how many rooms we wanted, how many bathrooms, kitchen requirements and other features. *Because our site is just inside the edge of a deep woods with a view to the east of tall trees and to the west of a ten acre field planted in corn or soy beans we knew at the*

outset that our house must have maximum window space and talked at that time about the desirability of having thermo pane. With all that glass our house would be cold, expensive to heat. We decided, however, to forego it as it would have increased the cost of the house to a degree that was unacceptable to us.

The architect had a model of a house he had designed earlier for himself and then, for various personal reasons, decided not to build. Since the model incorporated many of the requirements we had decided on, he suggested that we might like to keep it for a while and see if we liked the design well enough to build our house to be like it or something like. *This model was very helpful. I remember taking it outside and putting it down on the grass in the backyard and lying down beside it to peer into its rooms.* I could see shadow patterns and sunlight on the floor. In my imagination I could see us living there in quite a short time, actually, we did come to the conclusion that we liked the design and wanted to build. Others, as it turned out, also like the design. Our house won the Chicago Chapter AIA Distinguished Building Award for 1980.

A simpler, but no less important requirement we had concerned room for utilities, tools, garden equipment, etc. A prefabricated steel pole building was decided on and the architect draw its details including a wide overhang so that we can walk from one room to another, protected from rain and snow. A real treat for me is a study there, far away from my workaday world. Probably, it is as soothing for the housewife to be

in a building that has no kitchen facilities as it is soothing for some people to be where there is no telephone.

Why It Worked So Well

Our experience with our architect was remarkably uncomplicated. Quite simply, we accepted his design our understanding being much helped by the model, and we closely watched construction as the work progressed. *Quality control was maintained by the regular visits of a young architect with the firm we had retained, who made sure that all the design specifications were followed.* As I mentioned earlier, the house was very long a-building, but that had more to do with contractors' priorities than with architectural vagaries.

There was one temporary impasse on the subject of fireplaces. Although I could see that something so non-contemporary as a fireplace would not fit very well in a design such as ours, I believed quite firmly that northern country winters need the comforting presence of an open fire. There was a good deal of badinage on the subject as I remember, and finally the architect hit upon the happy solution of two Norwegian stoves, one of which can be converted into a fireplace. The stoves give out a lot more heat than a fireplace and they fit in very much better.

In conclusion, I would report that *our finished house did not cost more than the original estimates agreed upon with the contractor.* The reason for this is probably the fact that we, the clients, did not demand design and material changes as we went along. When such demands are made hostility frequently develops between the

members of the contract and costs are increased. But I felt that the design of our house, because of its nature, permitted no changes and that to demand them would seriously alter its character and defeat our purposes.

"Announcements "

FELLOWSHIP: The Center for Philosophy and Public Policy at the University of Maryland invite applications for its Rockefeller Resident Fellowships. This Center investigates the structure of arguments and the nature of values relevant to the formation, justification, and criticism of public policy. The deadline for application is January 31, 1984. For further information, write to Henry Shue, Director, Center for Philosophy and Public Policy; 0123 Woods Hall; University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742.

CONFERENCES: On May 1-2, 1984, the IEEE will host its 1984 Symposium on the Social Implications of Technology, entitled "Electro-Culture 1984." Topics include: Government Imposed Secrecy & Technology Transfer; Robotics Automation, Society & Work; Computer & Communication Privacy & Security; and Weapons in Space. The Society is putting out a call for papers, with abstracts due November 21, 1983 and manuscripts due February 28, 1984. Contact: Professor Stephen H. Unger, Department of Computer Science, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027. Phone: (212) 280-8187.

The American Society of Law & Medicine announces its 1984 Spring Seminar Series. The seminar on Institutional Ethics Committees and Healthcare Decisionmaking will be held four times: February 18-17 in Los Angeles, February 23-24 in Houston, April 12-13 in Detroit, and June 14-15 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Other seminars are: Ethics on the Front Lines of Medical Care, February 29-March 2, Denver; Physicians and Hospitals in an Era of Change, March 1-3, Miami Beach; Legal Controversies in Nursing, March 9-10, Los Angeles; Genetics and the Law, April 2-4, Boston; Hospices: Legal Medical & Ethical Issues, May 10-11, Chicago; and Medicine for Attorneys, May 16-18, Boston. Contact: American Society of Law & Medicine, 765 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215.

The Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology was established in 1976 for the purpose of promoting education and scholarship relating to ethical and policy issues of the professions.

EDITOR: Fay Sawyier
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Warren Schmaus
STAFF: Marion Denne, Jessica Tovrov
EDITORIAL BOARD: Thomas Calero, Frederick Elliston, Mark Frankel, Norman Gevitz, Martin Malin, Vivian Weil

Opinions expressed in Perspectives on the Professions are those of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions or the Illinois Institute

of Technology. Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill. 60616.