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This thesis analyses the roles played by international, national, regional and local organisations and discourses in the heritage valorisation and conservation of modernist architecture – a process that has so far spanned some three decades. A leading role in this narrative has been played by international conservation organisations, which have acted as a unifying front for conservation advocacy and defined a conservation ideology that integrates the principles of both the modern movement and the conservation movement. Partly, this international emphasis has stemmed from the characteristics of the 20th century Modern Movement itself, including its strong strain of cosmopolitanism, as well as its still controversial reputation today at a local level. This initially gave the proselytising of modernist conservation a somewhat elite, trans-national character, exemplified by pioneering organisations such as DOCOMOMO. Yet the ‘internationalism’ of modernist conservation is only part of the story – for to establish this innovative new strand of heritage on a more entrenched basis, the familiar, more locally specific organisations and discourses that had supported previous phases of conservation growth were also increasingly applied to ‘MoMo’ heritage. This ‘on the ground’ involvement represented a convergence with more ‘traditional’ conservation practices, both in advocacy and campaigning, and in the research-led documentation required to document buildings’ significance and continued fitness for purpose. These geographically-specific forces operate at both a national level and also a regional or even local scale, as the thesis illustrates by the two national case studies of Great Britain and the United States of America. Although both countries shared numerous cultural similarities, especially the 19th century veneration of private property, the far more emphatic 20th century turn towards state interventionism in Britain led to a strong divergence regarding modernist heritage, both in the overall character of the modernist architecture built in the two countries (far more ‘capitalistic’ in the US) and in the approach to heritage conservation (more state-dominated in GB). In Great Britain, following on from the comprehensive post-WWII government ‘listing’ programme, the statutory heritage bodies – ‘regionally’ differentiated between England and Scotland - have maintained their leading role in the conservation of modern movement heritage through initiatives to identify buildings of significance, and powerful city planning authorities have provided co-ordinated enforcement. In the US, on the other hand, heritage protection has stayed faithful to its philanthropic roots and the onus of modern movement conservation is left to voluntary advocacy groups who then must campaign to have buildings protected piecemeal by local city or state preservation bodies.
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Part 1. INTRODUCTION
1.1. **Research Question and Interpretative Ideas**

Throughout most European countries, the preservation of historic buildings has not only been seen as natural, but as inherently good. However, for many, this accepted correlation has been challenged by the proposed conservation of modern movement architecture. This thesis analyses the roles played by international, national, regional and local heritage conservation organisations in the valorisation and conservation of modern movement architecture over the past three decades. Given the presumed international narrative of the modern movement itself, and the elite, trans-national character of early modernist conservation, this research has analysed the development of conservation charters and initiatives that specifically address the conservation of modern movement architecture from an international level down to a local level. The question this research set out to answer is whether the conservation of modern movement architecture has continued to follow earlier nationally specific values and trends in conservation, and if not, how the valuation of modern movement architecture as heritage has changed the definition of conservation and thus the future direction of the conservation movement as a whole.

International conservation organisations have provided a unifying front for conservation advocacy and have collectively defined a conservation ideology that integrates the principles of both the modern movement and the conservation movement. Their influence on modern movement conservation has been assessed by tracing how these internationally coordinated principles have been reflected in the national, regional and local conservation policies in Great Britain and the United States of America.

Several books have been written on the development of architectural conservation as a profession and as a movement, however few have focused on the movement to conserve modernist architecture specifically and none so far have focused so intently on the relationship between the principles championed by the international conservation organisations and the development of national and local practices and policies. Through an analysis of the valorisation, designation and management processes applied to modern heritage at a local, regional and national level in Great Britain and the United States,

---

nationally held values and traditions have been found to have a strong influence on the conservation of modern movement architecture in each country, leading to nationally unique conservation movements.

The United States of America and Great Britain were chosen to assess how markedly different conservation models have developed within two nations that formerly shared a monarchy, that continue to share the same language and many basic cultural norms, and for whom a reliance upon much of the same research has led to many shared conservation theories. Prior to World War I, both countries’ governments operated under a similar capitalistic reliance on the private sector to build and provide for its people. With regard to the built environment, through the 19th century and into the 20th century, both countries harboured distrust in government interventionism, but this began to change in Britain after WWI and much more rapidly after WW2 with the establishment of the Welfare State. With this came a willingness on the government’s part to intervene in the private sector through housing, healthcare, transportation and so forth and today, these nationally-backed systems are still overwhelmingly supported by its citizens, especially the government’s involvement within the heritage sector and healthcare.

Though the Thatcher government moved Britain closer toward a free market economic model during the 1980s, the government retained a level of control over the built environment that would not be acceptable in the United States. The US federal government has however intervened in the private sector on certain occasions, such as with the establishment of the New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps and the Historic American Building Survey programmes in 1933, and during the post-war period, the government dabbled in social provision through controversial government-subsidized straightforward solutions to issues that challenged the stability of post-war America, most successfully executed through the New York City Housing Authority’s public housing programme. Modernist buildings in Britain and America were designed to convey differing socialist (GB) and capitalist (US) messages of contemporary politics, and these political leanings continue to affect how the movement to conserve modern architecture has developed in each nation. Modern movement conservation in Great Britain has been primarily a government-led initiative and the ‘interventionism’ of the post-war Welfare State is retained through the public’s support for powerful heritage protection legislation that places restrictions on listed buildings with or without the owner’s permission. The laws governing the built environment in the US today are still very much in favour of the free market and the private property owner and therefore, the heritage protection system
in the United States remains largely a private-led movement and the conservation of modern movement heritage has stayed true to the movement’s philanthropic roots. Though the statutory systems that protect architectural heritage in each of these nations differ greatly, we will see that the material and technical issues particular to modern movement architecture have brought architects and conservation practitioners in both countries to a similar conclusion that ‘conservation’ in its traditional definition may no longer apply to architectural heritage of the modern movement and now the post-modern movement. The evolitional conservation theories and their application in practice have been discussed in Part 2 and Part 3, but the implication of the conservation of modern movement architecture on the whole of the conservation movement will be addressed most fully in Part 4.
1.2. METHODOLOGY

It should be clarified that the whole breadth of conservation within the United States or Great Britain could not be adequately addressed between the covers of this thesis, so focus was given first to relevant national level research and initiatives, then to certain regions that have been most active or innovative in their approach to the conservation of modern movement architecture. Being based in Edinburgh, the study of the conservation of modern movement heritage in Britain was an obvious start. The statutory conservation bodies in England and Scotland each began to address the conservation of modern movement heritage while modernism was still the predominant style, however they have since taken different stances on many important issues, such as whether a conservation agenda should impede projects with live planning permission. The conservation efforts in Wales and Northern Ireland were not included in this study primarily because the situations there could not be covered effectively within the word limit of this thesis, but equally because their approach to the conservation of modern movement heritage either is not as developed as that of England or Scotland or because the heritage legislation does not differ greatly enough from the same passed in England to warrant a full regional case study. For instance, the contemporary framework guiding the designation and maintenance of historic buildings and sites in both England and Wales is based upon two English legal acts: the Ancient Monuments and Archeological Areas Act of 1979 and the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act of 1990. The Ulster Architectural Heritage Society published a book on the modern architecture in Northern Ireland, and though the small nation of only 1.5 million has many fine modernist buildings to exhibit, as contributing author David Evens wrote, ‘Against the background of the Troubles, architecture has had its successes but it is an art form that depends upon settled times and economic growth to prosper – conditions that were sadly missing through much of the 70s and 80s.’ Certainly an in-depth study of conservation within these four constituent British territories would be interesting, however the intent of this thesis was to track the development of modern movement conservation through the most active regions within both Great Britain and the United States of America to assess whether the conservation of modern architecture has followed established national conservation traditions or whether


\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{ David Evans, Charles Rattray, and Paul Larmour, Modern Ulster Architecture (Belfast: Ulster Architectural Heritage Society, 2006). (p 22).}\]
modern movement heritage has required a distinctly different conservation approach, regardless of location and tradition.

In the United States, conservation initiatives most commonly develop at a local or state level, so focus was given to three of the most active regions. The local and municipal heritage conservation legislation and advocacy efforts of three cities – New York City, Boston and Minneapolis – feature heavily in the study of modern movement conservation in America primarily because these three cities experienced a surge of construction during the post-war period, each city currently has active governmental and non-governmental conservation bodies and each city has presented numerous interesting case studies, thematic studies and continuing cultural and technical issues and tensions relating to its modern movement architecture. As Minneapolis is my home city, I was already well-aware of the city’s most prominent modern movement architecture, especially that of Ralph Rapson’s Cedear Square West housing development, though I was only made aware of the conservation efforts underway to save this development and others through the course of my research. Having been invited to present my research at an international conference in Manhattan in 2013, I used that opportunity to conduct on-the-ground research and to speak with prominent figures advocating for the conservation of modern movement architecture in New York. Through these interviews, I was made aware of some interesting work then underway by postgraduate historic preservation students at Columbia University and Pratt Institute, and was also introduced to some of the special legislation that has guided historic preservation in New York over the last five decades. Finally, Boston provides a unique narrative of modern movement conservation as a city that perhaps most avidly supported modernization efforts during the 1960s and 1970s, then as one that has almost unanimously rejected the buildings and achievements of this era outright. The revalorization of Boston’s infamous city hall has only recently begun under the directive of a new mayor, and the refurbishment of the Josep Lluis Sert Law Tower at Boston University is evidence that the opinions of even the most staunch critics of modern movement architecture can be changed. However, as the municipal statutory conservation commission seems uninterested in listing modern movement buildings, many buildings in Boston, like Paul Rudolph’s Blue Cross-Blue Shield building, remain under threat.

The contemporary nature of this topic has meant that much of the research has relied upon conference proceedings, journal articles, international conservation charters and documents, and municipal, state and national heritage policies published within the last
three decades. Over the course of 2012 – 2015, a number of heritage and architectural professionals were interviewed in Edinburgh, Glasgow, London, New York, Boston and Minneapolis to help reveal variations in current local, state and national conservation systems and agendas, and to decipher any locally specific theoretical perspectives on the conservation of modern movement heritage. Transcriptions of these interviews can be found in the appendices. As comparatively few books have been published specifically on the conservation of modern movement architecture, a number of these books have been referenced extensively. These include *Modern Movement Heritage* (1998), *Preserving Post-War Heritage: the Care and Conservation of Mid-Twentieth Century Architecture* (2001), *Conservation of Modern Architecture* (2007) and *Preservation of Modern Architecture* (2008).

Case studies have been used throughout to demonstrate the application of international conservation principles and national or local policies to modern movement buildings. As briefly mentioned earlier, I came into this research questioning how the designation of the Cedar Square West housing development on the US National Register of Historic Places might influence modern movement conservation across America and what its subsequent refurbishment might mean for the future of modern movement conservation on the whole. Other case studies were discovered either through an extensive reading of credible literature on the matter or through association – I first met Henry Moss, the project architect of the Boston University Law Tower refurbishment, at the aforementioned conference in Manhattan and then subsequently visited him in Boston the following June to visit the building site and to discuss the progress and intricacies of pushing forward a conservation agenda for that project. All of the case studies were chosen to represent certain issues under the overarching theme they most fully represent (Designation, Valorisation or Management), though each theme is usually represented in each case study to some extent. For instance, the Barbican Listed Building Management Guidelines only came into being after the housing estate was listed by English Heritage at Grade II in 2001, however the case is most interesting from a management perspective for the guidelines that were established in 2005 to assist the Barbican Estate Office and residents with future maintenance and upgrades. By comparison, a set of guidelines this prescriptive for a modern building in America were only just written for Louis Kahn’s Yale Center for British Art in 2011, however, they were prepared by London-based architects Peter Inskip and Stephen Gee of PI+PJ Architects Ltd, showing that this level of intervention in the future stewardship of a building is decidedly British in nature.
Other case studies were brought to my attention through interviews with the architects or conservation professionals working directly with the buildings or the development of conservation policies. Heritage Partnership Agreements and Joint Working Agreements have been used to a similar extent in England and Scotland to assist local authorities with the management of large-scale post-war estates, like the University of East Anglia and the University of Edinburgh. Estate management has remained a private affair in the US, however the preservation and development plan for the Josep Lluis Sert buildings at Boston University demonstrates how a conservation agenda was achieved when the university administrators initially did not want the word ‘preservation’ attached to the refurbishment project at all. To varying extents across the US, federal and state historic tax credits have been used to incentivise a conservation agenda and Cedar Square West in Minneapolis has been studied in this thesis as the first modernist post-war low-income housing estate in the US to use tax credits to entirely fund refurbishment works. Without this funding, the works would likely have required subsidization through the gentrification of the estate, as has happened at Keeling House and other modern movement council housing estates across London.

The heritage designation legislation in Scotland, England and the United States has been discussed in terms of its ability to assess, designate and protect significant modern movement architectural heritage from alteration or demolition. Heritage designation in Britain began in earnest with the ‘salvage lists’ created by the RIBA during WWII and the designation of modern movement heritage has progressed in a coordinated, thematically driven fashion. However, alongside the designation of modernist buildings, statutory heritage protection agencies in England and Scotland have moved progressively away from their militant origins toward the promotion of a brand of heritage conservation that collaborates with commercial development. Given the strictly honorary nature of designation on the US National Register of Historic Places, local preservation organisations have been forced to develop their own municipal legislation, and the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) has become the most powerful heritage protection system in the US. Despite the LPC’s ability to statutorily designate buildings only 30 years old, real-estate values and development proposals pose a continual threat to Manhattan’s historic buildings, and a rezoning proposal now threatens some of the city’s most significant post-war modernist office buildings in Midtown East. One tool that was used in the 1970s by the NYC Department of City Planning to successfully protect a number of pre-WWII housing estates is the Special Planned Community Preservation District designation and students of the Pratt Historic
Preservation programme have argued that this designation status should be enacted again to protect the post-war Lower East Side public housing estates that are currently under threat of development.

A number of case studies are used in this thesis to demonstrate how re-evaluation, research, public education and interventions can lead to the revalorisation of formerly undervalued or despised post-war modern movement buildings by the general public and local community. Thematic studies have been the primary method used by Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland to identify and evaluate the multitude of styles, building types and construction methods used during the post-war period. These thematic studies have led to the listing of many post-war buildings, which has subsequently led to a broader valorisation of the buildings by its residents and users. This ‘listing effect’ has been demonstrated through three housing estates - Anniesland Court in Glasgow and Spa Green and the Brunswick Estate in London - and in each case, the social housing residents gained pride in their address and took new interest in conserving the significance of the estate. Thematic studies have been used in the US as well, but they have been primarily conducted in an ad-hoc fashion by grassroots preservation groups to raise awareness for a particular local landmark under threat. One instance where a thematic study of post-war modern movement buildings was conducted by the federal government is the Growth, Efficiency, and Modernism: GSA Buildings of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s survey, which was instigated as a result of public outcry against renovation works proposed for public General Service Administration (GSA) buildings from this period. The survey resulted in the designation of a few GSA buildings on the National Register, but more importantly, the significance of the buildings as a group has been made visible to the government and the public, and the preservation community will likely hold the government accountable for the stewardship of the buildings going forward. Finally, the US federal government’s hands-off approach to the management of private property has created a conservation system that requires grassroots conservation groups to campaign for the preservation of local buildings. Campaigns led by the Recent Past Preservation Network, the National Trust’s Modernism + Recent Past programme and other more local advocacy groups like Friends of the Boston City Hall are discussed in reference to the role these organisations play in the wider valorisation of modern movement heritage across America, but also to in reference to their limitations.

In both Great Britain and the United States, the case studies have also revealed the often-conflicting views held by the users, building owners, architects, local authorities, state
heritage bodies and international conservation organisations on the conservation approach most appropriate for modern movement buildings. In both Part 2 and Part 3, the re-valorisation of modern movement heritage has been discussed through the effect of thematic studies, listing and renovation works on the public’s perception of stigmatised and often poorly maintained large-scale modernist buildings. What these case studies have shown is that for the unrecognised or undervalued heritage of the modern movement, the views of international heritage experts rarely have much influence on the local valorisation of modernist buildings and preservation efforts must therefore begin within the local community and must be shown to economically benefit the local community. Robin Hood Gardens is a prime example of how, though internationally renowned architects like Zaha Hadid and Richard Rogers vocally supported the buildings’ preservation, calls from the international community to save the estate did not outweigh the local authority’s want to demolish it.
1.3. **Thesis Structure**

To keep the question of international versus national influences on the conservation movement for modern heritage at the fore, this thesis has been arranged in three parts. Sections 1.1 through 1.4 of Part 1 address the overall aim of this thesis and its place within the literature on the architectural conservation movement. Section 1.5 introduces the primary international conservation organisations and the principles and initiatives they have established to influence the conservation of modern movement architecture around the world. These initiatives have been discussed in terms of their influence on a national and local level in Europe and further afield.

Part 2 and Part 3 bring this study to a national level, tracing the development of governmental and non-governmental initiatives to protect and promote the conservation of modern movement heritage in Great Britain and the United States of America. While the information in these chapters is generally arranged chronologically, the development of the conservation movement for modern architecture has been found to be contingent with three main themes - designation, valorisation and management – and it is around these themes that Part 2 and Part 3 have been structured. To demonstrate the national preferences in conservation policy, a number of detailed case studies have been utilised throughout Part 2 and Part 3 to exhibit the varying degree of advocacy and planning tools used to include or exclude modern buildings from protection and/or governmental funding in both Britain and America. The conclusion at the end of Part 3 summarises the reasons behind the distinct differences between the two national conservation systems.

Part 4 summarises the findings of this thesis in its entirety, drawing together the developments made in modern movement conservation on a local, state, regional and national level in Great Britain and the United States to compare them against the conservation principles of the international heritage organisations outlined in Part 1. Here the question of influence and interdependence will be discussed in its most current form.
1.4. **ACADEMIC CONTEXT**

Numerous books, peer-reviewed journal articles and conference proceedings addressing the conservation of modern movement buildings have supported this research. While some of these sources focus purely on the conservation of modern movement architecture within as single national setting, others address international movements to a varying extent. This section has therefore been organised chronologically to trace the publication of literature on modern movement conservation bilaterally as both a national and international movement.

The president of the US based Association for Preservation Technology (APT) Michael Lynch first addressed the issue of preserving modern movement architecture at the 1987 APT conference in British Columbia in his talk titled ‘What are we going to do with the recent past in the not so distant future?’. The following 1989 APT conference in Chicago then held training sessions on concrete repair and technical issues with high-rise buildings. The APT Bulletin has since hosted five special issues on modern movement conservation: *Preserving What’s New* (1991)\(^4\), *Mending the Modern* (1997)\(^5\), *Curtain Walls* (2001)\(^6\), *Special Issue on Modern Heritage* (2011)\(^7\) and *Modern Metal Finishes* (2015)\(^8\). While the majority of papers in these special issues focused specifically on technical problems and solutions for modern movement construction methods, the 2011 *Special Issue on Modern Heritage* took a more reflective view on what had been accomplished up to that point and reflected a growing interest in how sustainable measures could be incorporated into the conservation of modern movement buildings.

Within the United States National Park Service (NPS), formal discussions on the conservation of the recent past architecture began in 1993 with a thematic issue on the topic in its *Cultural Resource Management* journal. The first consolidated effort to address the conservation of America’s twentieth century heritage was with the National
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Park Service’s 1995 *Preserving the Recent Past* conference⁹, followed by a second conference of the same name in 2000. Papers from the first conference covered the modern period from 1920 – 1960 and demonstrated the great variety in architectural styles of that period. In the corresponding 1995 NPS publication, ‘Preserving the Recent Past’, conservation specialists submitted articles ranging from the identification of 1960s suburban housing as a heritage resource to repair methods for modernist curtain wall and structural glass wall systems. In an article titled, ‘International Perspectives on 20th-Century Heritage’, Thomas C. Jester discussed the early international forums that had taken place at that time, including the 1989 Council of Europe meeting on 20th century heritage and the formation of DOCOMOMO in the same year.¹¹ The second *Preserving the Recent Past* conference expanded the scope of focus up through the 1970s and shifted attention to the less-iconic structures of the modern movement like supermarkets, low-income housing and banks. In the five years between the conferences, the main concern also seems to have shifted from establishing the argument that modern movement architecture should be preserved to how best to preserve the integrity of these buildings.

The first conference to address the conservation of twentieth century architectural heritage in the United Kingdom was hosted by the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies at the University of York in 1993. This early conference was organised to facilitate the identification of diverse representations of built heritage in the twentieth century. At this conference, Diane Kay outlined these early initiatives and difficulties in the listing of post-war modern movement heritage in England. Though Kay acknowledged the increased workload that the designation of post-war multi-owner housing estates could create by way of Listed Building Consent applications, she confirmed the particularly British stance toward the conservation, saying that ‘listing is the key first step if we are to gain time to address such issues at all’.¹² Bob Kindred discussed the situation that led to the creation of perhaps the first conservation management plan for a post-war building anywhere, written for the Willis Faber & Dumas building designed by Foster Associates in 1975 after it was spot listed at Grade I
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in 1991. While many of the papers dealt primarily with pre-war modern movement buildings, Hilary Chambers’ paper, ‘The Conservation of Twentieth Century Social Housing’ reflected the despair felt at the time at the prospect of conserving and upgrading the large-scale social housing tower blocks of the post-war period. Chambers explained that it was far less politically ‘rewarding’ to invest in the upgrading of derelict and problematized social housing and that riots like that at Broadwater Farm in London were necessary ‘to persuade politicians to divert resources to existing high density housing’.

Playing both sides of the argument, with reference to the Elgin Estate tower blocks, Chambers’ concluded that the unhealthy level of asbestos within the flats and the level of deterioration found in the external Glass Reinforced Panels (GRPs) meant that there was no conceivable use to which the buildings could be put that would justify the high financial investment necessary to make the buildings habitable, and in short, recommended demolition over conservation in this case.

Papers presented at a second conference hosted by the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies at the University of York on twentieth century heritage in 1996 were published in the book, Structure and Style: Conserving Twentieth Century Buildings (1997). Even at this early date, the papers show that interest was already moving away from the iconic ‘International Style’ buildings of the early modern movement toward addressing the more challenging social and economic issues of modern movement commercial buildings, public buildings and social housing from the 1950s – 1970s. For the majority of these buildings, the editor and a number of the speakers already took the view that a SPAB approach of ‘cautiously undertaking the minimum remedial works’ would be irrelevant. However, in her paper ‘Conserving Carbuncles’, Susan Macdonald contested the orthodoxy of that time that all modernist buildings required comprehensive interventions, and instead advocated for case-by-case repair plans based on the careful assessment of the cause of decay and how the decay would be likely to continue. In his paper ‘Beyond the Fringe’, Kenneth Powell explained the role of the Twentieth Century Society at that time, writing that it would be particularly inappropriate to restrict the society’s efforts with a SPAB-like manifesto given the vast number twentieth century
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buildings and the few instances that call for strict preservation. Instead, he said that for these buildings, ‘stimulus of new use is vital’ and often ‘there is the need to accommodate – sometimes encourage – new design and the work of contemporary architects and designers’. The expansion of the Thirties Society to the Twentieth Century (C20) Society in 1992 was driven by a concern for threatened post-war buildings, and though some within the organisation felt uncomfortable with this expansion into the very recent past, in 1996 the C20 Society voiced their concern over proposed plans to in-fill the atrium at 1 Finsbury Place (Arup Associates, 1984). Though they decided not to oppose the plans in the end, and the works were given planning permission, this tenacity to get involved with a building constructed only 12 years prior has continued through today and the society continues to challenge the public’s opinion on the value of the twentieth century built environment in Britain.

As the organisation that led the development of an international conservation movement for modern movement architecture, DOCOMOMO conference proceedings and publications have been referenced extensively in Section 1.5.2. Over the past three decades, these conferences have addressed issues such as the image of modernity and its conservation, inventorisation and the creation of registers, the public’s reception of modern architecture as heritage, the national and regional variations of the ‘International Style’ and most recently, adaptive re-use and energy efficiency concerns in modern movement conservation practice. As an international organisation of architectural experts, these conference proceedings provide a multi-national view of contemporary national conservation ideologies and concerns.

The DOCOMOMO publication, Modern Movement Heritage (1998), addressed an early point of contention - whether or not the architects of the modern movement ever intended for their buildings to endure past their useful life. Though this collection of articles was published nearly two decades ago, the topic remains unresolved in some regards today. It is widely agreed that modern movement architecture deserves to be conserved, but whether we should value functionality over original intent is still not yet settled. Architects like le Corbusier and J.J.P. Oud defined modern architecture as the embodiment of progress. It was to be soundly based on scientific research and rationality, and its purity relied upon a complete avoidance of any pseudo-classical or historical
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references. As Robert Maxwell points out in the preface to *Modern Movement Heritage*, though the modern movement was based stylistically and theoretically on science, ironically, many of the faults associated with buildings of this period were technical and that ‘If we feel now that buildings showing these kinds of defect are worth preserving, it is not to economise on their replacement, but to recognise their value as a record of a quest, as part of a historical and cultural development that is crucial to our own identity; and in some instances, as an embodiment of value that make them part of an artistic and spiritual heritage.’

In March 2000, the Institute of Historic Building Conservation ran a special issue on the conservation of 20th century architecture in its journal *Context.* In this, Peter Smith suggested that ‘not all post-war buildings deserved bulldozing’ and Peter Wakelin argued that though it may be hard to see character and quality in post-war shopping centres, motorway stations and the multi-storey car parks, there must be impartiality in conservation practice. In the same year, English Heritage published its Guide to Post-War Listed Buildings and DOCOMOMO published its guide to important modern buildings within its 32 member nations.

*Preserving Post-War Heritage: the Care and Conservation of Mid-Twentieth Century Architecture* (2001) is a compilation of papers presented at a conference of the same name hosted by English Heritage in June 1998 that aimed to further develop themes presented at the 1995 ‘Modern Matters’ conference. With conservation professionals in mind, the incentive for this book was to address both philosophical and technical questions that had little precedence at the time of publishing. Many papers addressed the on-going debate of whether the original design, function and materials of post-war modernist buildings are able to meet current users needs, and whether the unique qualities of modern architecture fall outside the grasp of traditional conservation principles. In the opening paper, Alan Powers suggests that the ‘reaction against Modernism in the 1980s, may, in the future, be seen not as a norm but as a temporary, if significant, inversion of
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the norm’. If this is to be the case, he then questions whether it is appropriate to conserve modern movement architecture as an example of a bygone era or if it its viability should be a key concern, while taking care to retain its most valuable characteristics. Powers therefore argues that perhaps modern movement conservation practice should value ‘essence’ before ‘substance’. Listing Statements are understandably primarily concerned with substance – i.e. the tangible fabric of a building – and the meticulous designation of significant elements of modern movement buildings has been instrumental in saving design details like the Gillian Wise mural in the Barbican Arts Centre, which would have otherwise been discarded during the 2006 renovation (see Section 2.4.3.3). By Powers’ definition, essence is the quality of light within a space, the sequence and circulation of a plan and the total special realisation of the interior, exterior and landscaping. Essence, he says, is only found in the interpretation and subliminal discourse around conservation issues. In taking this approach to a conservation project, one may be less concerned with the retention of original fabric as long as the ‘feeling’ is retained through interventions, and by judging appropriateness not strictly on art historical terms, but instead more subjectively, conservation practice could allow and even promote new alternative mechanical systems over the costly replication of obsolete technology.

Also in Preserving Post-War Heritage, Susan MacDonald’s paper, ‘Defining an Approach: A Methodology for the Repair of Post-War Buildings’, focused on the importance of the correct identification of causes of decay, the development of appropriate repair strategies and the training of specialist contractors and engineers to deal with the specific set of problems presented by typical post-war materials and construction methods. This issue has been a focus of MacDonald’s career, which has guided the development of the Getty Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative and its associated publications and initiatives (see Section 1.5.5). While an underlying concern of how to protect and raise public awareness of the importance of post-war modern movement buildings runs throughout Preserving Post-War Heritage, the majority of papers address the more pressing physical realities of conserving these buildings and how
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to update them to meet current codes and user standards. This case-by-case working format is indicative of the way modern movement buildings were being addressed at the time by English Heritage and other conservation organisations around the world, as the designation of each one had to be thoroughly legitimised to a public and a government that did not understand their significance.

In ‘Preserving Heritage or Revaluing Resources?’ John Allan voices a concern that would be expanded upon in many of his later papers, which was a concern that the more ordinary modern movement buildings constructed between 1940 and 1980 would require a different conservation approach than the iconic works of modernism classified as heritage with a capital ‘H’. In this paper, he argues that though the ‘ordinariness’ of these buildings may prohibit them from being listed, it should not exclude them from the conservation discussion all together. Noting that the value of these buildings would more likely be derived from attributes like ‘urban location, change of use, transport linkages, capacity for spatial reconfiguration, infrastructure longevity, ratio of patent to latent value, tenure revision and commercial marketability’ rather than heritagisation in the traditional sense, Allan promoted a conservation agenda that viewed these buildings with a more holistic understanding of what conservation might mean in these circumstances.

The conversion of Marathon House and the Alexander Fleming House from office blocks into apartment blocks by Avanti Architects went against the traditional conservation agenda to retain original uses, but Allan argues that the change was necessary because both buildings could no longer compete commercially as office blocks, but found new potential value as housing. Projects such as these raise critiques from both the detractors of modern movement building designation who argue that buildings should not merit protection if they are no longer fit for purpose, and from stringent conservationists who argue that modern movement buildings have not been awarded the same protection from the listing system as earlier styles and have therefore been subject to more drastic, character changing alterations. Allan maintains today that a conservation model that enables these buildings to be recycled for new commercial uses is one that is suitable for the hundreds of modern movement schools, health facilities and housing estates across Britain.

Through commissioned papers, *Tracing Modernity: Manifestations of the Modern in Architecture and the City* (2004) sought to understand the philosophical, social and
historical significance of the modern movement within the contemporary culture. In ‘Modernity and the Question of Representation’, Dalibor Vesely criticizes the placement of cultural value on architecture and the shortcomings of modern movement architecture specifically, stating that the purpose of representation is to provide a mediating role, enhancing the public’s ability to participate with its architecture. He argues that the perceived emptiness of modern architecture does not stem solely from the buildings themselves, but also from the absence of an articulated common culture. To counteract this outcome, the architect would not only have had to create an architecture of the time but also to facilitate a culture that would make the building meaningful. Vesely continues, saying ‘no amount of wishful interpretation [could] bridge the gap between the promise of meaning and its fulfilment,’ and in the end, modern movement architecture can only be appreciated for what it is - ‘cultivated material structures which can at best be appreciated aesthetically.’

One obstacle to the heritagisation of post-war housing estates is that many are not visually differentiated in a traditional manner the public is used to, which inhibits the creation of personal connection and place-making activities. The more distinctions and individual experiences, the more ‘imageability’ an area possesses. For instance, a survey of public art at Glenrothes New Town led to an increased interest in the modern artworks within the local community, by both local residents and post-war enthusiasts further afield (See Section 2.3.1).

In Architectural Conservation: Issues and Developments (2006), Donovan D. Rypkema’s paper ‘The American Contrast’ presents an interesting study of the differences between the American and British heritage conservation systems. Putting it in knowingly oversimplistic terms, he says that essentially, ‘in the UK, the process is largely national, top-down, regulation-driven and carried out by the public sector; in the US, the process is largely local, bottom-up, incentive-driven and carried out by the private sector.’ Rypkema explains that the differences are fundamentally reflective of the American legal system’s partiality to the rights of property owners while the British system triumphs the government’s stewardship responsibilities. In the US, Rypkema says ‘the ‘carrot’ of incentives is preferred to ‘the ‘stick’ of regulations’, meaning that indirect government subsidies through historic tax breaks are more politically palatable than direct
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government involvement in the property market. While many of the same deductions about the differences in the heritage protection systems have been made in this thesis, Rypkema does not address how these systems address twentieth century and post-war modern movement heritage, nor what influence the international experts groups and charters have had on the protection, recognition and management of modern movement heritage in either the United States or Great Britain.

Through a collection of contributed papers, *Conservation of Modern Architecture* (2007) presents many of the philosophical and practical challenges of conserving modern architecture faced by practitioners and conservation experts around the world. Many of these issues, such as how to improve energy efficiency while preserving authenticity are presented through the confined parameters of individual case studies like the recladding of the CIS Tower or the rehabilitation of Louis Kahn’s Yale University Art Gallery. In the paper ‘ICOMOS: Twentieth Century Heritage International Committee’, Sheridan Burke outlines the development of the committee more commonly known as ISC20C and its efforts to promote the identification, conservation and presentation of twentieth century heritage on an international scale (see Section 1.5.4 for more details). Anne-Laure Guillet shares the early convictions and raison d’être for DOCOMOMO and explains that while many architectural historians view the modern movement as something that is finished, DOCOMOMO by contrast stresses that the modern movement is not defined by its style, but rather that ‘it is the innovative character of the modern approach to twentieth-century building (in its social, technical and aesthetical dimensions) that creates its uniqueness.’ Guillet raises the issue of inconsistent legislation for the protection of modern movement heritage, noting that in many European countries, including the Netherlands, Italy and Spain, a building must be at least 50 years old to receive statutory protection. The legislation in Great Britain covers buildings at least 30 years old, and those only 10 years old in exceptional cases, though many will argue that heritage of the recent past receives a far lesser degree of protection, regardless of the degree of designation. The late Dennis Sharp convincingly demonstrated evidence of this in his article, ‘A Modern House Bites the Dust: The Greenside Case
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In this case, the owner of the modern home used the European Human Rights Act 1996 as the reason to demolish one of England's celebrated modernist concrete-frame houses.

*Preservation of Modern Architecture* (2008) by Thoedore Prudon reviews the roles of international and national conservation organisations in a similar fashion to this thesis, and while we tread similar ground discussing the philosophical and practical dilemmas of modern movement conservation, it has become apparent that in the eight years since the publication of Prudon’s book, modern movement conservation has progressed significantly and has most notably begun to address issues of the sustainability and carbon emissions from the built sector, which is not touched upon at all by Prudon. Part 1 of his book addresses the major conservation philosophies and functions as a theoretical introduction to the case studies in Part 2, and as this thesis does not provide any technical recommendations on how to conserve specific materials, systems or building typologies, any overlap in content would be found in these earlier chapters. Prudon’s role as the president of DOCOMOMO US, associate professor in architectural preservation at Columbia University and Pratt Institute and as an architect with ample experience in modern building conservation projects has meant that his interpretation of the application of international conservation concepts to the development of preservation guidelines and practice within the United States has functioned as an invaluable basis of knowledge for this research and has therefore been referenced extensively. What this thesis provides to further the understanding of modern movement conservation is a comparison of local and national legislative and non-governmental conservation activities to those of the international heritage bodies in greater detail. The material in Part 2 of Prudon’s book is intended more for the practicing architect through its extended use of case studies organised under building typology and reflects the author’s views on ‘best practices’ in the restoration and rehabilitation of modern movement buildings largely but not exclusively located in the United States. That being said, case studies referenced in this thesis are more recent than those referenced in Prudon’s book and have been used to demonstrate how expectations from users, building owners, architects and conservationists have changed in recent years to the extent that improved energy efficiency is often a required aspect of any renovation project for modern movement buildings, both ordinary and iconic.
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John Pendlebury argues in *Conservation in the Age of Consensus* (2009) that heritage is not a static inheritance to which fixed and enduring values are applied, but that parts of our built heritage lose or gain significance as our relationship with them changes. Heritagisation, or the valuation of certain works of architecture or objects, is a process of identification, or ‘heritage creation’ as he says, wherein we attach additional values to built objects. That societies only conserve what is valued is a simple enough concept, but this heritagisation process that creates new cultural, economic, political or social values is often complex and individual to each country, region, culture or even each instance.

Cultural values are reinforced by patterns, processes and differential markers that distinguish one culture from another, so the heritage markers we choose are important not only for what they represent, but also for how we place them within the established hierarchies of significance. To this point, Pendlebury argues that heritage is rarely, if ever, ‘neutral’ and can be used politically for good or ill.

While certain expressionistic modern movement buildings like Eero Saarinen’s TWA Terminal are being accepted by the masses as heritage, social housing, office blocks and university buildings are still widely perceived as ‘spectacularly ugly junk’ whose continued presence is both unwelcome and misunderstood. In his book *Time Honoured: A Global View of Architectural Conservation* (2009), John Stubbs devotes a scant two-page section to the conservation of modern architecture, disparagingly titled ‘Shortcomings in Modern Architecture and Planning’. In this section, he writes that ‘Post-World War II planning is filled with examples of over scaled, inefficient, and inhospitable spaces, many of which have become national embarrassments’ and argues that millions of these buildings worldwide have ‘neither proven durable nor served their inhabitants well.’

Architectural Conservation in Europe and the Americas: National Experiences and Practice (2011), by John Stubbs and Emily Gunzburger Makaš, takes a comprehensive look at the history of conservation theory and its applications throughout Europe and the Americas through profiles of key issues, developments in the conservation practice, leading figures and case studies in nearly 90 countries. The expansive nature of the book means depth is sacrificed for breadth, but nonetheless the book serves as a first-rate
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overview of the most important policies, theories and actors involved in the countries studied. The authors state that Europe and the Americas were chosen for their broadly shared beliefs, social ambitions and legal bases relating to heritage conservation, though restricted access to financial support and professional training in the Eastern European countries and in Central and South America have led to significant developmental differences. The authors argue that other varying theoretical differences date back to the Venice Charter of 1965, which was only tacitly signed by delegates from the United States of America and the United Kingdom ‘because of a perceived continental European bias towards monuments that did not take fully into account some of the less monumental heritage found in all countries, or the vernacular and indigenous heritage of the New World’. It is perhaps this early focus on the less monumental heritage of Britain and America that has indirectly led to conservation environments that are more receptive to the designation of the recent heritage of the modern movement. European, British and American-based conservation organisations have also been instrumental in the protection of significant architectural heritage sites worldwide and have thus influenced local conservation practices in the process.

Miles Glendinning’s mammoth book, *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation from Antiquity to Modernity* (2013), authoritatively reflects the multiple variations and trends in the conservation of architectural heritage and built landscapes and in the development of the conservation movement itself within Western society. The final chapter in his book covers the post-1989 conservation movement through three thematic topics: the geographical and economic effects of globalisation, commercialisation and commodification; the conservation movement’s inward reassessment of theoretical issues like authenticity and the resultant shift toward the conservation of intangible heritage; and finally, the shift away from authoritative ‘old versus new’ conservation principles toward a more free and ambiguous post-modern interpretation of heritage values. During the postmodern period, Glendinning explains that the breadth of the conservation movement expanded to a point where it began ‘to undermine the principles of special importance, rarity and threat that had given conservation its sense of public urgency and communicability throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.’ A decade earlier, in the paper, ‘The Conservation Movement: A Cult of the
Modern Age’, Glendinning had argued that although conservation has generally presented itself as the antithesis of the modern movement, throughout the 1960s and 1970s, the two movements shared many of the same principles, such as an emphasis on authenticity and integrity, yet since then, it has ironically proven more difficult to apply these conservation concepts to the architecture that originally shared them.  

It is within this post-1989 period of conservation practice where my research begins, when the remaining modernists loyal to the original movement were railing against post-modern theorists and began advocating for the protection of the most iconic modernist buildings of the inter-war period. After the initial tide of iconic modernism restorations, Italian historian Andrea Canzani cautioned against an emerging ‘Dorian Gray syndrome’ in which authenticity is drawn from the iconic imagery rather than the actual built form, ‘eras[ing] the dimension of the use and material authenticity’. Against arguments that far too much of the built environment is already constricted by conservation measures, the conservation movement is now faced with how best to conserve the vast quantity of ordinary everyday modernisms that are valued not as great works of art but as reminders of a socio-political architectural movement that captured the imaginations of architects, politicians and the general public worldwide during the post-war period. As architectural variations of the modern movement can be found in every region of the world, Section 1.5 will discuss how international heritage organisations have addressed the conservation of twentieth century and particularly modern movement heritage and the how intervention from the international level has since influenced modern movement conservation on a national level.

---

1.5. INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

In Section 1.5, the internationally developed principles regarding the conservation of modern movement heritage are discussed in terms of their direct or indirect influence on conservation efforts at a national, regional and local level. Since the charters and statements developed by these international conservation organisations are not legally binding in any nation, their main intent is to encourage research and to spread knowledge, and the extent to which this has been accomplished will be evidenced in Part 2 and Part 3 by looking at the current state of modern movement conservation in Great Britain and the United States of America. In this section, four international organisations have been identified as having played a lead role in the diversification of the international conservation movement to included modern movement heritage. These include DOCOMOMO International, the World Heritage Centre, the International Council on Monuments and Sites and the Getty Conservation Institute. The activities of each group are discussed in this section in relation to how their conservation ideologies around modern movement heritage have instigated change within the conservation movement as a whole.

1.5.1. INTRODUCTION

Before delving into the development of an international conservation movement for modern architecture, it is useful to briefly underline the dominant theories that have guided the conservation movement up to this point. The modern movement and the Athens Charter of 1931 both shared a call for a clear distinction between old and new, however after the Second World War, the proponents of each movement took up conflicting views on how war-damaged historic monuments should be rebuilt across Western Europe, and particularly in Western Germany. After the wartime bombing of Geethehaus in Frankfurt, to the dismay of Modernist architects, the City Council voted in April 1947 to reconstruct a facsimile of the building and a hugely popular fundraising campaign followed. However, modernist ideologies prevailed in Hildesheim and local conservation officers supported the construction of the six-storey modernist Hotel Rose (1962-4) on the site of the historic timber-framed Knockenhauer Amtshaus (1529, rebuilt 1889) that burnt to the ground in March 1945. The solution was short-lived though, and a local activist campaign began in 1978 to see the traditional square reinstated and the hotel
replaced by a replica of the Knockenhauer Amtshaus, which was completed a decade later.\textsuperscript{45} The rejection of modernism from the late 1960s onward in both professional circles and in the public forum corresponded with a rejection of its strongly held principle against facsimile building.\textsuperscript{46} Glendinning explains that during the 1960s and 1970s, a distrust of the Welfare State and its large-scale redevelopment schemes had settled into societies across Europe and North America and in response, a passionate, democratic community-oriented conservation movement grew to replace it.\textsuperscript{47} The postmodern capitalistic conservation movement held no such qualms with blending the contemporary with the historic and in the latter 20\textsuperscript{th} century a revival of pastiche neo-traditional styles and the nationalistic reconstruction of lost historic buildings and \textit{altstädte} played out across Europe.

In the US, from the 1980s onward, a conservative shift in US politics further decried the interventionism of earlier housing and urban renewal programmes begun by President Kennedy and continued by President Johnson.\textsuperscript{48} One 1983 review of James M Fitch’s seminal textbook \textit{Historic Preservation} criticised it for placing too much emphasis on ‘the bureaucratic role of preservationists and “the responsibility of the state” to tell people what to do’.\textsuperscript{49} In this vain, the 1986 revision of the Tax Reform Act further restricted eligibility for the Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit programme from its more inclusive 1981 version and progressive cuts in federal funding for the Historic Preservation Fund (created by Congress in 1976 to support the State Historic Preservation Offices) throughout the 1980s reflected the prevailing conservative political views at the time. However, despite these governmental cuts, the private sector conservation movement continued to gain public support. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, for instance, grew from approximately 40,000 members in 1973 to 140,000 just five years later, and now maintains an annual membership rate of approximately 750,000. Local support for preservation activities can be traced through the establishment of powerful municipal-level preservation commissions across the country, starting with the Los Angeles Landmark Preservation Commission in 1962. By the late 1990s, conservation had once again become a governmental concern and funding for State Historic Preservation Offices soared to its highest level to date.

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid. (p. 271).
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid. (p. 320).
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid. (pp. 320-25).
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid. (p. 350).
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid. (p. 350).
With the stabilisation of the conservation movement within the local and national planning systems across Europe, Britain and the United States during the 1970s, a neo-vernacular style emerged in contemporary architecture, leading to a more collaborative relationship between the two fields. However, it was not long before the disingenuous nature of postmodern facsimile reconstructions, façadism and tourism-led regeneration came under scrutiny and early advocates of modern movement conservation began to look for conservation principles based on integrity and authenticity. With the unique theoretical and technical conservation issues posed by modern architecture, conservationists once again looked to the Athens Charter and its recommendations to employ the ‘judicious use of all the resources at the disposal of modern technique’ to legitimise mechanical and material upgrades when replacement in-kind was either impractical, financially prohibitive or undesirable. The 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity and the 1999 Burra Charter brought increased flexibility to the conservation movement by challenging conventional definitions of authenticity and cultural significance, notions which have since been employed to argue for the conservation of modern movement buildings.

The 1985 Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of the Architectural Heritage of Europe was followed by the 1989 colloquium in Vienna, titled, *Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage: Strategies for Conservation and Promotion*. The colloquium addressed the whole variety of 20th century European architecture, but as chairman of the newly established DOCOMOMO, Hubert-Jan Henket was invited to present the unique questions posed by the conservation of modern movement architecture. The resultant document, “Principles for the Conservation and Enhancement of the Architectural Heritage of the Twentieth Century” (Recommendation No. R (91) 13, adopted 9 September 1991), noted that the abundance, youth and diversity in character kept 20th century architecture from being recognised as heritage by national conservation organisations and the public alike. These attributes and a general lack of interest in twentieth century heritage prompted council members to advocate that each member state embark on a programme of identification, protection, management and education to address underrepresented 20th century heritage, cautioning that its irreparable loss would

---

‘deprive future generations of this period of European consciousness’. The Council of Europe Recommendation No. R (91) 13 also encouraged finding present day uses for undervalued 20th century buildings, as long as the new uses did not detract from the building’s architectural or historic significance. Any maintenance or alterations were to respect the fundamental conservation principles applied to other eras of architectural heritage, which presumably meant a preference for material authenticity.

The 1991 Council of Europe recommendations concluded that cooperation across the European member states was essential for the development of criteria for register selection and practical conservation principles. National chapters and specialist committees were established within ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO to facilitate the flow of ideas between nations and international heritage organisations and unsurprisingly, many of the discussions and subsequent doctrines established on an international level have been instigated by real conservation needs on a national or local level. The Council of Europe recommendations inspired 1995 ‘Seminar on 20th Century Heritage’ in Helsinki, which revealed the efforts already underway to identify significant twentieth century heritage in the 13 countries represented, and the representative experts in attendance identified thematic studies as the most useful tool to identify and promote the conservation of modern movement buildings as a unified set. The meeting also acknowledged education in all levels of society as being of the utmost importance and that appreciation of this era of architecture was necessary, particularly at the local level, in order to secure its continued presence in the future. In the same year, English Heritage hosted the ‘Modern Matters’ conference in London and the US National Park Service organized the first ‘Preserving the Recent Past’ conference in Chicago (followed up by the Preserving the Recent Past 2 conference in Philadelphia in 2000) to address the particular philosophical and technical preservation challenges presented by recent past architectural heritage in each country.

To introduce the 2005 DOCOMOMO International conference thematically focused on the reception of modern movement architecture, France Vanlaethem argued that if
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52 The seminar was organized by the Finnish National Committee of ICOMOS in collaboration with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (WHC) and the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM).
53 Jester, "International Perspectives on 20th-Century Heritage." (p. 28).
54 Ibid. (p. 28).
modern architecture is better protected in some countries, it is largely due to the strength of their heritage designation systems rather than a broader recognition of the buildings as heritage by the public. This point gets to the crux of this research by clearly differentiating the two means by which architecture becomes protected or valued. Without being able to enforce the protection of heritage sites, international conservation organisations have worked to promote certain conservation principles regarding modern movement heritage, which will be traced through the activities of the following four international organisations that continue to have a strong influence on conservation ideologies in Europe, Great Britain and North America. In Part 2 and Part 3, we will see how the interests, ideologies and conservation initiatives of these international bodies have been reflected in the national conservation policies and practices in Great Britain and the United States of America.

1.5.2. DOCOMOMO INTERNATIONAL

DOCOMOMO International began as a small group of independent architects and architectural historians interested in the recognition of the modern movement architecture as heritage. The organisation has since grown into a valuable advisory group to both international conservation organisations and national statutory heritage bodies, with 69 national chapters as of 2016. DOCOMOMO effectively got its start in 1982 when the Dutch Government Heritage Department asked local architect Hubert-Jan Henket to develop a methodology that would enable them to make responsible decisions in regards to culturally significant modern movement structures. The Zonnestraal Sanatorium became the project’s case study and to establish a consensus on how to tackle the building’s particular problems, Henket contacted researchers and architects from other countries and found they were also approaching these issues in an ad-hoc, isolated manner. In response to these discussions, Henket formulated the following questions, which would later guide the founding declaration of DOCOMOMO International:

I. How is it possible to extend the economic and functional life of particular buildings in environmentally acceptable ways without sacrificing the authenticity of the original idea, including visual and tactile qualities?

56 The Zonnestraal Sanatorium was already notorious in the architectural community for its technically and spatially complex problems as well as for its dire state of decay, making it one of the first ‘modern ruins’ sought out by photographers.
II. Can the paradox of conserving 'throw away' buildings be justified?

Founded in 1988 through the School of Architecture at the Eindhoven University of Technology by Henket with the assistance of architect and research fellow Wessel de Jonge, DOCOMOMO International became the first international amenity group for architectural experts concerned with the conservation of modern movement architecture. \(^{57}\) DOCOMOMO is an acronym for 'the working party for the Documentation and Conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement', and documentation was intentionally placed before conservation because Henket believed documentation was an inherent and more realistic priority to establish for successive chapters and leaders. \(^{58}\) Guiding discussions in the early days of DOCOMOMO were concerns about public education, government responsibilities, conservation methodology and whether or not an architectural style that was ideologically founded on the rejection of tradition should be conserved. A number of these theoretical and technical issues associated with the conservation of modern movement architecture will be discussed in the following pages.

The first DOCOMOMO conference was held at Eindhoven in 1990, at which Henket, Wessel de Jonge, and UK members Christopher Dean, John Allan and James Dunnett designed the constitution, leaving each of the twelve national member chapters at that time to organise their own affairs within the unifying framework. The Eindhoven Statement was issued and approved at the closure of the conference, which outlined the main goals of the organisation as such:

I. Bring the significance of the modern movement to the attention of the public, the authorities, the professionals and the educational community concerned with the built environment.

II. Identify and promote the recording of the works of the modern movement, including a register, drawings, photographs, archives and other documents.

---

\(^{57}\) In 2002, DOCOMOMO International had over 2000 individual members worldwide and 45 national working parties. By 2009, membership had grown by 4 national working parties and approximately 500 additional individual members. In just 4 years, the number of national working parties has now jumped to 66. The growth in membership of 21 national working parties in the past 11 years is evidence of the growing interest in and concern for the built heritage of our recent past on an international basis. Curacao, Peru and Uruguay and Venezuela were accepted as national working parties at the General Assembly in 2008, where the DOCOMOMO International Secretariat worked closely with each national party to help them develop seminars, conferences, campaigns and publications. In 2009, Algeria, Costa Rica, Egypt, India, Iran, Tanzania and Venezuela also applied to the International Secretariat for membership. Of these, Egypt, Iran and Venezuela have since been accepted for membership.

III. Foster the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation and disseminate this knowledge throughout the professions.

IV. Oppose destruction and disfigurement of significant works of the modern movement.

V. Identify and attract funding for documentation and conservation.

VI. Explore and develop the knowledge of the modern movement.

The Eindhoven Statement has been updated at least seven times and was revisited again in September 2014 at the 13th international conference in Seoul, where the honorary President of DOCOMOMO International Hubert-Jan Henket and the Chair of DOCOMOMO International Ana Tostões proposed additional revisions. The revisions focused on the themes of sustainability and adaptability, and included the additional aim to ‘Promote the conservation and (re)use of buildings and sites of the Modern Movement.’ Objective III was modified to read, ‘Foster and disseminate the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation and adaptive (re)use’ and the term ‘(re)use’ was added to the end of objective V as well. The rephrasing of objective VI as ‘Explore and develop new ideas for the future of a sustainable built environment based on the past experiences of the Modern Movement’ shows a decisive reorientation of organisational aims. In addition to its already established International Specialist Committees (ISC) on Registers (ISC/R), Technology (ISC/T), Urbanism and Landscape (ISC/U+L) and Education and Theory (ISC/E+T), the committee established two new international specialist committees on Sustainability (ISC/S) and on Publications (ISC/P).

At present, many of the most iconic buildings of the modern movement have been internationally recognised and locally safeguarded, so focus has begun to shift away from the masterpieces toward the vast amount of less exceptional modern movement buildings under threat of being demolished before anyone takes note. For these buildings, their continued existence relies heavily on their capacity to support new uses and their ability to be upgraded to meet current energy efficiency standards and building user expectations. Throughout the rest of the architectural profession, it is no longer acceptable to build unsustainable buildings, and DOCOMOMO International has officially reoriented its raison d’être to promote conservation measures that put sustainability at the fore. As such, re-use and sustainability were made the dominating themes of the 14th DOCOMOMO International conference, ‘Adaptive Re-use: The Modern Movement Towards the Future’.

It is useful to trace the evolution of the organisation’s concerns through its conferences and collaborations, as these are often reflective of many nations’ induction into the
conservation of modern movement architectural heritage. At the invitation of ICOMOS, DOCOMOMO was asked in 1992 to conduct a feasibility study into the possibility of establishing a ‘tentative list’ of modern movement buildings for possible inclusion on the World Heritage List.\textsuperscript{59} To gain acceptance into the DOCOMOMO International community, each national chapter was asked to create a register of the 50 most important modern movement buildings within their country. Henket wrote that the process and the resulting collection established the modern movement in architecture as ‘heterogeneous, full of regional variations, thereby dispelling the erroneous reputation as a unified, universal movement dubbed in 1932 as “The International Style”.\textsuperscript{60} The DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee for Registers (ISC/R) was established to manage these collections and in 1998 a fiche of modern movement buildings (along with a standard selection format) was submitted to ICOMOS for inclusion on the World Heritage List.\textsuperscript{61} In a separate venture, national chapters were asked to nominate the most important works found in their country for the DOCOMOMO International List, culminating in a thoroughly documented collection of more than 600 buildings worldwide, which Henket believes to be one of the most extensive sources of documentation in the history of architecture.\textsuperscript{62}

In response to the register findings, the 4th DOCOMOMO International Conference, held 18-20 September 1996 in Sliac and Bratislava, addressed this issue of \textit{Universality and Heterogeneity} in the modern movement. The conference and the papers suggested that the modern movement has known ‘many different local and regional interpretations of one universal goal’ and as such, called for greater emphasis on the multifaceted nature of the ‘international’ architectural movement and for greater recognition of modern movement heritage outside of Western Europe and North America. Ten years later, this concept was covered in greater depth at the 9th DOCOMOMO International Conference, \textit{Other Modernisms}, held 26-29 September 2006 in Istanbul and Ankara. The conference aimed to highlight local interpretations of modernism outside of Western Europe and North America, both ordinary and the eclectic, and to discuss how race, gender, class and


\textsuperscript{61} The Modern Movement and the World Heritage List, Advisory Report to ICOMOS composed by the DOCOMOMO International Specialist Committee on Registers, Final Version November 1997.

\textsuperscript{62} Sharp and Cooke, The Modern Movement in Architecture: Selections from the Docomomo Registers.
nationality had influenced the modern movement in different regions. These two conferences highlighted the great variations in style, influence and lifespan of the modern movement that has, since 1932, been viewed as one monolithic homogeneous movement with a discernible beginning and end. These simple assumptions are now up for dispute and some argue the modern movement has not ended, but has just conformed to the decline of socialism and the rise of capitalism.

Through the 1990s, the conservation profession advocated for the retention of formal unity in iconic modern buildings through the reproduction of failed materials; however, some argue this has produced a pseudo-imaginary representation of an idealised past. In *The Difficulté d’être of the Modern Heritage*, France Vanlaethem of DOCOMOMO Quebec writes that ‘the restoration of modern architecture dominated by respect for the original design, which eradicates modifications carried out over the years, contradicts one of the most important points of the doctrine of conservation’ and argues that this idealist over-valorisation of the original creative act is unrealistic for the conservation of the real-life structures. Marieke Kuipers, Professor of Cultural Heritage at Maastricht University and senior researcher with the Netherland’s Department for Conservation, writes that the image of modern movement architecture has been distorted from the reality, which has impressed upon us different expectations from conservation measures. Kuipers argues that the photographs of pristine architecture devoid of any human presence ignore the fact that these buildings have developed meaning to their users, which may differ from what the architect had originally envisioned, and therefore that their conservation should not be solely an architects’ affair. When revered as iconic masterpieces, she says it seems ‘almost blasphemous to disturb the relationship between idea and materialisation – first by occupying the building, then by adapting it to suit needs, and next by asking critical
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63 Quote from the 9th DOCOMOMO International conference proceedings: ‘The ‘other’ was meant to provoke a range of different readings including —but not limited to— the ‘non-western’ others (colonial encounters, exile, emigration, diasporas, trans-national histories, etc), the national, regional or local others of ‘international style’ (various searches for ‘national expression’ within twentieth century modernism), the subaltern others of homogeneous modern identities (i.e. race, gender and class as they have informed modern spatial practices), the anonymous, vernacular or ‘ordinary’ others of canonic modernism (such as generic slab-block apartments or squatter zones), the ‘hybrid’ others of a pure, pristine modernism (eclectic variations, multiple identities, cross-breeds), the ‘underdeveloped’ others of advanced, industrial modernisms (low-tech, appropriate tech, infrastructure projects, materials, building industry, labor, capital, patronage, etc), the preservationist others of a transient, design-oriented, utopian conception of the modern (the idea of modern architecture as repository of collective memory, as ‘heritage’) and, the temporal others of a linear modern history that has peaked in two periods: interwar and postwar (i.e. time-lags, synchrony, diachrony, pioneers, latecomers, etc).’


questions about failures, functionality, finances and future uses’ and thus criticises the fact that the occupation phase is rarely seriously investigated as a source of culturally significant alterations or additions.\textsuperscript{66} Words such as ‘icon’ and ‘monument’ imply immortality, but in most cases, icons of the modern movement can no longer be used in both their original form and function. Not only does the context change physically, culturally and/or economically, but new building codes and technical requirements have also placed unimagined pressures on these buildings.

Early restoration projects executed under the DOCOMOMO doctrine, such as the 1987 restoration of the Rietveld Schröder House (1924) in Utrecht, demonstrate this methodology of preserving the image and manifesto rather than the continued usefulness of a building.\textsuperscript{67} Kuipers has questioned the appropriateness of the conservation programme that went so far as to erase all evidence of a lifetime spent in the house by Ms Schröder-Schräder. Viollet-le-Duc, whose teachings have come to influence conservation theories regarding modern movement heritage, advised against such facsimile restorations, warning that we ‘are on slippery ground as soon as we deviate from literal reproduction’.\textsuperscript{68} ‘In the first case,’ le-Duc warned, ‘the good faith and sincerity of the artist may lead to the gravest errors, by consecrating what may be called an interpolation; in the second, the substitution of a primary form for an existing one of a later period also obliterates the traces of a reparation, whose cause, if known, would perhaps have rendered evident the existence of an exceptional arrangement’.\textsuperscript{69} Instead of reproduction, he advocates a methodology of historic improvement, arguing that to refuse to introduce gas lighting and modern heating systems into a Medieval church just because it would be anachronistic is foolish, and recommends instead that modern interventions should be designed by a master of the present time. Yet, as the purest representation of the De Stijl manifesto in built form, one could argue that the Rietveld Schröder House should be preserved for posterity in its original and most true phase. Upon completion, the house was renamed to incorporate the architect’s name at the fore, consecrating DOCOMOMO’s interest at the time in conservation through an art historical lens rather than the more flexible programme which it now advocates. The house was inscribed on

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{67} Architect Gerrit Thomas Rietveld designed the iconic interwar modern house for Ms Truss Schröder-Schräder. Although it was completed in 1924, Rietveld and Ms Schröder-Schräder continued to make alterations to the house throughout the 1930s.
  \item \textsuperscript{69} Ibid., p. 270.
\end{itemize}
the World Heritage List (WHL) in 2000, making it one of only 34 modern (i.e. nineteenth and twentieth century) structures or complexes to be inscribed at the highest level of heritage designation.

In 1998, John Allan (founding member of DOCOMOMO International) outwardly criticised the organisation’s objectives, writing that its tools were those of an art historian, its posture was evangelical, its reflexes were defensive and its sensibilities were nostalgic.70 During the group’s foundational meetings, it was debated whether modern movement buildings should be regarded as monuments or instruments and given that the primary concern was the identification and protection of key modern movement works, art historical or cultural values were employed to identify significant buildings and economic and commercial pressures were ignored in the process. By choosing one set of values over the other, two separate value systems were established. Though it is widely agreed now that modern buildings should be regarded as both monuments and instruments, Allan argues that in the broad stock of post-war modern movement buildings, there are ‘some so irredeemably awful in every conceivable respect as to be wholly indefensible even by the most ardent Modernist supporters’.71 For the buildings that fall between ‘the great and the ghastly’, Allan advocates that these buildings be viewed as instruments with malleable attributes suitable to renovation. In cases such as the Alexander Fleming House, the wider public may never regard these structures as a work of beauty, but their value as an instrument of commercial or private use cannot be denied. As Alan Cunningham wrote in 1998, ‘The motive in conserving selected manifestations of Modernism is not generated by nostalgia, rather the significance rests on their success as manifestations of a worthy principle; the presence of the object must not obscure the motive for its making, for that is where the cultural investment lies.’72 Therefore, rather than a conservation ideology which focuses on material preservation, the ideology supported by Allan and others supports conservation methods that reveal the architect’s original ideals to a new generation through a sensitively modified and useful structure.

The designation and valorisation of built heritage often go hand-in-hand and though specialists guide the development of conservation charters on an international scale, it is

71 ibid. (p. 23).
the local communities that are often the safe keepers or condemners of the lesser-known modern movement buildings. In 2002, the 7th DOCOMOMO International conference addressed the reception of the built environment of the modern movement, not from the perspective of the architects and academics, but from that of the users and the wider public. In the introduction to the conference proceedings, France Vanlaethem argued that the movement to conserve modern architecture reflected the specialists’ agenda rather than a broader shift toward its recognition as heritage. For this reason, studies on the wider acceptance of modern movement architecture as heritage are needed to continually gauge the stance of the public so that conservation measures react accordingly. In the conference proceedings, Isabelle Chesneau argued that the premature obsolescence of post-1945 architecture has become one of the basic justifications for a second phase of urban renewal, stating that the disjunction between the special forms of modern architecture, social practices and advancing technological innovation has led the ‘inert material works of the past [to be] rendered anachronistic, irreversibly desynchronised, [which] in the case of architecture lead[s] to its destruction’.

At the same conference, Anja Kervanto Nevanlinna questioned for whom modern movement architecture is being conserved. Nevanlinna argued that the professional assessment of architecture is insufficient when applied to the value assessment of modern movement architecture. From a professional viewpoint, architecture is assessed on values such as its aesthetic qualities, its role in the writing of architectural history and on the international fame of the architect; however, from a non-professional viewpoint, structures are valued for their unique relation to a place and the different cultural groups living in it. Nevanlinna argues that by upholding the origin as the primary point of reference for conservation, this places the professional reception of modern movement architecture ahead of the user’s values and preferences. The preservation of a modern movement building in its original form, she says, is founded on the presumption that the original values have remained intact over the decades because they are universal values. This ignores the changing relationship of the building to its cultural context, and thus, disregards the cumulative life history of a building. For instance, the conservation of Alvar Aalto’s Viipuri Library (1935) (renamed the Vyborg Library after the city of
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Viipuri was annexed from Finland to Russia after WWII) raises the question of whether we should conserve the built environment for the architectural community, the culture that built it or for the culture that has inherited it. After the war, almost every aspect of the town changed – the people, the language, the values, the way of life and the accompanying social structure. Nevanlinna writes that ‘the preservation of built traces of the past is always about questions concerning whose values are chosen as significant and which cultural groups are rejected.’

How then do we decide whose values are most important? Can we reconcile all interests or will the result only partially satisfy?

A collaborative international effort to restore the Vyborg Library was begun in 1992 by the Finnish Committee for the Restoration of Viipuri Library and the St Petersburg Committee for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments. Seven years of restoration work began in 2002 and upon its completion the Finnish Committee published the report, *Alvar Aalto Library in Vyborg – Saving a Modern Masterpiece*, perhaps hoping to rename the library a third time and to establish it as architectural heritage belonging not to Finland or Russia, but to the international community. The international ownership of Aalto’s buildings is exemplified in the continued insistence within the professional community to speak of it as the Viipuri rather than the Vyborg Library, despite having been renamed over 70 years ago. It is important to think about what use-value the library will have to the community of Vyborg and when conservation is enforced from an international stage, and whether we should expect the local community to accept, value and maintain the structure afterward. For some, the Vyborg Library may function as a nationalistic symbol of Finland representing Finland as the rightful owner of the sequestered land, but for others it may exist as an unwanted reminder of the past.

From the earliest days of DOCOMOMO, it became clear that the conservation of modern movement architecture raised different questions pertaining to authenticity than buildings of earlier periods. Many within the organisation believed that modern buildings were designed for a limited lifespan, after which the technological integrity would lose
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76 Ibid. (p. 447).
78 The work of Alvar Aalto has been widely recognised throughout Finland and internationally as the epitome of Finnish modern design and the Alvar Aalto Foundation has been campaigning for and monitoring the conservation of his buildings since its establishment in 1968. The importance of Aalto heritage to the people of Finland was demonstrated through the restoration of his 1960s Finlandia Hall. The original Carrara marble façade had deteriorated badly in Finland’s climate and rather than replace it with less costly and more durable granite panels of a similar appearance, the public voted to devote public funds to re clad the building in new Carrara marble to retain its authenticity.
applicability and the out-dated systems would fail. To conserve such systems of a bygone era thus seemed at odds with the originally intended logic of economy, rationality and functional design. Seeing modern architecture as both a monument and an instrument, Hilde Heynen of DOCOMOMO Belgium first argued in 2006 that ‘an honourable attitude towards the inheritance of the Modern Movement implies a position balancing between a truthful reproduction of the original design and a dynamic renovation which accepts new functions and thus honestly reflects the building’s primary conceptions.’ To validate her point, Heynen referenced an argument Marcel Breuer made in 1934, wherein he stated:

\[
\text{The solutions embodied in the forms of the New Architecture should endure for ten, twenty or hundred years as circumstances may demand... Though we have no fear of what is new, novelty is not our aim. We seek what is definite and real, whether old or new.}
\]

Breuer does not say that modern architecture should not be conserved or that it should not be adapted to suit future uses, but that it should endure for the length of its use, however long that may be. As authenticity is often understood to refer to the material honesty of a building, how then can the authenticity of modern movement buildings be conserved if a great amount of the innovative and often untested materials fail and need to be replaced? Hilde Heynen reminds us that the modernist credo of authenticity infers that buildings should be ‘straightforward answers to the requirements of modernity, that they should be up-to-date in terms of materials and technologies, and that their aesthetics should comply with the rationality and abstraction for which the times were calling.’ This, then, shifts the definition of authenticity away from material honesty to an authenticity based on the fulfilment of original intentions.

As the keynote speaker for the 12th DOCOMOMO International conference in Helsinki in 2012, architect John Allan reiterated his argument for a wider interpretation of the DOCOMOMO mission established at the Eindhoven conference 22 years earlier. Allan proposed a pyramidal structure to guide the conservation of modern movement architecture, with the few most iconic examples at the summit and those ripe for development at the bottom. The widening of the pyramid coincided with the diminished...
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heritage value and expanding number of modern movement buildings. At the centre, Allan locates the largest collection of buildings and what Thomas Jester has called *ordinary everyday modernism.* The vast quantity and varying quality of this collection of modern movement buildings stands in opposition to the general definition of heritage, which is based on exceptional craftsmanship and uniqueness, and though they may not warrant listing, Allan argues they are certainly too numerous and valuable as property to demolish. Thus, he calls for a change of focus away from the most significant monuments of the modern movement to the more numerous, if more mundane, structures of the later modern movement.

For this larger class of modern structures, Allan argues that ‘sentiment’ is inapplicable or insufficient to warrant their preservation, but that conservation measures must be guided by economics and sustainability. Allan uses Pimlico School, Robin Hood Gardens, and the Broadgate Estate to emphasise the discord between what the British public intuitively accepts as heritage and what the specialists see as heritage. The unpopularity of post-war modern architecture in Britain has meant that arguments in their defence have been left to the specialists, and statutory designation has become their main shield against demolition. Allan argues that this is where the problems lie. As it sits now, to lose the listing battle has meant losing the building all together. Rather, Allan proposes that for the more mundane buildings of the modern movement, DOCOMOMO should be promoting the exploration of other possible means to retain and keep these buildings in use.

Thus, Allan’s keynote speech called for a review of DOCOMOMO’s recommendations for the conservation of modern movement architecture. He argues that conservation practitioners cannot expect to operate in a supportive heritage culture where post-war modern architecture is concerned, but that they must often balance the concerns of the users, owners/investors and the conservationists through the application of upgrades and sensitive adaptations. Users are most often concerned with upgrades to make their environment as comfortable as possible, while owners and investors are most concerned with maximising the building’s exchange value and return. For the majority of modern movement buildings at the centre of his pyramid, Allan explains that the concerns of the users and investors dominate the renovation plans, but that through the course of the project, these groups can often acquire an appreciation for the building’s heritage as well.
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84 John Allan, "From Sentiment to Science - Docomomo Comes of Age" (paper presented at the 12th International Docomomo Conference, Espoo, Finland2012).
From shifting the focus of modern movement conservation from ‘sentiment’ to ‘science’, Allan argues that practitioners can save more modern buildings by demonstrating their usefulness to the public rather than by pleading for special heritage privileges.

1.5.3. **The World Heritage List and The Programme on Modern Heritage**

With funding from the Netherlands Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre instigated the *Programme on Modern Heritage* in 2001, which was a joint initiative with the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) and DOCOMOMO International. Fearing that 19th and 20th century built heritage was increasingly subject to destructive alterations or demolition due to a general lack of understanding of its significance, the programme aimed to foster the identification, documentation and promotion of this era of architecture around the world. The UNESCO World Heritage Centre (WHC) has published a series of papers on all aspects of heritage conservation and through its fifth paper, *Identification and Documentation of Modern Heritage* (2003), the committee’s aim was to assist national conservation bodies in identifying and nominating modern heritage sites of ‘outstanding universal value’ for World Heritage protection.\(^{85}\) As of June 2002, 730 sites had been inscribed on the World Heritage List (WHL), and though properties completed within the past 25 years are eligible for designation, only 12 of the total listings dated from the 19th or 20th century and few were nominated for their distinctly modern aesthetic or technical attributes, but were included instead as a subsidiary part of a larger nomination or as representations of other historical or cultural movements like colonisation or industrialisation.\(^{86}\)

An equally important objective of the Programme on Modern Heritage was to advise state agencies and the public on the importance of protecting this era of architecture. Between 2002 and 2005, five regional meetings on modern heritage were organised by UNESCO’s World Heritage Centre in Latin America, Asia and the Pacific, Sub-Saharan Africa, North America and the Mediterranean Basin. Select experts in each region were invited to these meetings to discuss the identification, protection, conservation and possible nomination
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of modern properties to the WHL. In July of 2004, an additional 21 modern era properties were added to the WHL, and of the total modern era listings, 18 relate specifically to the modern movement in architecture. The first modern movement related designation was the Works of Antonio Gaudi in 1984 (extended in 2005), followed by the 1987 designation of Brasilia (1956-60), and the Major Town Houses of the Architect Victor Horta in 2000. The youngest property on the WHL, the Sydney Opera House (1973), was listed in 2007, though attempts to have it listed began only 11 years after it was completed. Of these 18 modern movement properties, seven were completed in the post-1945 period. 87 As the most widely recognised indicator of historic value, UNESCO World Heritage List designation is highly sought after for the notoriety and tourism dollars it can bring to heritage sites, as well as for the exclusive access to expertise and financial aid to support the development of heritage management plans.

Given that the recent heritage of the modern movement is often undervalued or unrecognised, the most basic criteria for inclusion on the World Heritage List - evidence of outstanding universal value – is all the more difficult to prove. According to the 2005 WHC publication on modern heritage, ‘as the twentieth century was above all a century of the common, it is important to bear in mind that not everything can be preserved: selection is crucial.’ 88 Following on from this publication, six of Berlin’s most iconic early twentieth century modernist low-income housing estates were listed on the WHL under criteria (ii) and (iv) 89 as a testament to the housing reform movement in Berlin from 1910 – 1933 and of the innovative technical and aesthetic solutions designed by some of Germany’s most prominent modernist architects of the time, including Bruno Taut, Walter Gropius and Martin Wagner. 90 This designation has set a precedent for the identification and designation of further significant modern movement social housing estates, and a number of conferences and publications have since addressed social

87 Post-1945 properties include: Brasilia, Brazil (1956) (C i, iv); 1987; Ciudad Universitaria de Caracas, Venezuela (1940-60) (C i, iv); 2000; The White City of Tel-Aviv - the Modern Movement, Israel (1930s-1950s) (C ii, iv); 2003; Luis Barragan House and Studio, Mexico (1948) (C i, ii) 2004; Le Havre, the city rebuilt by Auguste Perret, France, (1945-64) (C ii, iv) 2005; Central University City Campus of the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico (UNAM), Mexico (1949-52) (C i, ii, iv) 2007; Sydney Opera House, Australia (1973) (C i) 2007
89 Criterion (ii): to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; and Criterion (iv): to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history.
housing from the late-modern period, such as the 2012 Fitch Colloquium on the preservation of public housing held at Columbia University in New York.

Following the 2011 inscription of Walter Gropius’ Fagus Factory (1910) in Alfeld, Germany, the 2014 inscription of the Van Nelle Factory (1923-31) in the Netherlands is the most recent modern movement addition to the UNESCO World Heritage List and is one of the few sites to be listed specifically for its modernist architectural qualities as well as for its industrial and technical contributions to factory design. Like the Berlin modernist housing schemes, the Van Nelle Factory was also listed under criteria (ii) and (iv). On authenticity and integrity, the listing maintains that the 2000-2006 restoration perfectly preserved the authenticity of the place, showing that authenticity, in this case at least, is based on material authenticity since the restoration reversed the property back to a resemblance of its earliest unadulterated state. The integrity of the site has been upheld through its continued use as office space, and the restoration preserved various aspects of the buildings that contribute to the understanding of the site, such as location and associated panoramic views, interior and exterior organisation and the functional relationship between spaces.91 Also aiding the Van Nelle Factory’s inclusion on the World Heritage List is its guaranteed state of protection. The Factory has been inscribed on the Netherlands National Monument List since 1985, and to ensure its continued protection, a property management plan was drawn up jointly by the City of Rotterdam and the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands in January 2013. Currently on the Tentative WHL is the Zonnestraal Sanatorium (Jan Duiker, 1926-31) – the building around which DOCOMOMO was founded - and previously on the Tentative List was an application for sites attributed to Le Corbusier’s worldwide influence on architecture and planning in the twentieth century. The Paris-based Le Corbusier Foundation had assembled the transnational nomination of the ‘Urban & Architectural Work of Le Corbusier’ for the UNESCO World Heritage List in 2006, which included works in Germany, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Argentina, Japan and India.92 The application, sponsored by the French Ministry of Culture, aimed to secure Le Corbusier’s legacy as an internationally influential thinker of the twentieth century, and Chandigarh – being the architect’s only realised urban-scaled project – featured prominently in the application. Chandigarh was successfully listed on the Tentative World Heritage List the

same year, and few doubted that it would soon be fully inscribed as a UNESCO World Heritage Site, however, problems arose with the statement of ‘outstanding universal value’, which focused on Le Corbusier’s ‘incomparable global contribution to the development of urban planning, architecture and building technology in the twentieth century.’ This view negated the influence of the many Indian architects, engineers and planners that have gone unnamed and have since been forgotten in the pages of history. Some of these surviving architects and planners protested against the Corbusier-centric application and against their exclusion from the narrative, and amidst growing concerns that the city’s Department of Culture and Tourism was ill equipped to handle the citywide impacts of World Heritage designation, the transnational Le Corbusier nomination went forward without Chandigarh in its collection. The nomination was determined ineligible for inscription at the 33rd UNESCO meeting in June 2009 because, without Chandigarh, the application failed to demonstrate the ‘outstanding universal value’ of Le Corbusier on twentieth century architecture. The City of Chandigarh then decided to seek World Heritage nomination on its own, but failed to meet the deadline for two consecutive years.

The aforementioned modern movement WHL designations were more straightforward because they were nominated by a single country with an established heritage management system. The Le Corbusier proposal was deemed too ambitious and the application was twice deferred in 2009 and 2011 to allow the State Parties to strengthen their justification of ‘outstanding universal value’, to delineate clear buffer zones around the sites and to develop management systems that involve the local authorities and local communities. Yet, the influence of WHL recognition can actually be assessed quite well through these failed attempts to list Le Corbusier’s modern city Chandigarh as part of the overall Le Corbusier nomination. In ‘Beyond Le Corbusier and the Modernist City: Reframing Chandigarh’s ‘World Heritage’ Legacy’, authors Manish Chalana and Tyler Sprague explain the complications of preserving Chandigarh on a Western model when the local cultural appropriation of the city does not abide by UNESCO’s rules for
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93 Ibid. (p. 203).
95 The creation of Chandigarh was spurred by India’s independence from Great Britain in 1947, which also left the eastern India Punjab without a capital city. Chandigarh was to be a modern secular city and through its architecture, was to reflect the modern ideals and religious and political tolerance of the newly independent India.
authenticity and integrity.\textsuperscript{96} The application to inscribe Chandigarh on the World Heritage List as part of Le Corbusier’s legacy of iconic international works revealed the disparity between the value systems of the locals and those held by the international professional heritage bodies.\textsuperscript{97}

Though the City of Chandigarh officially gave up hopes for World Heritage nomination at the end of 2010, the process awakened the government and its citizens to the special architectural value of their city and led to a re-evaluation of Chandigarh’s legacy and heritage. The whole application process brought about questions of integrity and how it should be interpreted with cultural differences in mind. Historic integrity, as defined by UNESCO, is related to the property’s level of ‘completeness/intactness’ and its ability to portray its ‘outstanding universal value’. Chandigarh was designed to Western urban planning principles, but has since been modified and ‘inhabited in very Indian ways’.\textsuperscript{98} Multiple families now live in plots designed for a single family, narrow lanes have been adapted for spaces of informal commerce and pavement curbs have been appropriated for makeshift market stalls, the Green Belt now has many non-green uses, and the Capital Complex has been expanded to accommodate two governments – the Punjab and the Haryana.\textsuperscript{99} It is these alterations throughout the city which Chalana and Sprague argue have created a ‘spirit and feeling’ vastly different from what Corbusier could have envisioned. In India, the ability to modify one’s own surroundings is called \textit{jugaad}, and is a highly valued aspect of the Indian national character. Chalana and Sprague argue that Le Corbusier’s Chandigarh exists as a successful Indian urban space ‘\textit{because} of these \textit{jugaad} inhabitations that occur on a daily basis, not despite them.’\textsuperscript{100}

The Chandigarh Heritage Conservation Committee (CHCC) was established in 2010 to oversee the identification, documentation and preservation of the city’s architectural heritage, but the organisation stays away from any sort of neighbourhood designation or blanket heritage legislation because of this \textit{jugaad} tradition of development. This

\textsuperscript{96} Manish Chalana and Tyler S. Sprague, “Beyond Le Corbusier and the Modernist City: Reframing Chandigarh’s ‘World Heritage’ Legacy,” Planning Perspectives 28, no. 2 (2012), accessed 5 June 2013, \url{http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02665433.2013.737709}.
\textsuperscript{97} The doctrinal definition of authenticity accepted since the acceptance of 1964 Charter of Venice was challenged in the early 1990s under the influence of postmodern relativism, resulting in the 1994 Nara convention and Declaration. The Nara Document represents a shift in the conservation movement from authoritarian conviction toward one of flexibility and uncertainty, and recommended that ‘heritage properties must be considered and judged within the cultural contexts to which they belong’ to ensure that its tangible and intangible values of the culture that created them were accurately and honestly represented.
\textsuperscript{98} Ibid. (p. 214).
\textsuperscript{99} Ibid. (p. 214).
\textsuperscript{100} Ibid. (p. 215).
appropriation of the cityscape is at odds with Western definitions of authenticity and integrity, and poses even greater difficulties if the significance of Chandigarh is tied to Le Corbusier’s original plan. This static point of reference does not allow for inhabitation, but instead, if the significance is placed on Chandigarh as an ‘evolving modernist Indian city’ with an ‘adaptable urban fabric (not just a collection of buildings)’, then, in addition to structural integrity, authenticity can be found in the traditions and techniques, the location and setting, and the spirit and feeling of the place, as defined by the Nara Document on Authenticity.\footnote{Ibid. (p. 216).} In the end, the Le Corbusier nomination was reoriented to focus solely on his ‘architectural work’ and was accepted to the World Heritage List in July 2016 by including only the Complexe du Capitole in Chandigarh, which can be preserved in the traditional western sense.

1.5.4. THE ICOMOS INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE FOR 20TH CENTURY HERITAGE

The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) was founded in 1965 as a result of the 1964 Charter of Venice and is an international non-governmental organisation for the conservation of places of cultural heritage. ICOMOS acts as an advisor to UNESCO on World Heritage Cultural Sites, assessing World Heritage List nominations, monitoring the status of listed sites and developing specific conservation policies in relation to cultural sites. Since its inception, ICOMOS has developed a range of internationally recognised charters, guidebooks and conservation practice declarations that have sprung from the many meetings, conventions and conferences usually instigated by one of its over 120 national member states or the 28 International Scientific Committees established to address a particular need.\(^{102}\)

In 2000, the ICOMOS Montreal Action Plan 20 (MAP20) Task Force conducted an international survey of 20th century heritage in more than 50 counties to document the emerging issues, international and local conservation practices and management strategies related to twentieth century architecture in diverse regions of the world. Issues of protection, management and presentation were investigated and an ambitious international inventory of important twentieth century sites worldwide was compiled. The survey was not limited to modern movement heritage, but reviewed the full breadth of styles and functions, including buildings of ‘new construction, vernacular, examples of reused buildings; urban ensembles (neighbourhoods, new towns); city parks, gardens and landscapes; artwork, furniture, interiors or integrated industrial design; engineering works (roads, bridges, waterworks, harbours, industrial complexes); archaeological or commemorative sites’.\(^{103}\) Though some countries were progressive in listing recent past heritage sites, such as the recent listing of the Cueta Airport (1996) in Spain, the survey found that most countries were hesitant to list anything less than 50 years old and that comparatively few 20th century structures were listed in the countries that participated in the study. For instance, 20th century heritage sites make up only 2% of the total heritage listings in Australia.
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\(^{102}\) Prudon, Preservation of Modern Architecture. (p. 61).

\(^{103}\) Gunny Harboe and Alfredo Conti, Montreal Action Plan: Survey Letter to Presidents of National and International Scientific Committees (online: International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS)).
Following the MAP20 survey, the International Scientific Committee for Twentieth Century Heritage (ISC20C) was established in 2004 to promote a multi-national sharing of expertise through its members who each bring diverse experience relating to the conservation of modern structures within their own countries. The ISC20C promotes the identification and conservation of twentieth century heritage on an international scale and focuses the majority of its attention on mid- to late-twentieth century heritage that is at risk either through a lack of recognition or through inadequate safeguarding measures.

Then, following the publication of the WHC ‘Filling the Gaps’ report in 2005, experts from the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, DOCOMOMO and ICOMOS met in Paris to address the underrepresentation of modern heritage on the WHL. A separate analysis by ICOMOS and the ISC20C revealed that two of the five regions – the Arab States and the Asian and Pacific States – had only a single modern heritage property on their World Heritage Tentative Lists and none actually listed on the WHL, while the European/North American region alone had 12 modern properties on the WHL (accounting for 80% of the total listings) and a further 27 on the tentative list (See Figure 1-3).104 Overall, modern heritage was particularly poorly represented on the WHL, with only 15 designations (located entirely within the European/North America and Latin American/Caribbean regions) compared to the best-represented categories of architectural properties (341), historic towns (269) and religious properties (234) (See Figure 1-2). To encourage State Parties to assess modern properties for inclusion on their tentative lists and to connect regional practitioners to a network of international expertise, regional expert meetings were then held in Monterrey, Mexico; Chandigarh, India; Asmara, Eritrea; and Miami, USA.

---

ISC20C Co-President Sheridan Burke has said that the sheer quantity of modern movement buildings hinders its recognition as heritage and that ‘twentieth-century heritage still needs serious promotion, celebration and education to communicate its significance, develop community understanding and gain conservation support.’

Taking into account the structural deficiencies, material decay, functional obsolescence

---

105 Ibid.

and out-dated building codes prevalent in many modern movement buildings, ISC20C has advocated for a ‘value-based conservation policy’ that adapts ‘as necessary to conserve the values, authenticity and integrity of twentieth-century places’. 107

In 2009, an ISC20C subcommittee was formed with representatives from the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage (TICCIH), DOCOMOMO and the International Union of Architects (UIA) to develop a thematic framework against which UNESCO could judge twentieth century heritage for inclusion on the World Heritage List. To facilitate this task, the Getty Conservation Institute (GCI) hosted and sponsored a colloquium that brought together the ISC20C subcommittee, a representative of the World Heritage Centre and select international heritage conservation experts for two days in May 2011. During this time, the Draft Framework for Understanding the Significance of Twentieth Century Heritage was written and designed to function not only as a contextual reference for the World Heritage Committee, but also for any state and regional bodies responsible for the protection of twentieth century heritage. 108 Inventories, registers and thematic frameworks from each of these organisations were assessed and significant issues identified by the conference participants were outlined in the new framework.

At the international conference ‘Intervention Approaches for the Twentieth Century Architectural Heritage’ in Madrid, the ISC20C presented a separate set of guidelines and after three days of discussion, the guidelines were approved and published as the Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage (Madrid Document, 2011), 109 The idea to develop a set of criteria for the identification, conservation, intervention and management of 20th century heritage emerged from an experts meeting held in association with the 2009 ‘(Un)loved Modern’ conference held in Sydney. 110 A group of 20 experts then devised a set of recommendations based on their own experiences and theories, meaning that locally inspired ideas were reworked into an international doctrinal document.

107 Ibid. (p. 148).
The Madrid Document, as it is more commonly known, currently only addresses architectural heritage, specifically through guidance on intervention and change, but the authors plan to expand the scope to include all types of 20th century heritage. Moving away from a system that places significance on the architect’s original idea or the prevalence of the building’s original materials, Article 2.1 of the document advises that the integrity of the property should be maintained through the ‘careful assessment of the extent to which the heritage site includes all the components necessary to express its significance’ and it recognises that ‘buildings evolve over time and later alterations may have cultural significance’. Article 7.2 expands on this notion, stating that age is not the sole qualifier of significance and that ‘later changes that have acquired their own cultural significance should be recognised and respected when making conservation decisions.’ In this way, the Madrid Document advocates for varied conservation approaches within one site if necessary.

Like the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act adopted by English Heritage in 2013 (See Section 2.4.2), Article 2.3 of the Madrid Document advocates for clearly established limits of acceptable change before any intervention works begin, i.e. the conservation plan should define areas of significance and areas where intervention is acceptable. Though the document advocates a cautious approach to alterations, advocating for ‘only as much as is necessary and as little as possible’, it does allow for interventions to improve the performance and functionality of the building if its significance is not negatively impacted. For each intervention, the state of the building before, during and after must be recorded and made available to any interested member of the public. Where additions are appropriate, they must be identifiable as new and should take into account the existing ‘character, scale, form, siting, materials, colour, patina and detailing’ of the original structure.

From 2011-2014, the Madrid Document was circulated for use in English, French and Spanish and ICOMOS invited comments on the guidance it provided. Since then, the document has been translated into more than twelve additional languages, indicating a ‘need for and use of such international guidelines for twentieth-century heritage sites’.

\[\text{Approaches for the Conservation of Twentieth-Century Architectural Heritage (Madrid Document 2011).}\]
\[\text{Ibid. Article 2.3.}\]
\[\text{Ibid. Article 6.}\]
In a separate venture during November 2014, ICOMOS Canada hosted an international roundtable on ‘Integrity and the Heritage of the Modern Era’, which concluded that integrity was a more tangible concept than authenticity for experts, heritage site managers and guides to grasp throughout the whole conservation process from inventories and assessment to adaptation planning, the execution of work and on-going site maintenance. The roundtable members proposed to work to integrate ICOMOS and WHC principles into local level laws, regulations and tools. To support this, it was also proposed that ICOMOS develop further case notes and doctrinal texts to provide guidance on integrity in conservation as it relates to modern era heritage.

At the March 2016 ISC20C conference ‘Modern Heritage - Identifying, Assessing and Managing its Protection and Conservation’ in Florence, Italy, one presentation demonstrated how conservation principles typically applied to the restoration of ancient monuments had been applied to the restoration of Gio Ponti and Pier Luigi Nervi’s Pirelli Tower (1958) in Milan. After a small plane crashed into the building’s 25th floor in April 2002, the façade was meticulously restored between 2002 and 2004. Each component of the aluminium façade was carefully disassembled, marked, restored and reassembled in its original location according to the principles of anastylosis and the new aluminium frame pieces used around the impact site were date marked to clearly differentiate them from the original frame. Where elements had failed or had been damaged beyond repair, they were judiciously replaced with modern, more energy efficient but visually compatible materials. The mosaic ceramic tiles were carefully cleaned and patch repaired with new tiles using contemporary stainless steel pivots and epoxy resins rather than reinstating the failed original technologies. This methodological approach firmly associates architectural integrity and value with the original materials and therefore the method promotes the importance of preservation as a historical testimony by preserving ‘even the very technical errors that only the authentic object is capable of transmitting’. To the architects and conservation professionals involved in the restoration of the Pirelli Tower, it did not matter if the building was recent or ancient.

117 Ibid. (p. 215).
as they believe each building serves as a monument to the ‘epoch which produced it’ and is therefore a monument to the ‘collective personality’ of its time.\(^{118}\)

### 1.5.5. The Getty Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative

The Getty Conservation Institute (GCI) is a private international organisation established in 1985 to advance the conservation sciences in architecture and the arts and to spread understanding and knowledge of conservation related issues. This is accomplished generally through scientific research into the causes of decay and through the dissemination of information through publications, conferences, and education and training modules using model field projects such as the conservation work and research being conducted at the Eames House and Studio (1949) in Los Angeles. Susan Macdonald, Head of Buildings and Sites at GCI, wrote in 2013 that despite the many advancements made in conservation practice, many important twentieth century buildings still remain unprotected (for instance, the Melnikov House in Moscow) and that there still remains a gap in the resource base that addresses how to deal with the technical problems common to this era of construction.\(^{119}\) Training in this area of conservation remains isolated and ad-hoc, especially after the cancellation of the Modern Architecture Restoration Course (MARC) in 2011, which was run by the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM) and the Finnish Institute of Architects in 2011. It was these shortfalls in training and knowledge distribution and the fact that the conservation of modern architecture still has not gained the broad public support that earlier periods of architecture enjoy that led to establishment of the Getty Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative (CMAI) in 2011.

The CMAI was established by the GCI as a long-term programme to advance the practice of conserving the heritage of the twentieth century with a particular focus its unique set of problems. The CMAI began with the aforementioned experts meeting in May 2011 hosted by the GCI to develop a framework for the identification of significant twentieth century heritage. Leading on from this meeting, an extensive bibliography was compiled by the Getty CMAI of sources relevant to the conservation of modern architecture in

\(^{118}\) Ibid. (p. 220).

order to assess which type of resources were available and to expose any gaps in the knowledge base. A second edition was published 2013 with nearly 330 new citations, a quarter of which had been published since the first bibliography was drawn up in 2011.120

Under the Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative, the ‘Colloquium to Advance the Practice of Conserving Modern Heritage’ was held in March 2013 to bring together practitioners and experts to identify existing challenges and to develop an action plan for areas needing advancement.121 Papers were presented on each of the four themes: philosophy and approach, physical conservation challenges, education and training, and identification, assessment and interpretation. The following day, participants were divided into four groups corresponding to the themes and were tasked with identifying the most crucial issues, potential actions and suitable organisations that could be charged with undertaking these actions. Following the colloquium, the GCI summarised and categorised the prioritised actions into a ‘Proposed Action Plan’ under three themes: research, publications and information dissemination, education and training.122

In correspondence with the colloquium, the 2013 spring edition of the Getty’s Conservation Perspectives newsletter was devoted to conserving modern architecture and featured a debate titled, Modernity, Temporality, and Materiality, with Susan MacDonald (then Head of GCI Field Projects), Catherine Croft (Director of The Twentieth Century Society), architect Hubert-Jan Henket (founder of DOCOMOMO) and Johanne Widodo (Co-Director of the Tun Tan Cheng Lock Centre for Asian Architectural and Urban Heritage).123 In the excerpt below, disagreement between these leading modern movement conservation organisations over how the perceived temporality of modern architecture effects its conservation came to a head:124

Henket: We [DOCOMOMO] were interested in understanding what modernity, at least in our part of the world, really was, and in how we could safeguard it for future generations. Like it or not, what we are talking about is a paradox if you accept that modernity has to do with
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121 Kyle Normandin and Susan MacDonald, Experts Meeting: A Colloquium to Advance the Practice of Conserving Modern Heritage (Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute, 2013).
122 Ibid. pp. 18-22.
temporality and – up to now – the constant new.

MacDonald: Can I challenge you on that? Maybe its terminology, but when I think about some buildings that are manifestations of this idea, I can’t believe that an architect would have thought of these places as temporal. Unite d’Habitation has a solid permanence, as does some of Le Corbusier’s late work. It’s solid, it’s heavy, and it’s monumental.

Croft: Le Corbusier – specifically in regard to the Unite – described enjoying the idea that the concrete would erode back into the sand that it’s made of.

MacDonald: Right, but we at the GCI talked to a lot of architects about how they saw their work, and they always said they were hoping that their buildings would endure – that they had added something to society today and in the future. They often surprised me regarding how endurance of their buildings was really important.

Henket: If you believe in a dynamic society, which is the whole idea of modernity, then you’ve got a problem.

The writings of early modernist architects Antonio Sant’Elia and Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, who stated that ‘each generation will have to build its own city’ and that buildings should be demolished once no longer functional, have been at the heart of debates about the conservation of modern movement architecture. Corbusier may have had conflicting views on the endurance of his own architecture, but in 1960, at the insistence of Corbusier himself, a campaign to save his Villa Savoye from demolition was launched. Corbusier had hoped to restore the house to its original state and then turn it into a museum exemplifying his five points of architecture. French legislation restricts any building from being listed while its architect is still alive, but it was declared a public building in 1963 and was officially listed as an historic monument in 1965 after Le Corbusier’s death. An international campaign to restore Villa Savoye was strengthened by an exhibition launched at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1966 titled, ‘Destruction by Neglect’, which compared images of the Villa Savoye in pristine condition during the 1930s against contemporary images of it in a state of disrepair. The first restoration was completed in 1967, but a second restoration was undertaken from 1985 to 1993 to correct the interventions of the earlier ‘heavy-handed’ approach.

In June 2014, moving from theoretical discussions toward the development of technical advice, the GCI held an experts meeting to deal specifically with concrete conservation in modern era buildings. Through this meeting, the GCI identified the following issues in

127 Ibid. (p. 51).
concrete conservation that need to be addressed through further research and the dissemination of case studies:

- A lack of detailed information on deterioration mechanisms affecting specific types of historic materials (i.e. concrete and reinforcement) and construction techniques, and related implications for their conservation and/or repair
- To achieve reliable condition survey results of concrete structures currently requires undertaking destructive testing methods
- A lack of long-term, evidence-based information on the efficacy of treatment methods
- An absence of agreement within the field on basic procedures/methodologies for concrete repair and conservation, often times resulting in poor repairs
- Identified effective repairs frequently alter the surface appearance of a building
- A need for guidance on concrete repair and conservation that is not produced by manufacturers or those with a vested interest
- A shortage of concrete conservation experts exists internationally (professionals with advanced knowledge in both conservation and concrete) and universities and technical colleges are generally uninterested in meeting the needs of a small, niche market such as concrete conservation. Thus, there is a lack of widespread qualifications, certification, or requirements for those working on conservation of concrete heritage projects.

Also in 2014, the GCI announced the Keeping It Modern initiative, an international philanthropic grants scheme developed to compliment the research being done through the CMAI. The Keeping It Modern initiative awards funding to support the conservation of modern movement buildings of outstanding architectural significance, but requires the development of long-term maintenance plans and the testing, analysis and recording of treatments applied to the building’s original materials. These grants are intended to safeguard some of the modern movement’s most iconic buildings, but also to facilitate exemplary conservation projects that can serve as models for future conservation projects worldwide. In 2014, grants of up to $200,000 were awarded to support the conservation of ten of the most iconic twentieth century modern buildings, including Alvar Aalto’s Paimio Sanatorium (1933) in Finland, Max Berg’s Centennial Hall (1911) in Wroclaw and Louis Kahn’s Salk Institute Campus (1965) in La Jolla, California. The GCI has since entered into a partnership with the Salk Institute to investigate and address the long-term care of the campus. The 2015 grants highlighted some lesser-known projects by
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well-known modern architects, such as Marcel Breuer’s Saint John’s Abbey and
University Church (1961) in Minnesota, Paul Rudolph’s Jewett Art Center (1958) in
Massachusetts and the better-known Hill House (1904) in Scotland by Charles Rennie
Mackintosh.

In 2016, the GCI has released a call for case studies to fill out its second volume in the
CMAI series, ‘Energy and Climate Management in Modern Buildings’. This volume aims
to provide ‘best practice’ recommendations on how to balance the preservation of
architectural significance with sustainability concerns by showcasing recent case studies
that are technically focused and demonstrate sensitive material, mechanical and thermal
improvements. This volume is also intended to fill a void in technical how-to guides
covering many of the structural and mechanical issues present in modern era buildings
with a special focus on the conservation of modern era curtain wall systems and how to
improve the energy performance and thermal comfort in existing buildings using passive
and active mechanical solutions.
1.6. **PART 1 CONCLUSIONS**

In Section 1.4, we reviewed the most noteworthy publications and conferences devoted to the conservation of modern movement architectural heritage and over the past three decades, through which we can begin to see a general shift in conservation priorities. From an early date, Kenneth Powell and others recognised that a SPAB-like conservation approach would be inappropriate for many modern movement buildings and would be detrimental to most conservation advocacy campaigns.\(^ {130}\) Powell advocated for a conservation approach that encouraged architects to put a contemporary stamp on modern movement buildings and recognised the importance of stimulating new uses for buildings that purportedly were no longer ‘fit for purpose’. The technical issues presented by the many new, experimental and untested materials and mechanical systems designed during the post-war period present a somewhat ironic conundrum given the architectural movement’s preoccupation with scientific research and rationality. Robert Maxwell therefore proposed in 1998 that we preserve technically innovative but defective modern movement buildings as records of the scientific and mechanical achievements of the time – ‘as a record of a quest… crucial to our own identity’.\(^ {131}\)

A few years later, when modern movement architecture was still extremely unfashionable, Alan Powers suggested that the distaste for modernist architecture that dominated the previous twenty years was perhaps a ‘temporary, if significant, inversion of the norm’\(^ {132}\) Powers’ greater concern with the retention of essence rather than substance stems from his belief that ‘modern architecture is not a historical phase that is now over, or the subject of a revival. It has hardly even begun and, if it comes, could look something like what we can now begin, from projects such as Bankside, to recognise as conservation’.\(^ {133}\) As many of the theoretical and stylistic tenants of the modern movement are now re-exhibiting themselves in contemporary architecture, Powers’ prediction seems to be coming to fruition and his recommendation to value ‘essence’ over ‘substance’ is
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\(^ {132}\) Alan Powers, "Style or Substance? What Are We Trying to Conserve?," in Preserving Post-War Heritage: The Care and Conservation of Mid-Twentieth Century Architecture, ed. Susan Macdonald (Shaftesbury: Donhead, 2001). (p. 5).

\(^ {133}\) Ibid. (p. 10).
evident in the conservation approach applied to many of the case study buildings in this thesis.

A conservation approach which relies on the investigation and reinstating of the original ‘spirit’ and theoretical intentions of a building is inevitably vague and one for which the success of the renovation is dependent upon the awareness and the ability of the architect, however if done well, the flexibility of the approach allows for contemporary intervention through a Viollet-le-Duc style upgrading of services and building functionality. Dalibor Vesely argued that ‘no amount of wishful interpretation [could] bridge the gap between the promise of meaning and its fulfilment’ and that the modern movement’s break from common culture continues to contribute to the general public’s lack of affection toward these buildings. However, as John Allan has shown, the value of ordinary modern movement buildings is not derived from aesthetic beauty, craftsmanship or rarity, but instead from attributes like urban location, transport linkages, capacity for spatial reconfiguration and commercial value. As organisations like APT, DOCOMOMO and the ICOMOS ISC20C continue to further question the role of sustainability within conservation, it will perhaps be our society’s growing concern with environmentalism and sustainability that will create new meanings and add value to modern movement architecture through renovations that improve the energy efficiency but also respect the original design and essence.

Throughout Section 1.5, the ideas and ideologies behind four of the leading international conservation organisations addressing the architectural heritage of the modern movement and the twentieth century in general have been discussed through their initiatives. These international, and primarily Western, concepts of conservation do not always apply easily to local concepts of heritage, which was demonstrated most poignantly through the failed attempt to list the whole urban plan of Chandigarh attributed to Le Corbusier as part of the Le Corbusier World Heritage Site nomination. This failed designation attempt has, however, given rise to an acknowledgement of a different mode of valuation for the built environment that is not based solely on the original idea or material authenticity. In contrast to UNESCO’s definition of integrity based on the level of completeness or intactness of the original urban environment, for Chandigarh integrity is based on the


particularly Indian traditions and techniques of inhabiting a place. Thus, the urban plan of Chandigarh is valued locally for its adaptability and for the spirit and feeling that these modifications have created, which contradicts UNESCO’s static interpretation of historical importance and the WHL nomination’s notion of a sole creator.

The intent of these international conservation bodies has been to disseminate ideas, not prescriptive measures, and therefore, the four organisations discussed here have largely focused on the identification of important modern era buildings and the collation and dissemination of research. With the great structural and aesthetic variety in modernist buildings, it is doubtful that a shared methodological approach is possible or desirable, but a greater production of technical studies that outline the issues and possible solutions will help enlighten local practitioners to conservation and re-use possibilities for the less iconic modern movement buildings. As there is no one-size-fits-all solution, the variety of conservation approaches should be as numerous and flexible as the interpretations of modernism itself.

While the identification of undervalued 20th century heritage continues to be a worldwide concern, international conservation organisations and their national chapters are increasingly looking to document the technical aspects of modern movement conservation. As a requirement of the Keeping It Modern grants initiative, the Getty Conservation Institute is promoting the development of detailed conservation plans in countries around the world including Taiwan, Palestine, Brazil, India and others, and is currently collating technical papers for a new publication to share a variety of ‘best practice’ conservation methods for modern movement buildings. Through the 2011 Madrid Document, the ISC2OC is promoting a scientific, well-researched approach to the conservation of 20th century buildings that emphasises the modernist value of truthfulness and clarity in the alterations made to a building. Instead of advocating for the restoration of modernist buildings to a pristine ‘original’ state, the ISC2OC advocates for an ‘as much as necessary and as little as possible’ approach that also accounts for the cultural value of changes made to buildings over time.

In Part 2 and Part 3, we will test the extent to which these internationally espoused conservation principles and values are reflected at a national, regional and local level through the ideologies, policies and practices of governmental and non-governmental conservation organisations in Great Britain and the United States of America. Through an assessment of the carefully selected case studies and important changes to conservation
policies in Britain and America, we will see how the valorisation of modern movement architecture as heritage is beginning to challenge the definition of conservation from the ground up.
Part 2. GREAT BRITAIN
2.1. **INTRODUCTION**

Part 2 documents how the movement to conserve modernist architecture has developed within Great Britain’s longer tradition of heritage protection and veneration. England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland each have their own heritage protection bodies, but within this thesis, we will only be examining the regional similarities and differences between England and Scotland. In both Part 2 and Part 3, the growth of the conservation movement for modernist heritage has been studied under the three overarching themes of designation, valorisation and heritage management to draw out national, regional and local similarities and differences in the processes and the philosophies that guide them. Over the past three decades, thematic studies, educational programmes and the development of more inclusive and informative designation systems and heritage management tools designed specifically for post-war listed buildings and estates in both England and Scotland have contributed to a wider acceptance of modern movement architecture as heritage.

The conservation movement’s stable, non-confrontational relationship with the modern movement began to crumble in the 1960s when at first architects, and then the wider public began to question the ideals of modernism. With modernism’s fall from favour, the agenda of the conservation movement surged into prominence and, as we will see, eventually established itself as an integral part of urban planning in Britain. Jane Jacobs is widely recognised as the leader of the 1960s tenement rehabilitation movement in New York City that opposed Robert Moses’ and the NYCHA’s large-scale quasi-governmental housing renewal schemes and likewise in England, Ian Nairn blasted Welfare State council housing, saying they created a ‘loveless landscape… built without love, they have inspired none in their occupation.’ In 1968, many local constituencies in Britain voted against the Labour party of the Welfare State and in favour of the Conservative representatives based on their promise to curb modernist redevelopment schemes and the construction of multi-storey housing estates.

The democratisation and radicalisation of the conservation movement throughout the 1970s was expressed in wildly popular publications like *The Sack of Bath* and *The Rape of Britain*, the second of which John Betjemen said revealed that wartime destruction
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‘pales into insignificance alongside the licenced vandalism of the years 1950-1975’\textsuperscript{137} English philosopher Roger Scruton echoed these sentiments when he wrote that modernism was ‘one of the greatest catastrophes the world has ever known in peacetime’ that ‘seized control of our cities and shook them free of human significance.’\textsuperscript{138} In 1986, Peter Shaffer vocalised the disenchantment many felt toward modernist architecture in the \textit{Architecture at the Crossroads} series for the BBC, opening polemically with:\textsuperscript{139}

\begin{quote}
This is a programme about murder – architectural murder. …No doubt to many of you the word murder will seem exaggerated. You will say that what we call today development is a necessary part of change. If you really think this, so much the worse for you and so much the worse for your children. They ask for bread, and this particular, you give them not stone, but dead concrete. A building like this, lifeless, faceless, hopeless, joyless, mean spirited, damning the sky with its load of [andrite], ruining everything around it. The people who designed this thing are, if you can believe it, heirs of Wren and Nash. To me they are criminals. Worse are the people who commissioned it, who approved, probably insisted upon its mediocrity, and worse still are the people who indifferently let it happen, who don’t really even notice it. You. Us.
\end{quote}

However, around the same time the \textit{Architecture at the Crossroads} series was airing on British television sets, a small group of pioneering architects and academics were meeting in the Netherlands as the newly formed amenity group DOCOMOMO to discuss the conservation of this new widely despised and threatened era of architecture. From the beginning, the conservation of modernist buildings has been led in Britain by specialists. Three authors of the DOCOMOMO International manifesto subsequently founded the DOCOMOMO-UK chapter, and both English Heritage and Historic Scotland had already begun to designate the most significant early-20\textsuperscript{th} century modernist buildings, however, public opinion has since been slow to catch up and many people still find it nearly impossible to envision the utopian ideals behind many post-war modernist buildings and New Towns in Britain. When Cumbernauld New Town was built, it was hailed as the future of urban planning, but today its architectural language is still foreign to its residents and has subsequently been awarded the notorious ‘Carbuncle Award’ twice by public vote in 2001 and 2005. In 2004, George Ferguson, then President of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), proposed an ‘X-list’ scheme to speed along the demolition of ‘vile buildings’ like the Park Hill Estate in Sheffield and the St James

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid. (p. 322).
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid. (p. 353).
\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Doubt and Reassessment}, directed by Peter Adam (BBC, 1986), http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/p01rk00j/architecture-at-the-crossroads-1-doubt-and-reassessment.
\end{flushright}
Shopping Centre in Edinburgh.\textsuperscript{140} Had the scheme been enacted, property developers would have been given generous grants to condemn ‘bad’ buildings that did not encourage community life around them and such buildings would be denied planning permission to change the use of the buildings, thus speeding along their demolition.

A few years later, John Winter began his chapter on ‘Conserving Buildings of the Modern Movement’ in \textit{Understanding Historic Building Conservation} (2007) by bitterly stating that the architects’ confidence that the Modern Movement would be accepted by the masses did not happen and argued that there are ‘relatively few - certainly fewer than a hundred – houses that need serious conservation’ in Britain. Winter rather erroneously said that the Twentieth Century Society ‘has searched hard to increase the number of examples, but previously unknown Modern Movement houses of quality almost never turn up.’ \textsuperscript{141} He further argues that the three modern movement houses open to the public – 2 Willow Road by Erno Goldfinger, High Cross House by William Lescaze and The Homewood by Patrick Gwynne and Wells Coates – are ‘probably enough’ and that we should not be ‘too precious about the lesser works of this part of our heritage’. To deal with the necessary upgrades and repairs to modern movement buildings, Winter proposes that experimentation and innovation rather than conservation theories or codes of practice should guide architectural practitioners and that that conservation standards should be lower and more flexible. As the only chapter in the book devoted to the conservation of modern movement architecture, Winter writes a largely damning account of modernism’s technical faults and dismisses most of the architecture from this period as unsuitable to the British climate and the British psyche. At the time of the book’s publication, any building constructed during or before 1987 would have been eligible for listing, however Winter hardly discusses anything built later than the inter-war period, leaving the greatest wealth of modern movement architecture in Britain untouched.

Against this backlash, Sections 2.2 and 2.3 will document how various valorisation efforts and the strong statutory listing programmes have been used in England and Scotland to promote and protect the architectural heritage of the modern movement. Throughout Part 2, we will also test how far the international conservation principles identified in Section 1.5 are evident on a national, regional and local level and to what extent the recommendations of international experts are compatible with the special


characteristics of conservation in Britain. Then in Part 3, we will see that capitalistic cultural values have had a stronger influence on conservation in the United States and have thus created a movement entirely different in character to Britain’s socialistic conservation agenda.

Note: During the course of this study, English Heritage (EH) changed its name to Historic England (HE) and Historic Scotland (HS) changed its name to Historic Environment Scotland (HES). The names of each organisation are used interchangeably in correspondence to their name during the time period being discussed, however, to avoid confusion and to provide consistency, Historic England (HE) and Historic Environment Scotland (HES) are predominantly used throughout when speaking of the organisations in general.
2.2. **The Designation of Modern Movement Heritage in Great Britain**

In Section 2.2, the designation of modern movement buildings in Great Britain will be discussed through the regional differences found in England and Scotland in the selection processes, protective measures and legislative tools used to evaluate architectural heritage. In Britain, the concept of ‘listing’ buildings of architectural or historic value began in Scotland under the direction of architect Ian Lindsay through the National Trust Scotland survey of 1936-8, which listed 1,158 buildings and sites across Scotland. The listing programme in England began with a sense of urgency in response to the bombing raids of 1940-41 when the Ministry of Works appointed a group of 300 local architects from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) to produce the first ‘salvage list’ for the Air Raid Precaution Committees. This successful wartime heritage protection programme was made a permanent fixture by the Town and Country Planning Acts of 1944 and 1947, and local authorities were given more comprehensive lists to help them decide what to salvage and what to rebuild. Back in Scotland, Lindsay produced the *Notes for Guidance of Investigators* in 1948 to promote a wide-ranging survey of historic buildings, advising surveyors that the act ‘does not state that they should be old, nor that they should be beautiful.’ Through this guidance, Lindsay also established a precedent that listed buildings also need not be popular or well liked, arguing that ‘[w]e may not like revival baronial but future generations may. Even if they don’t, it plays a part in the history of architecture.’

By 1969, over 30,000 buildings had been listed in Scotland – 12 times more per capita than comparatively sized Denmark, and across Europe, only the Netherlands surpassed Scotland with approximately 45,000 listed sites by 1974.

The Dutch compiled their first ‘Preliminary List’ of monuments from 1908-1933 and likewise conducted further surveys after the destruction of the Second World War. Though they worked according to a 50-year rule, hardly any building after 1850 had been listed, so a survey programme proceeded through the 1980s to inventory its ‘younger heritage’ (1850-1940). In Britain, the designation of twentieth century architectural heritage began a decade earlier, with the designation of 150 pre-1939 buildings in

---

143 Ibid. (p. 287).
144 Ibid. (p. 287).
England in 1970-71 and the first batch of post-war modernist buildings designated in 1988. In Scotland, the first post-war modernist building was designated in 1965, just five years after its completion, and twelve post-1945 buildings were listed between 1970-73.

As will be discussed further in Part 3, in the US, a number of Frank Lloyd Wright’s most iconic modernist buildings were listed on the National Register of Historic Places around this time, including the Robie House in 1966 and Fallingwater in 1974. However, these buildings were listed under Wright’s own insistence and the National Park Service still has not actively sought to identify and designate further modern movement buildings, preferring instead to leave nominations to the State Historic Preservation Offices and grassroots preservation groups. In this regard, we may come to find that the movement to conserve modernist architecture has been driven first by national conservation traditions and only more recently by the encouragement of the international specialists. The World Heritage Centre’s 2001 Programme on Modern Heritage has broadened the discussion on modern movement heritage and has encouraged nations to assess buildings from the 19th and 20th century for their heritage registers, however, as we have already seen, this programme followed behind what had already begun in a number of countries.

In Britain, systematic protection for built heritage of ‘special architectural or historic interest’ grew increasingly in opposition to the demolition caused by post-war redevelopment, and militant amenity groups sprung up to advocate for 19th and early 20th century buildings. The January 1958 edition of the Architectural Review addressed the need for a Victorian Society, stating that:

If the question be asked whether the time is ripe to treat the buildings and furnishings of so recent a period with the respect we accord to earlier ones, the answer surely is that examples are disappearing more quickly than we realize and that if we wait until [these] buildings are more widely studied and appreciated, it will then be found that the evidence on which scholarly studies should be based no longer exists.145

Though this statement was calling for the establishment of a Victorian Society, the sentiments in this quote mirror the sense of urgency that drove the participants at the 1989 Council of Europe meeting on twentieth century heritage to demand that member states instigate a programme of inventorisation to record the threatened and fast disappearing architectural heritage of the recent past. It is difficult to imagine a time now when Victorian architecture was almost universally despised, however in 1958, ‘the

quantity, as well as the bewildering variety’ of Victorian architecture was a national
‘embarrassment’ as it was evidence of how far Britain lagged behind America’s
modernisation efforts. The author conceded that within this period, there were
buildings that ‘most people would agree to be extremely ugly’ but argued that regardless
of current fashions, they represented a ‘characteristic trend, some turning-point of taste,
important in the history of the period’. Though the Victorian Society and the Thirties
Society could not halt the demolition of the Euston Arch in 1961 or the Firestone Factory
in 1980, the public outrage around these two events developed into an expectation that it
was the British government’s responsibly to protect the nation’s architectural heritage for
its people.

Reflecting upon the widespread unpopularity of modernist architecture in the mid-1990s,
Nigel Whiteley argued that the Modern Movement had moved into history, and therefore,
‘we should save Modern architecture, not necessarily because we are fond of it or even
because we especially value it as relevant to the needs of today, but because it is an
authentic and important record of historical values and practices’. Yet, Whiteley noted
that heritage, as opposed to history, carries a different connotation in reference to the
nation’s image of itself and argues that heritage implies a positive contribution to the
nation’s current collective identity, whereas history is allowed to be a negative yet distant
aspect of the nation’s past, using the analysis that ‘Hitler is part of Germany’s history;
only neo-Nazis would claim he is part of Germany’s heritage.’ In 1992, when
modernism was widely detested and still viewed as “un-British”, Erno Goldfinger’s 2
Willow Road house transitioned from history to heritage when it became an English
National Trust property, thus awakening an interest in other inter-war modernist
buildings.

Echoing early concerns over the designation of Victorian buildings, Thomas Jester has
argued that ‘between 1945 and 1980 the volume of the global built environment more
than doubled relative to all that had been constructed in the course of human history’ and
that the vast quantity and the varying quality of what he calls ordinary everyday
modernism (OEM) contradicts the general definition of heritage, which is based on
exceptional craftsmanship and rarity. With this view, one can concede that much of the
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147 Nigel Whiteley, ”Modern Architecture, Heritage and Englishness,” Architectural History 38 (1995),
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149 Jester and Fixler, ”Modern Heritage: Progress, Priorities, and Prognosis.” (p. 3).
built environment of the post-war decades must be lost to redevelopment before some of it can be recognised as special by the general public. So, as is still the case in Great Britain, the assessment of recent past architecture remains an elite activity left to heritage specialists and public opinion is simply expected to catch up over time.

John Pendlebury has written that the ever-increasing volume of heritage assets and the coinciding expansion of legislative control ‘represents both conceptual changes in what is considered to be heritage and changes in the willingness of the state to intervene in the rights of the landowners to do what they wish with their property’.\(^{150}\) As we will see in Part 3, this enforcement listing system that has developed in Great Britain would be unacceptable in the United States of America where legislation gives preference to personal property rights. One of the most fundamental differences between conservation in Britain versus that in the United States is that property owners in Britain are not granted any tax breaks or compensation for any lost value or costs incurred due to the designation of their building. Alternatively, in the US, designation on the National Register of Historic Places is largely honorary and places no restrictions on the owner; therefore, as we will see in Section 3.2, the protection of significant modern movement buildings depends instead on the strength (and existence) of a local preservation commission and on grassroots activism to call attention to threatened modernist buildings.

### 2.2.1. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN MOVEMENT DESIGNATION PROGRAMMES

#### 2.2.1.1. ENGLAND

The prospect of listing twentieth century buildings in England was first discussed at a meeting in March 1967. The Ministry of Housing and Local Government, responsible for heritage designation at the time, was concerned that inspectors were insufficiently qualified to survey this era of architecture\(^ {151} \), so in 1970, the highly regarded architectural historian Sir Nikolaus Pevsner was asked to produce a ‘top 50’ list to lead further
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\(^{151}\) The Town and Country Planning Act of 1968 removed the ability for local authorities to designate buildings of historic or architectural significance and gave this power solely to the Minister of Housing and Local Government. The term 'listed building' was also defined for the first time in this Act.
discussions. Pevsner surveyed buildings from 1922-39, most of which were representative of the modern movement, including the Lubetkin and Tecton designed minimalistic Penguin Pool at London Zoo (1934, restored 2004), and homes designed by Wells Coates and by the architectural firm Connell, Ward and Lucas.\(^{152}\) Then between 1970-71, 150 buildings from the pre-1939 period were listed. More inter-war buildings were added to the list throughout the 1970s, but all were listed at the lowest grade – Grade II – meaning they have subsequently had to be re-evaluated and re-graded as grants have been sought to repair or alter the structures. Of all listed buildings in England, 92\% are listed at Grade II.\(^{153}\) Of buildings built in the modern style between 1933-66, 1146 of the 1423 listed (80.5\%) have been listed at Grade II, 206 buildings (14.5\%) have been listed at the higher Grade II* and 71 buildings (4.5\%) have been listed at the highest Grade I level.\(^{154}\) These statistics appear to bode well for the appreciation of modern architecture, however many of the Grade I designations were actually listed for the more historic buildings that the modernist buildings are attached to or associated with. A more accurate search reveals that, of the 24 twentieth century listed buildings described as ‘brutalist’, none are listed at Grade I, 8 are listed at Grade II* and the rest are listed at Grade II.

When Sir Albert Richardson’s Bracken House (1957-59) came under threat of demolition in 1987, it was considered ineligible for listing because the imposed cut-off date for listing had been arbitrarily set at 1940. Amidst mounting pressure from a wide range of professionals, Lord Elton, then Secretary of State in the Department of the Environment (DOE - formerly the Ministry of Housing and Local Government\(^{155}\)) abolished the 1940 cut-off date, established a rolling 10 and 30 year designation rule, and listed Bracken House at Grade II* in August 1987.\(^{156}\) The new legislation permitted the designation of any building over 30 years old and in special cases, buildings of exceptional quality under imminent threat of character-destroying alterations or demolition could be listed if they


\(^{153}\) Grade II buildings are considered to be of special interest and warrant conservation, though they may be altered with listed building consent. Grade I listed buildings are those of international importance and Grade II* buildings are considered outstanding examples of a particular architectural style that any book on the subject would include.

\(^{154}\) Statistical data was found using Historic England’s listed building online search tool. Statistics up to date as of 5 January 2016.


were at least ten years old. Importantly, the measurement of age was set as the date construction began, which has proved to be greatly important in the case of modernist developments that have often developed over a lengthy period of time. The Alexandra Road Estate in Camden, for instance, was first envisioned in 1959, was designed by Neave Brown in 1967, constructed between 1972-78 and designated as a conservation area on 18 August 1993, making it the first post-war council housing estate to be statutorily listed and at Grade II*.

Though the Bracken House was designed in the monumental classical style that was popular in tandem with the modern movement, it is widely regarded as the first building listed in its own right from the post-war modern period. With English Heritage as advisor, Lord Elton then asked the public to propose other buildings from the post-war period up to 1957 for listing, of which English Heritage recommended 70 for listing. However, Lord Elton’s successor, Lord Caithness, proceeded more cautiously and in March 1988, accepted only the 18 least controversial recommendations, seven of which were traditional in style. Leading conservation advisor to the government, Bob Kindred, has said this early reluctance by responsible government ministers to designate modern movement buildings was down to the implication that doing so would imply that these buildings should have greater access to public funds for maintenance or repair. In the end, Lord Caithness rejected all recommendations for public housing, as well as the Bankside Power Station, which was seriously threatened at the time but has since been converted into the extremely popular Tate Modern Gallery. Yet, Sir Basil Spence’s reconstruction of the Coventry Cathedral (1956-62) was given the well-deserved Grade I listing, as was the Royal Festival Hall (1949-51) by Leslie Martin, Robert Matthew, Peter Moro and their team at the London County Council.

Recognizing a lack of research-based knowledge on the architectural qualities of the post-war period, in 1991, Baroness Blatch (Junior Minister in the DOE) asked English Heritage to conduct a three-year research project, known as the post-war listing programme, in order to develop an academic background to base future listing decisions upon and to increase the public’s understanding of post-war architectural design through
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publications and exhibitions.\textsuperscript{160} Before any further listing recommendations were made, the recommendations had to be endorsed by three committees: a Post-War Steering Group, by English Heritage’s Historic Buildings and Areas Advisory Committee and by its Commissioners.\textsuperscript{161} The Post-War Steering Group, existing of approximately 20 heritage and architectural experts, was established in 1992 to administer a systematic approach to designation by building type. A vigorous vetting process was established for post-war listing proposals and only the proposals that achieved a substantial majority of votes in the steering group were passed on to the EH Advisory Committee, then the Commission for review.\textsuperscript{162} The first post-war thematic study focused on schools and universities, and in March 1993, Peter Brooke, the subsequent Minister of the newly founded Department of National Heritage (DNH), accepted all 47 sites (containing 95 separate educational buildings) shortlisted for designation by the three committees.\textsuperscript{163} After a ministerial change and a year’s silence on the next post-war thematic study concerning industrial and commercial properties, Minister Stephen Dorrell announced in March 1995 that all future thematic listing proposals of post-war buildings would need to be released for public consultation before any listing decisions were made, after which he accepted only 21 of the 35 recommended for listing from the second post-war thematic study.\textsuperscript{164} By the close of 1995, 189 separate post-war buildings or structures on 111 sites around England had been listed largely due to the work of architectural and heritage specialists through the post-war listing programme, showing that research and specialist knowledge was indeed needed to support the listing applications for buildings not readily recognised as heritage – as is still the case today.\textsuperscript{165} According to a review of past and present thematic studies undertaken by English Heritage to assess the continued relevancy of ‘legacy’ designation programmes, in total 245 listing recommendations were proposed through the post-war listing programme, meaning the remaining 134 buildings and sites are due for re-evaluation if they have not already.

\textsuperscript{160} Harwood, Something Worth Keeping?: Post-War Architecture in England. (p. 5).
\textsuperscript{162} Cherry and Chitty, Review of Past and Present Thematic Programmes. (p. 16).
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid. (p. 15).
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid. (p. 15).
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid. (p. 5).
Figure 2.1. Post-war listing programme thematic studies and listing recommendations. Source: Heritage Protection Reform Review of Past and Present Thematic Studies (2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pre’92</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>n/k</th>
<th>De-listed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Higher education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Commercial and industrial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Railways</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Private houses (to 1970)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rural housing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Churches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Public and institutional housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Communication &amp; Transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Entertainment and sport</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hospitals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Schools</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sculpture &amp; memorials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 New Town housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Bridges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Planning Town Centres</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Prefabs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Private houses (after 1970)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Military listings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.2. Number of post-war buildings and sites listed by category and year. Source: Heritage Protection Reform Review of Past and Present Thematic Studies (2009).

---

166 Category 4: Subsumed under communications (category 18)
167 Category 17 subsumed under public housing (1 item)
168 Category 19: Not implemented
169 AA/RAC telephone boxes; listing preceded thematic programme (1987-9)
170 Note: There are some discrepancies and possible faults in the addition of figures in the tables presented by the Heritage Protection Reform study, namely with categories 13 and 16 and the calculation of designations during 1998. To avoid confusion, the figures in this thesis have been presented as they are in the original study.
Many of the recommendation reports from each category of the post-war listing programme were bound up into the publication *Something Worth Keeping* (1996), while others exist only in paper format and are unavailable to the public. According to Elain Harwood, who was one of the principle authors of these reports, explained that English Heritage had been able to list so many buildings in the early years of the post-war listing programme firstly because very short reports were required to support their recommendations compared to today’s standards and secondly, because the whole listing process was based solely on the expertise of a heritage specialist. As one can see, the greatest number of post-war listings went through in 1998 following the publication of the 17 survey reports and public consultations. However, from the mid-1990s onward, wider debates around public opinion, listed building management regimes and the economic performance of buildings were taken into account and informed the initiatives undertaken by English Heritage, which slowed the listing process.\(^{171}\)

The Post-War Steering Group was disbanded in 2002, leaving the final three thematic studies incomplete. Perhaps the government felt the outside input was no longer necessary, or perhaps, as Catherin Croft (Director of the Twentieth Century Society) imagines, the designation of post-war buildings was proving to be exceedingly difficult, was taking up a vast amount of time and energy, and the whole process was making the government’s relationship with English Heritage too contentious. As a result, the government pulled back from the post-war listing programme, deciding to approach post-war listings ‘in a more discreet way’ by doing less of it.\(^{172}\) However, with over 500 post-war buildings or sites statutorily listed in England as of 2009, it seems the post-war listing programme and successive thematic studies and re-studies have normalised what was once contentious.\(^{173}\) Yet, the listing recommendations made through the post-war listing programme were never meant to be definitive and many buildings on the cusp of the 30-year rule are likely due for re-evaluation. In January 2016, 41 further post-war sculptures were listed as a result of a thematic study of public art between 1945 and 1995.\(^{174}\) True to the legacy of thematic studies, the designations were followed by an educational exhibition at the Somerset House in

\(^{171}\) Cherry and Chitty, Review of Past and Present Thematic Programmes. (p. 15).

\(^{172}\) Caroline Engel, Interview with Catherine Croft, Director of the Twentieth Century Society (London: 2013).

\(^{173}\) Cherry and Chitty, Review of Past and Present Thematic Programmes. (p. 17).

London from February to April 2016 to help the public recognise the significance of the individual artworks and the mood of the post-war society that commissioned them.

2.2.1.2. SCOTLAND

In Scotland, perhaps surprisingly, the designation of post-war buildings began as early as 1965. The Courier Building tower (L.T. Lindsay Gray, 1960), built as an addition to a 1902 palazzo-styled office block in Dundee, was listed at Category B on 4 February 1965, just five years after its completion.\(^{175}\) An awareness of the vulnerability of post-war heritage began in earnest in the 1970s, and from 1970 to 1973, twelve other post-1945 structures were listed, nine of which were less than thirty years old at the date of designation. The structures range from memorials to housing developments, and though constructed in the post-war period, not all were built in the modern style. In December 1970, two of Robert Hurd’s post-war redevelopment projects on the historic Canongate in Edinburgh were listed. The housing block at 82-84 Canongate (1954), designed as a replica of the façade of the 1624 Nisbit of Dirleton’s House, was listed at Category B and the housing development at 191-193 Canongate (1958), designed in a Scots Modern style sympathetic its neighbouring the 17\(^{th}\) and 18\(^{th}\) century tenements, was listed at Category C. Basil Spence, Glover and Ferguson’s modern tenement developments at 65-71 and 97-103 Canongate (1961-69) would take a similarly sympathetic approach, though they exhibit a markedly less bashful use of concrete and modern forms. The Spence development was listed at Category B in September 2008, nearly four decades after its completion.

While Historic Environment Scotland (HES) has traditionally taken a more cautious approach to the listing of post-war modernist buildings than Historic England (HE), and have proportionately listed fewer modernist buildings, they have not shied away from listing controversial buildings that they argue most deserve listed status. The same criterion for listing applies to modern movement buildings as to traditional buildings, though the bar is set considerably higher for post-war buildings as they are not readily recognised by the public as having ‘special architectural or historic value’. Dawn McDowell, HES Head of Listing, argues that the designation of post-war buildings can yield a sort of heritage dividend by renewing investment interest in these often undervalued buildings and by re-establishing a sense of place and pride in one’s town or

\(^{175}\) Caroline Engel, Interview with Dawn Mcdowell, Head of Listing at Historic Scotland (Edinburgh: 2013).
neighbourhood. To address the demolition and alterations being made to many undervalued post-war modern movement buildings across Scotland, Deborah Mays published, ‘An update on listing in Scotland’ in November 2009, to both promote awareness and to seek direction in the listing of this era of architecture from other professionals working within the field.176 In the same month, Historic Scotland (HS) also published ‘Scotland: Building for the Future – Essays on the Architecture of the Post-War Era’ in correspondence to a conference held at Dundee.177 The conference papers were later published in a second book, which illustrated the clash of opinions that arose during conference discussions.178

In 2011 and 2012, HS jointly published two books with the city councils of Edinburgh and Glasgow: Edinburgh’s Post-War Listed Buildings179 and Glasgow’s Post-War Listed Buildings180. These two books, written and prepared by McDowell, compiled a gazetteer of listed post-war buildings within each city (Glasgow had 38 and Edinburgh had 60 at the time). In Edinburgh’s Post-War Listed Buildings, McDowell wrote that interest in architecture from this era is growing both through advocacy and through opposition, meaning that the public battle between modernist and anti-modernist critics in the media has helped these discussions to reach a wider audience, but has also undoubtedly assured that post-war buildings are put through the most stringent vetting.181 While the public nature of many post-war listing proposals keeps the listing process transparent, it may also keep HES from listing the most controversial modern movement buildings, such as Sir Basil Spence’s 1957 Queen Elizabeth Square tower blocks (also known as Hutchesontown C) in the Gorbals neighbourhood of Glasgow (See Section 2.3.1).

Of the 246 post-war buildings listed to date in Scotland, only two have been lost: the Category A listed St Andrew’s College halls of residence by Gillespie, Kidd & Coia (1968-69) were demolished in 2011 and the Category B listed Princess Margaret Rose Hospital lecture theatre and clinical unit by Morris and Steedman (1960-65) was demolished after a fire in 2002. Since 2010, 49 additional post-war buildings and sites have been listed across Scotland, the most recent being the Elmwood College main block

180 Dawn McDowell, Glasgow’s Post-War Listed Buildings (Glasgow City Council and Historic Scotland, 2012).
181 McDowell and Gillon, Edinburgh’s Post-War Listed Buildings. (p. 4).
(1966-71) designed by the Fife County Education Architects Department, listed at Category B on 19 May 2014; Bonar Hall (1975-77) at the University of Dundee, designed by Isi Metzstein and Andy MacMillan of Gillespie, Kidd & Coia, listed at Category B on 14 January 2014; the late-Brutalist Glasgow Sheriff Court (1972-1986) by Keppie Henderson and Partners, listed at Category B on 20 August 2013; and The Burrell Collection building in Glasgow by Barry Gasson Architects (1971-83), listed at Category A on 23 January 2013. In Edinburgh, the youngest modern movement building to be listed is the 1972-76 Scottish Widows Fund and Life Assurance Society Head Office designed by Sir Basil Spence & Partners, listed at Category A in March 2006. Between 2011 and 2016, six modernist post-war buildings or developments were listed in Edinburgh (all at Category B or C), including two housing developments by Sir Basil Spence & Partners at 1-63 Claremont Court (1959-62) and 7 & 9 Laverockbank Avenue/13-17 Laverockbank Crescent (1957-60), the Muirhouse St Andrews Parish Church (1962-65) designed by architect Harry Taylor, the ‘Festival of Britain’ styled St Nicholas Parish Church (1955-57) by architects Ross, Doak and Whitelaw, the modern rural vernacular-styled Colinton Mains Parish Church (1952-4; church hall circa 1965) by Ian G Lindsay and Partners, and the experimental energy-saving Millbuies House (1955-60) designed by Robert Matthew of Robert Matthew Johnson-Marshall & Partners.

2.2.2. CONSERVATION LEGISLATION & STATUTORY HERITAGE BODIES

2.2.2.1. ENGLAND

Heritage designation, and indeed the listing of post-war modernist buildings, still largely depends on current politics and the architectural preference of the incumbent Minister.\footnote{Historic England, also known as the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England and formerly as English Heritage, is the governmental statutory advisor on the historic built environment. English Heritage was established as a non-departmental public body in 1983, and is sponsored by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). Unlike Historic Environment Scotland, Historic England does not make the final decision on the listing of buildings, but advises the Secretary of State of the DCMS, who has the authority to accept or reject listing proposals.} Presently, the Minister for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS)\footnote{The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) replaced the Department of National Heritage in 1997, broadening the scope of the department to include not only heritage and the arts, but also sport related activities, tourism, libraries, museums, broadcasting and film, press freedom and regulations. The DCMS was largely preoccupied with preparations for the London 2012 Olympics the 4-5 years leading up to}
the final say on listing applications, but is required by law to confer with Historic England and any other expert deemed appropriate.\textsuperscript{184} Listing requests are made to or by Historic England, but the DCMS Minister is able to and often disagrees with Historic England’s recommendation and so what qualifies as heritage is largely left up their personal judgement. Historic England’s Post-War Specialist Elain Harwood explained that,

\begin{quote}
[Historic England] does try to second-guess the politics as to what's going to be controversial, and usually gets it so wrong that it’s not really worth trying. But, essentially our role is to be dispassionate and professional and give the expertise as to what's good and what's not. And then, it’s for the Minister to take out.
\end{quote}

Complicating matters further, the Culture Minister is a relatively junior position within the British government, so Ministers understandably often advance to more senior positions as they become available, meaning few stay for the full five-year term. Thus, every few years, Historic England and other amenity groups like the Twentieth Century Society (who is a statutory amenity society for England, Scotland and Wales) have to develop a relationship with a new Minister who may or may not have much experience or interest in the historic built environment. As the Secretary of State for the DCMS is an appointed position, it means that the listing of buildings is inevitably political.\textsuperscript{185} The Minister may garner public and political distrust should he approve the listing of a long troubled housing estate or an unpopular post-war office building, especially if the property sits on a valuable inner-city site slated for redevelopment. Nevertheless, the current Minister of DCMS, Ed Vaizey, has been relatively open to the idea of listing the more controversial post-war buildings. In the past, the designation of unpopular post-war architecture garnered little support from the wider public, which has perhaps led to its disproportionately tough evaluation in terms of its cultural, architectural and historic value. Harwood warns that many of people, particularly architects, who are now in senior positions within HE or the government joined the conservation movement in the 1970s and 1980s precisely to advocate against modern architecture.\textsuperscript{186}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{185} For details relating the to the political nature of the designation of earlier eras of architectural heritage, see Bob Kindred’s article ‘What Direction for Conservation’ in Architectural Conservation: Issues and Developments (2006).
\textsuperscript{186} Ibid. (p. 680).
\end{flushright}
Striking a balance between pressure from political figures, conservation groups, the media and the general public is made all the more difficult when controversial post-war modern movement buildings are proposed for listing. Harwood explained during a 2013 interview that ‘if you are offending as many people as you are pleasing, you are probably somewhere about right, but it is like you have to be ahead of opinion, but not completely off your head.’\textsuperscript{187} In designation cases where Historic England stood ahead of public opinion, by and large, Harwood said she has seen the public come around to modernist buildings like Centre Point. When she first looked at the Barbican in 1989, she admitted it seemed outrageous to be listing it, but now a whole new population is moving there precisely for its design and listed status.\textsuperscript{188}

However, while looking out the window of RIBA Headquarters on Portland Place, London, Harwood commented on the disparity in the listing process, saying,

\begin{quote}
I look here, and look how many Georgian buildings there are along here, and the number of 20th century buildings is very few, and so, to me, they are more unique and they have had to go through more hoops in order to be listed, and they have to be near on perfect to be listed. But then, this double standard appears that they are allowed to be more altered than the Georgian buildings and that just seems puzzling, utterly ludicrous and wrong.\textsuperscript{189}
\end{quote}

In England, local planning authorities are required to publicise applications for Listed Building Consent (LBC) on or near the building, on the local council’s website and normally within the local newspaper for a minimum of 21 days. They are also required to consult the appropriate national amenity societies, like the Twentieth Century Society, for works that compromise any aspect of a listed building.\textsuperscript{190} During this time, amenity societies or members of the public can file objections to the proposed works, which the local authority is then required to review before granting final consent. If consent is granted for the demolition of a listed building, the building owner must allow HE access to the building for recording purposes for a minimum of 30 days after consent is granted and before demolition works begin.\textsuperscript{191}

\textsuperscript{187} Caroline Engel, Interview with Elain Harwood, Postwar Specialist at Historic England (London: 2013).
\textsuperscript{188} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{189} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{191} Harwood, Historic Environment Law: Planning, Listed Buildings, Monuments, Conservation Areas and Objects. (p. 69).
Section 7 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act of 1990 required that consent must be obtained before any works that may harm the special architectural or historic interest of a listed building are undertaken. This special architectural character may be exemplified by its material features inside and out, its plan, its structural technique or as an attribute to a larger ensemble of buildings.\textsuperscript{192} Should someone make alterations to a listed building without first obtaining consent, legal action can be taken against them.\textsuperscript{193}

The Department of the Built Environment will investigate all alleged breaches of planning control of which it is aware and aims to resolve the matter by negotiation wherever possible to achieve a satisfactory result. A full investigation of an alleged breach will be carried out before a decision is made as to what action should be taken. Once a breach has been established, an enforcement officer will contact the occupier and the freeholder to advise them of this and offer to meet those responsible for the works to discuss the issues and how they may be resolved.

The Department of the Built Environment will normally seek to deal with the matters in the manner described above, but in serious cases, if a satisfactory agreement cannot be reached between the Enforcement Officer and the parties behind the alterations, the Department reserves the right to prosecute. The current penalty for conviction in a Magistrates’ Court is a £20,000 fine and/or six months imprisonment. According to the Department of the Built Environment Enforcement Charter, a conviction in the Crown Court could yield unlimited fines and/or up to two years imprisonment.

The most significant violation of a modernist listed building in Britain is the Greenside case. Designed by architects Connell, Ward and Lucas, Greenside (1937) was an International Style modernist house built alongside a golf course on the Wentworth Estate in Surrey. Though it was listed at Grade II in 1988, it was apparently considered an eyesore by local golfers and the owner David Beadle applied for Listed Building Consent to demolish it on the grounds that its upkeep was too expensive and the repairs necessary were too extensive. The local council granted consent and Beadle quickly demolished the house on 22 November 2003; however, English Heritage and the Twentieth Century Society had opposed the ruling and the Deputy Prime Minister John Prescott had called in the application to make the final decision, meaning the demolition was illegal.\textsuperscript{194} On 22 April 2005, Beadle was fined £15,000 and ordered to pay an additional £10,000 toward

\textsuperscript{193} Ibid. (p. 45).
\textsuperscript{194} Harwood, Historic Environment Law: Planning, Listed Buildings, Monuments, Conservation Areas and Objects. (p. 5).
prosecution costs for the illegal demolition of a Grade II listed building, but English Heritage estimated he stood to make £4.6 million from redeveloping the site (Beadle had previously unsuccessfully tried to sell the house for £2 million). Catherine Croft, Director of the Twentieth Century Society, felt the fine did not act as enough of a deterrent when the market value of the redevelopment significantly exceeded that of the existing listed building, warning that, ‘everybody should be extremely worried about this decision. There is no point in listed building protection if there are not penalties.’

In March 2010, the Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings was published to provide general guidance and clarity to the listing process in England. This document re-established ‘age and rarity’ as the key characteristics that qualify a building for listing. For buildings constructed after 1945, it instructs that a ‘particularly careful selection’ must be made. Where a large number of building types survive from a certain era, the general policy is to only list those buildings that are most significant or most representative of a particular style. Harwood thinks this new principle may have been a reflection of incumbent DCMS Minister Margaret Hodge’s views in respect to a number of high-profile debates around the designation of modernist post-war buildings. In 2009, Minister Hodge went against English Heritage’s advice to list John Madin’s brutalist Birmingham Central Library at Grade II (1974, demolished April 2016). A spokesman for English Heritage responded to the decision, saying, ‘In offering the Government our expert advice, we examined all aspects of its architectural interest including: whether it fulfilled its brief; whether it was a particularly good example of a public library; how well it survives; how it compares to other listed buildings of a similar type; and how influential the building has been. In our view, these tests were met.’

By this point, Hodge had already developed a reputation for disliking post-war and especially modernist buildings, and said she saw herself as a representative of the people’s opinion rather than of the architectural experts. In 2007, the Twentieth Century Society was informed of an application made by the Tower Hamlets local planning authority for a Certificate of Immunity (COI) for the Robin Hood Gardens (RHG) housing estate (Peter and Allison Smithson, 1968-72), and promptly put forward a

---

recommendation to list the estate at Grade II. English Heritage reviewed the application and decided in this instance not to recommend the estate for listing, citing the "specific design aesthetic faults" like its over-reliance on repetition and its meagre variety in surface treatments.\(^{199}\) English Heritage also cited the questionable success of the 'street decks' in comparison to Park Hill and disputed the importance of the Smithsons, stating that they 'would stand by the assertion that the reputations of architectural thinkers is not always matched by the reality of their buildings (RHG or University of Bath).'\(^{200}\)

Regarding the fulfilment of the original brief, EH stated that,

> In some regards, RHG fulfilled its brief very well. It provided the requisite number of domestic units; it provided an open space; it dealt with the problem of traffic noise and pollution. Overall we accept that RHG met some of the requirements set out by the [Greater London Council] on practical grounds. We would contend that the brief also has a qualitative element as well as a numerical or technical one: was the housing of high quality as a place of human residence?\(^{201}\)

On 1 July 2008, Minister Hodge officially refused its designation, saying, "I do not think that [the Smithson's] reputation outweighs the evidence that Robin Hood Gardens was not innovative in terms of the 'streets-in-the-air' concept and it is not fit for purpose… When functional failures are fundamental, it raises questions about the architectural performance of the building and thus its claims to special interest."\(^{202}\) The Twentieth Century Society requested a review of their recommendation, claiming that the listing criteria had been incorrectly interpreted, but English Heritage held firm. Then in May 2009, Culture Secretary Andy Burnham granted a five-year Certificate of Immunity (COI) to halt any further requests for designation.\(^{203}\)

Widely disliked by the general public, the architectural virtue of Robin Hood Gardens\(^{204}\) also divides opinions amongst the experts. Post-War Heritage Specialist for English Heritage Elain Harwood wrote that "Above all, perhaps, Robin Hood Gardens is the

---


\(^{200}\) Ibid. Item 2.6.

\(^{201}\) Ibid. Item 2.8.


\(^{203}\) This outcome was the recommendation given by Peter Stewart Consultancy, who was commissioned to report on the potential for listing Robin Hood Gardens in 2007.

\(^{204}\) The Peter and Alison Smithson designed Robin Hood Gardens housing estate (1968-72) in Tower Hamlets for the Greater London Council (GLC), the successor of the London County Council (LCC). The estate consists of two large blocks holding 213 flats, exhibiting the Smithson’s influential ‘streets in the sky’ scheme, also applied at the Grade II* listed Park Hill.
quintessential English contribution to post-war housing. Conversely, Sir Nicklaus Pevsner consented in the *London 5: East* architectural guide that it was impressively monumental, but ‘ill-planned to the point of inhumane’. Though Robin Hood Gardens was only completed in 1972, by the early 1980s, the condition of the estate had declined significantly according to an account by architectural critic Robert Maxwell, who visited to the estate with Italian architect Vittorio Gregotti:

> He wanted to see Robin Hood Gardens… We looked all over it, which was not easy. Many of the flats were boarded up, there were broken milk bottles and a smell of urine everywhere. There was hardly anyone about. This was not the jolly street life envisaged for street-decks. We were all at a loss, and not a word was spoken. We turned away…. Only a visit to Berlage’s Holland House, on our way back, could cheer him up.

In 2003, architectural critic and RIBA journal editor Hugh Pearman echoed Maxwell’s earlier experience and concluded that the whole project had been disastrous, both structurally and socially. Through Robin Hood Gardens, he said, ‘The Smithsons were exposed as both arrogant and fallible’ and said their reputation has never recovered in Britain.

The Robin Hood Gardens case has raised concerns over the capabilities and willingness of the heritage listing process in England is to consider the theoretical and conceptual aspects of design as a defendable reason for listing. Prominent architects like Zaha Hadid, Richard Rogers and many others supported the listing of RHG, and argued that the exceptionality of the place came from the concept and the powerful sculptural qualities of the building and landscape. In March 2015, in an open letter to the public and the British government, Rogers argued that RHG ‘offer[s] generously-sized flats that could be refurbished, are of outstanding architectural quality and significant historic interest, and public appreciation and understanding of the value of modernist architecture has grown over the past five years, making the case for listing stronger than ever.’

---
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After the COI expired in May 2014, the Tower Hamlets local authority applied for a second COI and the Twentieth Century Society embarked on a second eleventh-hour attempt to have RHG listed. As a statutory amenity body, local planning authorities in England and Wales are required to consult the Twentieth Century Society on all listed building consent applications calling for the partial or complete demolition of buildings within their remit.\textsuperscript{209} Seven years after making its first recommendation to Minster Hodge, English Heritage said it would consider all responses before making its recommendation to the incumbent Minister, but after again deciding not to propose the estate for listing, Head of Listing for English Heritage Emily Gee explained,

\begin{quote}
We assessed the complex for listing in 2008 and our advice was subject to detailed scrutiny and review. No new information has come to light that would cause us to revise our assessment, so we stand by our view that Robin Hood Gardens does not meet the very high threshold for listing.
\end{quote}

Since the announcement, local Labour MP Jim Fitzpatrick has said that the implication that the estate had historical significance was ‘nonsense’, and argued that estates of the same vintage in Balfron and Glenkerry are in much better condition and that ‘Robin Hood Gardens is well past its demolition date, and should be brought down ASAP’.\textsuperscript{210} Planning permission for the Blackwall Reach Regeneration Project was granted in December 2014, which will provide 1575 new mixed-income flats to replace RHG.\textsuperscript{211}

Minister Margaret Hodge was not the first to argue that listed buildings should be judged on the fulfilment of their original brief and continued ‘fitness for purpose’. In 1994, Chairman of the Arts Council of Britain, Lord Gowrie, announced that ‘If a building becomes redundant for the business it was originally built for it should be knocked down and replaced.’\textsuperscript{212} Given that the modern movement was driven by an ever expanding new language of architecture for ever more specific uses, this redundancy argument of Lord Gowrie’s neatly gathered most post-war modern buildings into a collection set for demolition and redevelopment.


\textsuperscript{211} Karakusevic Carson Architects, known for their award winning Claredale Street mixed-income housing scheme beside the regenerated Keeling House (see Section 2.3.2), were hired to design Phase 1b, consisting 242 flats in three new buildings on a vacant plot of land within the estate.

English Heritage has traditionally taken the view that, as long as a building has a viable future use, economic factors or physical conditions should not affect the decision to list.\textsuperscript{213} This position was challenged by the \textit{R. (Bancroft) v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government} case that went to the High Court in 2004-05.\textsuperscript{214} The Court ruled that ‘the extent to which the design of the building fulfilled the function or functions for which it was commissioned could be taken into account in deciding whether the building was of special architectural or historic interest.’\textsuperscript{215} The case involved the brutalist Pimlico School (1967-71) in Westminster designed by John Bancroft through the GLC Architects Department. English Heritage had repeatedly recommended the school for listing and the Culture Minister denied it each time. The Minister then granted the local authority a Certificate of Immunity on grounds that the building suffered from solar heat gain, insufficient access security, inflexible classroom sizes and maintenance issues, which were all attributed to faults in the original design. Situated on a long, narrow sight, Bancroft had designed the building with tilted glazed walls to allow natural light to reach within the deep rooms, and though a series of louvers had later been installed, this had not fully solved the solar heat issues the design caused. In a review requested by Bancroft of the decision to grant a COI, Justice Gibbs ruled that:\textsuperscript{216}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Article 53.} The architectural interest of a building must in any view be capable of including a consideration of how effectively or otherwise the building fulfilled the function or functions for which it was commissioned. In the case of a building designed as a school, it seems to me quite impracticable as well as misconceived to seek to divorce the aesthetic qualities of the structure from the degree to which its design successfully fulfils its practical function of providing a school building that works. A rule that permitted the Secretary of State to take into account the former aspect of the design but restricted her from referring to the latter would in my judgment be wholly artificial.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Article 54.} Further, it would put an unwarranted gloss on the natural meaning of the word “architectural”. It seems to me that the profession of architecture is generally regarded as not only an art but a science; a profession devoted not solely to providing aesthetic pleasure, but rather a profession which seeks to provide aesthetically original or pleasing solutions to the practical and functional challenges presented by its briefs.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textbf{Article 55.} It follows therefore in my judgment that the Secretary of State was entitled to take into account any design flaws in the building and the seriousness or otherwise of their consequences in determining whether to list the building. \textit{She was not entitled to take into account the way in}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{213} Harwood, “Keeping the Past in England: The History of Post-War Listing.” (p. 680).
\textsuperscript{216} Ibid. (p. 49).
Since this decision, listing recommendations must attempt to show that a building fulfilled its original brief, or that it was ‘fit for purpose’, but English Heritage stresses that no building ‘can be expected to meet future demands that its architects could not possibly have foreseen’. Essentially, if the faults of the building are due to the original design, the Minister can take them into account when deciding whether or not to list a building. However, if the building is currently unable to fulfil its function due to disrepair, poor energy performance or because it does not comply with current building regulations, these factors should not influence the listing decision. However, as Harwood points out, an innovative failure may also be of great architectural or historic interest.

In 2010, English Heritage asked architect and DOCOMOMO UK board member, John Allan, to respond to the newly imposed listing requirement, which he published in the paper, ‘Necessary test or convenient alibi?’ While it is widely agreed that sustainability should be at the fore of all planning for both new and historic structures, Allan criticised the Minister for placing this ‘fitness for purpose’ test selectively on the buildings ‘of recent construction’. At the core of this controversy is whether the functional and technical performance of a building can and should be taken into account when determining if a building is valuable enough to list. According to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act of 1990, the Secretary of State is allowed to take into account only two criterion when reviewing a recommendation for listing – special architectural interest and special historical interest – yet increasingly, a perceived failure to fulfil its original brief is quietly discrediting post-war buildings from statutory protection. The ‘fulfilment of the original brief’ itself would hardly qualify a building as ‘special’; either building plans progress fully throughout the construction phase, or, as is more often the case, the plans are revised throughout the design process and construction, and then again throughout its occupation. So there is a question of how ‘fulfilment of the original brief’ is to be defined. Allan argues that should this test be applied to earlier periods of heritage, would we discredit a 17th century castle which was successfully invaded and partially demolished because it did not live up to the purpose for which it was built? Likewise, architectural historian and critic Reyner Banham illustrates that

the ‘brief’ for modernist buildings may not be as straightforward as we may like to believe:219

With the International Style outlawed politically in Germany and Russia, and crippled economically in France, the style and its friends were fighting for a toehold in politically suspicious Fascist Italy, aesthetically indifferent England and depression-stunned America. Under these circumstances it was better to advocate or defend the new architecture on logical and economic grounds than on grounds of aesthetics or symbolisms that might stir nothing but hostility. This may have been good tactics – the point remains arguable – but it was certainly misrepresentation. Emotion had played a much larger part than logic in the creation of the style; inexpensive buildings had been clothed in it, but it was no more an inherently economical style than any other. The true aim of the style had clearly been, to quote Gropius’s words about the Bauhaus and its relation to the world of the Machine Age…to invent and create forms symbolising that age…and it is in respect of such symbolic forms that its historical justification must lie.

2.2.2.2. SCOTLAND

The Planning [Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas] (Scotland) Act of 1997 continues to regulate how the statutory listing system functions in Scotland. In 2008, the Memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas was condensed and replaced by the Scottish Historic Environment Policy (SHEP), which was further revised in 2011 and 2016. Age remains a major factor in the evaluation process and as many of the post-war buildings are now at least 30 years old, they may be included for listing, but their special architectural or historic value must be definite and exceptional to warrant listing.220 Buildings less than 30 years old will normally not be considered for listing unless they are deemed of national significance and/or are under immediate threat, however at least 28 post-1945 buildings have been listed within 30 years of their completion.

The 2008 Scottish Historic Environment Policy (revised 2011, 2016) reflects the Scottish Government’s more flexible approach to heritage management, and detailed guidance on these policies is provided by the Managing Change in the Historic Environment guidance note series. The 2008 document clearly outlined the principles for listing selection and included a revised policy on listing buildings associated with live applications. While Historic Environment Scotland (HES) has historically restrained from listing properties

220 Ibid. (p. 5).
while they were part of a live planning application, some modifications have been made to allow for exceptions in the case of buildings or monuments of national or international significance.

While England and Scotland share many of the same heritage policies, Scotland does not have a 10-year rule for listing exceptional buildings as it has been deemed unnecessary in accordance with the rate of development in Scotland. Its inapplicability is also due to the relationship Historic Environment Scotland strives to have with the private sector. Where Historic England may fight to list a building regardless of the amount of planning behind its demolition or redevelopment, Dawn McDowell, Head of Listing at HES, explained that they prefer to assess each situation in respect to the extent of resources already invested. There currently is no legislation keeping HES from listing any eligible building, regardless of previous planning permission granted, but McDowell explained that doing so would be undemocratic and that HES would not survive if it halted development plans throughout the country. 221

Like in England, the Cabinet Secretary for Culture and External Affairs is an elected position and the Minister therefore must work within the planning system while representing the interests of the public. Since 2009, HES has been working with institutions such as the National Health Service (first surveyed in 1989 in response to the privatisation of some sectors of the NHS estate), Network Rail, the Scottish Universities and the Scottish Courts Service to help the building owners recognise what of architectural value they may have in their possession before any redevelopment plans are made. In turn, these organisations have increasingly begun to check for buildings of heritage value at the early stages of redevelopment planning and through survey work, HES has been ready to advise them on what is worth listing, what is not, and why.

Building Preservation Notices (BPN) and Certificates of Intention Not to List (COINTL) have rustled feathers on both sides of the conservation battle pertaining to post-war modern movement buildings, but in reality, they are implemented in Scotland less often than people may think - the most recent BPN was issued in Scotland in 2004. McDowell explained that BPNs and COINTLs are no longer a necessary tool because of the partnerships HES has established with organisations and private owners, which means that more people have a better understanding of the planning process, historic building surveys, and of the designation review process. In the past, an isolated local conservation

221 Engel, "Interview with Dawn Mcdowell, Head of Listing at Historic Scotland."
officer may serve a BPN to gain temporary protection for an unlisted building under threat of demolition or alteration if it is thought to be worthy of statutory designation. HES would then have six months to confirm or deny the listing of the building. BPNs have also rarely been used because under Section 29 of the Listed Building Act, any persons who had an interest in the building (owners, leaseholders or any persons with contractual rights over the property) are given a right to compensation payable by the local planning authority.222

BPNs have, however, been used on two occasions to ‘spot-list’ modern movement buildings under threat in Edinburgh: Robert Matthew’s modernist inter-war home at 14 Kilgraston Road was listed at Category B in 1991 and 10A Greenhill Park (Alexander Esme Gordon, 1966) was listed at Category B in 2004. In each instance, the local council issued a BPN and asked HES to list the building after the owners had applied for planning permission to make alterations. Both buildings were privately owned and would not have come to HES’s attention had the local council not alerted them. The owner of 10a Greenhill Park claimed that he had been assured that his property would not be listed after it was deemed ineligible for listing during a 1992 modern architectural survey conducted by HES, and argued that it should only have been listed as part of a second survey that evaluated its significance against other buildings of equal or greater merit. Though both buildings were subsequently listed, the successive owner of the Robert Matthew house modified the house without Listed Building Consent and altered the home so extensively that it warranted its de-listing in 2011. In this instance, HES did not require the owner to revert all the changes since the building would not have been re-listed due to the lack of original materials.

Historic Scotland introduced the Certificate of Intention Not to List (COINTL) in December 2011, which works similarly to the Certificate of Immunity (COI) granted by Historic England. Rather than a certainty of immunity from designation, through this certificate, HS promises an intention to not list the building under question if it has a live planning application. While the Certificate of Immunity has been used on numerous occasions in London, a COINTL has, however, not yet been issued in Scotland. Once again, McDowell explained that Historic Scotland’s proactive attempt to work with development plans rather than in response to them has created little need for property owners to apply for a COINTL.

On 4 November 2014, the Scottish Parliament passed the Historic Environment Act of 2014, which established Historic Environment Scotland (HES) as a Non-Departmental Public Body (NDPB). The new NDPB is an amalgamation of the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historic Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) and Historic Scotland (HS) and the Act has made minor revisions to the laws protecting the historic built environment. In its new form, HES is akin to Historic England’s former relationship to the English government as an arm’s-length body, before it was divided into two bodies on 1 April 2015. The English Heritage name has stayed with its duties to manage the more than 400 state-owned historic properties as a non-governmental charity organisation, now formally known as the English Heritage Trust. The new organisation Historic England will continue to manage conservation activities as a public body funded by the DCMS. Historic England has thus lost much of its independence as a Management Agreement with the government now dictates which activities they undertake and how their money must be spent.223 As per the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997, Historic Environment Scotland is still responsible for the listing of buildings of special architectural interest, and listings are generally made in the following three ways:224

- Listing proposals, requests for reviews of existing listings and requests for delisting. These requests can be made by anyone using the form on Historic Environment Scotland’s website.
- Working in partnership with stakeholders to assess larger sites in advance of major development or planning proposals.
- Thematic studies of building types, places or the work of specific architects.

The process under which Historic Environment Scotland will now consider a listing proposal is outlined in the following chart:

---

Figure 2-3. The process by which a proposal to designate/amend designations is handled.
Source: Historic Environment Circular 1.
An amendment to section 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 now allows HES to legally differentiate any object(s) or structure(s) affixed to or within the curtilage of a listed building that are not to be considered part of the listing, and like in England, HES may now state within the listing statements the particular aspects of a listed building that are not considered to be of special architectural or historic interest and are therefore not protected. This is intended to reduce the instances where Listed Building Consent (LBC) is required. The 2014 Act also introduced a right of appeal for property stakeholders against certain decisions taken by HES ‘to ensure that examination procedures are proportionate and efficient; that the appeal process is transparent and fair; and that decisions are both robust and based upon a review of the proposals that were originally considered by Historic Environment Scotland.’

 Appeals can be made by the owner, occupier or tenant of the building in question, but cannot be made by third-party persons not directly affected by the decision.

The Town and Country Planning (Historic Environment Scotland) Amendment Regulations 2015 amended regulation 28 of the 2008 Act to add HES as a key agency, meaning they now have a duty to ‘cooperate with strategic development planning authorities or planning authorities during the development planning process’ in the following instances:

- The compilation of Main Issues Reports;
- The preparation of the proposed Plans; and
- The preparation of Action Programmes and proposed Action Programmes.

Throughout the 2014 Act and accompanying documents, stakeholders are repeatedly encouraged to engage with HES in the pre-application stage so that they can be made aware of any objects or buildings of historic interest within their possession and of the planning process in general. Planning authorities are especially encouraged to consult HES in the early phases of projects that include contentious, unusual or large-scale properties where listed building consent may be required. For certain types of historic buildings or complexes, a Joint Working Agreement may be set up to negate the

---
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requirement for local planning authorities to consult HES on straightforward decisions
(See Section 2.4.3.2 Joint Working Agreements & the University of Edinburgh). \textsuperscript{227}
2.3. **THE VALORISATION OF MODERN MOVEMENT HERITAGE IN GREAT BRITAIN**

In Section 2.2, we saw how statutory designation in England and Scotland has developed into a largely successful enforcement system with legal repercussions for unapproved alterations to listed buildings, however, under the leadership of Historic Environment Scotland and Historic England, conservation is moving away from its militant roots toward a model that is ever more integrated within the planning system. The political nature of modern movement designation was revealed through a discussion with Historic England’s Post-War Specialist Elain Harwood and Historic Environment Scotland’s Head of Listing Dawn McDowell, as well as through controversial cases, such as the contested future of Robin Hood Gardens, where the opinions of the international community are at odds with those of the local authority and Historic England. Furthermore, due to the controversial nature of modern movement designations, listing proposals must now demonstrate that the building in question is still ‘fit for purpose’, though buildings of an older vintage are usually exempt from this additional criterion.

Section 2.3 discusses other methods outside of statutory designation that have been used to evaluate and valorise overlooked or denigrated modern movement buildings and estates. As referenced briefly in Section 2.2.1.1, thematic studies, often with accompanying publications, exhibitions and public education activities, have been used to a wide extent by Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland to raise awareness for significant modern movement heritage with the ultimate goal to see some or all of the featured buildings listed. The revalorising effect of listing itself has also been documented through a number of stigmatised post-war housing estates across Britain, such as the Brunswick Centre in London.

Aside from the thematic studies conducted by the statutory heritage conservation bodies, heritage amenity groups like DOCOMOMO UK, DOCOMOMO Scotland and the Twentieth Century Society (formerly the Thirties Society) have been conducting successful advocacy campaigns for the conservation of modernist architecture since the early 1990s. The Thirties Society began in 1979 as a light-hearted amenity group to promote the conservation of Art Deco, Arts and Crafts, 20th century Neo-Classicism and inter-war Modernist buildings up through the 1930s, and in 1983, they ran a memorable campaign to save the now iconic red Post Office telephone boxes across Britain. Around
the same time, Prince Charles ‘exploited his royal position to proselytise a “Vision of Britain” combining violently anti-modernist architectural ideas with rhetoric of community participation and “sustainability”’. 228 Protesting against the proposed redevelopment of Mansion House Square in London with an unbuilt plan by Mies van der Rohe, Prince Charles famously declared, ‘You have...to give this much to the Luftwaffe – when it knocked down our buildings, it didn’t replace them with anything more offensive than rubble. We did that.’ 229 Though lambasted by the architectural community for his naivety and unsolicited meddling, Prince Charles’ vision of a pseudo-traditional England struck a chord with many through the 1980s and 1990s and his pet project Poundbury remains popular with its residents today.

As part of the Post-War Listing Programme, in May 2000, English Heritage commissioned a major national MORI survey, titled, ‘What does “heritage” mean to you?’ in order to gain a more conclusive insight into the public’s views on post-war heritage designation and to identify priorities for future heritage protection policies. The survey found that the great majority of people polled felt that public funds should be used to maintain historic buildings, and in fact, three-quarters of respondents felt that the best modern buildings should be preserved as well. 230 The survey showed that the assumption that the general public disliked modernist architecture was not only incorrect, but the majority of respondents were shown to disagree with the survey’s statement that buildings constructed after 1950 are not heritage and most respondents felt a moral obligation to conserve modern buildings as well as traditional buildings for future generations. 231

Public interest in modernist architecture and design has grown extensively since 2000, and the hard-to-love housing estates of the Welfare State are even becoming chic addresses. Sarah Thompson’s book Style Council, published in 2015, showcases the carefully curated interiors of council house enthusiasts across Britain. 232 Given the generous room sizes called for by the 1961 Parker Morris Committee report Homes for Today and Tomorrow made compulsory for council housing in 1969, refurbished ex-

229 Ibid. (p. 351).
230 When English Heritage conducted its first MORI poll in 1997, only 66% of those polled felt post-1950 buildings should be conserved, but within only three years, support for modern movement conservation had risen by another 10%.
council estates are fast becoming a desirable alternative to the meagre homes now being built in London and elsewhere after the abolishment of minimum space allowances in 1980. James Meek, author of Private Island, argues that ‘None of the things tenants found repellent about life on some council estates in the 1970s – the crime and anti-social behaviour, the damp, the powerlessness in the face of council bureaucracy, the noise, the distance from children’s playgrounds, the difficulty of imposing personal style on a habitat you didn’t own, the penny-pinching bodgery of council repairs, the obstacles of moving – is inherent to municipal tenure; they’re the result of incompetence, carelessness and unreasonable economies.’

Instead, Meek says council flats are once again becoming attractive places to live for the hipsters and the better off, saying ‘council houses in inner London are the new lofts, to be boasted about and refitted with salvaged Bakelite and Formica by the trendiest of the new inhabitants.’

Owning an ex-council house herself, Thompson’s intent was to ‘celebrate the unsung charms’ of council housing and to share ‘how everyday people have picked up the baton dropped by Right-to-Buy and run with it’. However, others have viewed the book as a glorification of the Right to Buy scheme and fear it may further fuel what they see as a middle-class exploitation of cheaper homes meant for society’s poorest.

Catherine Croft, director of the Twentieth Century Society and whose own ex-council home features in the book, says she hopes the book will inspire local councils to undertake long overdue maintenance and that it will also inspire today’s architects to look back and learn from the ideals of their public-sector predecessors.

To get to this point however, Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland had to convince the government and the public that these modernist buildings had value and were worth keeping. To do so, thematic studies proved most effective and are being used today to broaden the scope of recognised modern movement and now post-modern heritage. The designation of stigmatised and poorly maintained modernist housing estates has also been shown to have a significant impact on how the residents and broader community view these buildings. As the US does not have a culture of government interventionism, in Section 3.2 we will see how non-profit and grassroots preservation groups play a much more vital role in the valorisation and conservation of modern movement buildings across America.

---
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2.3.1. **THEMATIC STUDIES**

As was outlined earlier in Section 2.2.1.1, the post-war listing programme in England was instigated by the institutional changes made to the listing process by Lord Elton in 1987, which established a rolling 30-year rule and 10-year rule for the designation of exceptional buildings. Then in 1991, Baroness Blatch commissioned English Heritage to conduct a three-year study on the characteristics of post-war architecture in England, which established thematic studies as a primary tool to identify potential modern movement heritage for listing by building type. The post-war listing programme was the most ambitious to date, with its core objectives being to research twenty building types common to the post-war period, select buildings from each category to recommend for listing that would later act as a benchmark for further designations, and to share the findings with professionals, the academic community and the wider public through publications, exhibitions and consultations.²³⁶

Following the designation of 47 pre-1963 educational buildings by Heritage Minister Peter Brooke in 1993, Stephen Dorrell, the new Minister of the Department of National Heritage (DNH), announced in March 1995 that English Heritage must consult with owners, local authorities and the general public on all thematic studies.²³⁷ Throughout 1995 and 1996, English Heritage held a series of consultations and exhibitions for each of the post-war thematic studies conducted during that time. From the outset of the post-war listing programme, the expectation was that public opinion would eventually catch up with expert opinion, however, as Bob Kindred explained in the introduction to *Conservation of Modern Architecture*, during the mid-1990s there were also concerns that listings should not advance too far ahead of public taste and that ‘controversial buildings in terms of style, function or association should not be protected if the public – rather than the experts – would not support it’.²³⁸ To bring public opinion along with the post-war listing programme (and to keep the heritage protection system from ‘falling into disrepute’, as Kindred says), English Heritage hoped to use thematic studies to educate the public on the merits of modern movement architecture by providing a category within which the newly recognised heritage belongs.

The most controversial post-war thematic study was the public housing survey of 1996, and consequently, the standards for listing were set even higher than for other modern

²³⁶ Cherry and Chitty, Review of Past and Present Thematic Programmes. (p. 15).
²³⁷ Keeping the past. (p. 675).
movement buildings. It became clear that it was necessary for heritage professionals to relay the architect’s original intentions, as these were not readily apparent to the general public after years of budget cuts, delayed maintenance and inappropriate alterations. So an exhibition, seminars and meetings with local authorities and residents accompanied the survey, and short promotional films were made of the largest housing estates to help explain their particular significance. Residents generally responded positively to the outreach activities and as a result of this wider public support, 14 of the 19 post-war housing recommendations were listed in 1998, including Churchill Gardens (1947-60) by Powell and Moya, the Golden Lane Estate (1953-62) by Chamberlin Powell and Bon, Alton East and Alton West (1953-61) by the London County Council, and most controversially, Park Hill (1954-60) by Jack Lynn and Ivor Smith for Sheffield City Council.\footnote{239 Keeping the past. (p. 676).} Park Hill was the only estate where the residents were not fully in support of its listing.

A survey conducted in 2006 revealed that individual modernist private houses and housing schemes are under-represented on the national list, partly because the popular schemes and styles were imitated so extensively by developers that they seem ubiquitous and partly because of the rigorous standards set for the post-war listing programme.\footnote{240 Ibid. (p. 677).} According to the 2009 Heritage Protection Reform assessment of thematic studies, 66 pre-1970 private houses had been listed more or less sporadically between 1992 and 2009 (with 11 of these listed in 2007 perhaps as a result of the 2006 survey) and though English Heritage began a thematic study of post-1970 private housing in 2002, it was never completed and no buildings were listed as direct result of the report.\footnote{241 Ibid. (p. 678).} In *Keeping the Past*, Harwood explains that ‘Since the early 2000s, post-World War II listing has got progressively more difficult, reflecting trends found generally in listing but heightened to an extreme degree.’\footnote{242 Ibid. (p. 678).} Surveys of university buildings, schools and private houses built since the mid-1960s have remained unfinished or unpublished due to lack of resources or a lack of commitment at a high level.\footnote{243 Ibid. (p. 678).} Conversely, churches are well represented on the national list because listing is often sought in conjunction with applications for repair and maintenance grants. Thirty post-war churches were listed in 1998 as a result of the post-war listing programme, but a further 43 post-war churches have been listed in England outside of a thematic study between 1992 and 2009. Unlike housing developments,
church architecture is more readily recognized as heritage, even if it dates from the late modern movement.

During a conversation in March 2013, Harwood admitted she felt quite pessimistic about the future of some types of modern movement buildings, particularly schools, new towns and public housing. In November of 2012, English Heritage published a three volume thematic study on post-war schools in England, which had been identified as a post-war building type under threat. The first volume focused on schools built between 1962-88 in a general context, the second focused on school buildings from this period in Inner London, and the final volume focused on the West Suffolk area of England. The first of its kind, this study aimed to discuss the pedagogical ideas and architectural trends at the time in comprehensive context in order to inform the current debate about the future of schools from this period across the country. Aside from viewing these buildings as a possible noteworthy collection of historic buildings, the report aimed to educate current policy makers, local authorities, architects and the schools’ administrators on the economic lessons to be learned from the prefabrication construction methods of the lean post-war years. Through the study, a number of significant school buildings were discovered and accessed, of which, a small number will be assessed for designation in 2013.

The England’s Schools thematic study was commissioned as part of the larger Later Twentieth-Century Heritage project conducted from 2011-2015. The Later Twentieth-Century Heritage project picked up where the post-war listing programme left off and aimed to increase the knowledge base and the public’s appreciation for architecture built during the 1960s-1990s. As part of the project, the works of 11 modernist architects were surveyed, including John Madin (architect of the recently demolished Birmingham City Library) and Chamberlin Powell and Bon (architects of the Barbican Estate), and the findings were published as part of the Historic England Architects book series. In a separate but related venture, the *Introduction to Heritage Assets: the Late 20th-Century Commercial Office* was published as a result of the revision of 28 previously listed post-war commercial buildings to better indicate areas of greater and lesser significance, and to document changes made to each building since they were listed (see also Section 244).
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244 Interview with Elain Harwood, Post-war Specialist for English Heritage, 19 March 2013.
248 On 21 May 2009, the Malvern Girl’s College Sports Hall (now Edinburgh Sports Dome) was listed at Grade II.
2.4.2). Another recent publication through the HE Informed Conservation series has been completed on the post-war development and significant post-war heritage of Coventry. Finally, as with most thematic studies, Historic England’s most recent thematic study of post-war pubs from 1945-1990 was driven by a recent spate of demolitions or conversions. After an earlier survey of inter-war pubs, 19 of the 28 recommended pubs were listed in August 2015.

Moving onto Scotland, according to a timeline of important dates within the history of heritage designation in Scotland compiled by Historic Environment Scotland’s Head of Listing Dawn McDowell, the first survey of architectural heritage was completed in 1966, with an informal cut-off date of 1840, and the buildings listed in that survey were issued in 1971-72. As the first Chief ‘Investigator’, Ian Lindsey advised the investigators (who were mostly architects) that buildings need ‘not be old nor beautiful’ to merit listing, and that while ‘we may not like Baronial, we must be open-minded’. 249 Although the legislation for statutorily listing buildings dates from 1947, the listing process did not commence in full until after the completion of this first nationwide survey. The 1972 Town and Country Planning Act found the cut-off date of 1840 to be too early, leaving most Victorian, Edwardian and Industrial heritage unprotected, and so a re-survey was commissioned in the late 1970s to assess the later buildings that were not investigated in the earlier survey.

Since the last re-survey of the 1970s, the structure of listing assessment has moved away from comprehensive nation-wide surveys to focus on politically and socially relevant thematic topics. The first thematic survey was conducted in 1989 in response to the privatisation of sectors of the National Health Service estate. During 2013, a thematic survey looked at sporting structures throughout Scotland in correspondence to the excitement drummed up by preparations for the 2014 Commonwealth Games. With limited resources and the equivalent of only three fulltime staff members in the HES Listing Department, McDowell explained that modern movement heritage is best protected in conjunction with relevant thematic studies, rather than by working in isolation or against the tide. However, a few thematic studies have focused solely on modern movement heritage.

The first thematic survey exclusively dedicated to post-war modern movement architecture looked at post-war churches in Glasgow during the early 1990s. After the demolition of St Benedict’s in Drumchapel during the early 1990s, HES contacted the Glasgow diocese to inspect other buildings of interest within their ownership. As church attendance has continually fallen since the mid-twentieth century, many of these religious structures had reached the end of their useful life and were in threat of demolition. As a result of the thematic study, 17 post-war churches were listed, six of which were designed by the famed expressionistic modern architectural firm Gillespie, Kidd and Coia, and a number of churches were also rewarded renovation grants through HES.250

As part of the *Architects Series*, HES conducted a similar thematic survey in 2008 on Scotland’s most famous post-war modernist architect, Sir Basil Spence.251 The survey was conducted in correlation with the centenary of his birth year to monopolise on the publicity surrounding other research projects and publications being conducted by academics and amenity groups such as DOCOMOMO on Spence’s works and influence in the field of modern movement architecture. Only a decade earlier, Spence’s expressionistic brutalist Queen Elizabeth Square tower block (Hutchesontown ‘C’) in the Gorbals neighbourhood of Glasgow was demolished to celebratory fanfare. Spence’s reputation was at its lowest level in British public opinion at that time and Glasgow City Council argued the housing was unsuccessful ‘most specifically in terms of its unpleasant and dominant appearance, and in terms of its inadequate design and layout’.252 McDowell recalls that at the time, Historic Scotland did attempt to list the Queen Elizabeth Square flats because they would not have had the research or the resources to actively prevent its demolition. In the 1990s, it was also felt that there were better expressions of modernism and that the Queen Elizabeth flats were a compromise between Brutalism and Corbusian modernism. However, by the 2008 Spence survey, the flats had become the symbolic image of the great modernism of Scotland.

The highly successful exhibitions accompanying the corresponding thematic surveys have led to what Malcolm Cooper calls the ‘rehabilitation of the work into
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250 McDowell, *Glasgow’s Post-War Listed Buildings*.
251 The *Architects series* is a series of booklets that focus on the works of Scottish architects working in the modern style. To date, three volumes have been published, volume 1: Morris and Steedman, volume 2: Peter Womersley, and volume 3: Basil Spence.
Exhibitions of note are the *Gillespie, Kidd & Coia: Architectures 1956-1987* exhibition (2 Nov 2007 – 10 Feb 2008) and the *Back to the Future: Sir Basil Spence (1907-1976), Celebration of a Modern Architect* exhibition (19 Oct 2007 – 10 Feb 2008). Both exhibitions helped to draw attention to the works of each firm and to introduce these architectural practices to a new, younger audience.

The most recent post-war survey was undertaken by HES in 2010 was after a local MSP (member of Scottish Parliament) alerted them to the unexplained removal of public artworks in the New Town of Glenrothes. During the second half of the 20th century, public art began to take on a more ‘locally relevant and socially aware approach’, which lent itself well to the socially experimental New Towns of Scotland. David Harding, the first artist to be employed long-term by the Glenrothes Development Corporation from 1968-78, considered it important, from the beginning, to involve local residents in his work. This was the first formal position of its type in town planning across Britain and it spurred an interest in the role of art in town planning not just throughout the Great Britain, but in many other countries including the United States, Japan and Australia.

HES looked at the more than 140 artworks had been removed, recorded and were being cared for by the Parks Department, and as a result of the survey, four artworks were statutorily listed. While this may seem like a nominal gain, the greater benefits for HES are to be found in the working relationship developed with the local council. Through this process of identification, the local council now understands what they have and how the value lies in the collection as a whole, which is rather unique in scale and breadth. The process spanned a year and resulted in a popular exhibition that ran from July through August in 2012, a Historic Scotland publication of the history of the New Town and its art, and five separate self-guided walking routes planned around artworks still currently on display throughout the town. The process has helped to consolidate a unique identity for Glenrothes New Town and has inspired a pride of place amongst its residents.
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2.3.2. **The Revalorisation of Stigmatised Post-War Housing Estates**

If we feel now that buildings showing these kinds of defects are worth preserving, it is not to economise on their replacement, but to recognise their value as a record of a quest, as part of a historical and cultural development that is crucial to our own identity; and in some instances, as an embodiment of values that make them part of an artistic and spiritual heritage.\(^{257}\)

Section 2.3.2 will look at the efforts made to reposition stigmatised post-war modernist council housing estates in Britain in both academic dialogue and in the minds of the wider public. As we saw earlier with Robin Hood Gardens and Sarah Thompson’s publication *Style Council*, interest in British council housing estates has been growing within the design community over the past decade, however, as Robert Maxwell advised in 1998, for the general public to be able to see past the structural defects of modern movement buildings, they need also to be repositioned within a narrative of a common social identity.

For the past three decades, researcher Miles Glendinning has been visually documenting social housing tower blocks across Britain, Europe and Asia and in 1994, he co-authored a book on the tower blocks of Britain with Professor Stefan Muthesius.\(^{258}\) He has recently been granted £52,900 from the Heritage Lottery Fund to digitise the 3,500 images he has collected over the years and to develop a publicly accessible online database to host the collection. The project has a community outreach aspect as well, through which Glendinning hopes to record the experiences of the tower block residents. The online archive will include images and data of both demolished and existing social housing projects, and with an increasing number of tower blocks disappearing from Britain’s city skylines, Glendinning says he hopes ‘this project will help contribute to the ongoing shift in public attitudes towards the post-war Modernist housing heritage, which is fast turning from an object of dislike and alienation into a force for potential community empowerment.’\(^{259}\) While the great majority of tower blocks are generally not considered eligible for listing due to a lack of architectural interest or authenticity, the generous grant from the Heritage Lottery Fund is evidence that Welfare State council housing projects


have been officially recognised as an important part of Britain’s history and thus its people’s identity.

The tide is certainly turning for modernist council housing estates in London as developers and buyers recognise the potential value of these centrally located estates, however architect John Allan has argued that ‘In England, perhaps more than elsewhere, the disillusionment with public housing estates has typically led regeneration projects towards deliberate disguise of their original character in the effort to supersede an image of social alienation and technical failure.’\textsuperscript{260} Aside from the physical renovations and landscaping improvements, marketing has been employed to rework the image of the estate, mainly to outsiders, but also to the residents within. Annette Hastings of the Department of Urban Studies at the University of Glasgow has written of the resilient post-renovation stigma associated with Scottish post-war council housing estates and argues that to properly rid the estates of these negative associations, more research must be done on the causes of stigma before we can knowledgeably address its physical representations.\textsuperscript{261} In 1998, DOCOMOMO International president Hubert-Jan Henket concluded that documentation and demolition was a preferential form of preservation in cases ‘where a building or neighbourhood [had become] socially unacceptable and consequently, despised’.\textsuperscript{262} However, renovation methods that involve the social housing residents are increasingly being used to successfully reinstate a local pride of place and to support a broader understanding of the design characteristics and original intentions that make the estates special.

The Right to Buy policy enacted by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was devised to free the government of the hefty expense of managing and maintaining the numerous council estates built under the Welfare State by giving council tenants the opportunity to buy their homes at a greatly reduced price. In the first 25 years of the programme, the privatisation of council housing was worth approximately £40 billion nationally, however councils that sold off their properties were not allowed to reinvest the money earned in the construction of new homes, sending Britain back into an era of impounding housing shortages. James Meek explains how the Right to Buy programme has backfired, pointing

\textsuperscript{261} Annette Hastings, "Stigma and Social Housing Estates: Beyond Pathological Explanations," Journal of Housing and the Built Environment 19, no. 3 (1 September 2004), http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10901-004-0723-y.
out that ‘Thatcher and her successors have done all they can to sell off the nation’s bricks and mortar, only to be forced to rent it back, at inflated prices, from the people they sold it to.’

Today, council housing in Britain accommodates a mere 17% of the population, though from 1997 to 2012, the waiting list for council housing grew by 80%. Not only is the government not earning rent payments from properties they would have already paid off in full, but they are now paying two to three times the monthly council flat rent in housing benefit payments for citizens who have been forced to rent in the private market. This means that the government simply cannot afford to maintain or refurbish its remaining council housing estates, so privatisation may be the only financially feasible option available to save architecturally significant post-war housing estates. For council estates still in the ownership of the local councils or housing associations, in most cases, the debts have been paid off, meaning that the income from rents could soon generate a surplus. This surplus could be used to build new houses on the land they already own or to invest in necessary renovations for those already built.

In April 2013, an article in The Economist argued that social housing in Britain was ‘quietly making a comeback’, attracting new young, college-educated, yet poorly paid or only part-time employed residents. Facing the harsh realities of an economic recession and an extremely competitive job market, many young adults across Britain are once again seeing council housing as a necessary welfare service provided by the government. The Masefield Housing Estate outside of Birmingham, a typical 1960s estate with high- and low-rise housing, is beginning to change from within. Despite the abundance of rubbish and the general sense of dilapidation, well-tended gardens and solar panels on roofs indicate a changing population. Though the utopian dream of Welfare State architects to house a broad range of society from the factory workers to the doctors was not and will likely never be realised, the introduction of ‘affordable rents’ alongside ‘social rents’ may add diversity to council-run buildings and estates, while bringing in a significantly higher cash flow to support maintenance and repairs. Reviving the economic diversity found in council housing during its early days may also reinvigorate a sense of community and dispel the associated stigmas that have been attached to council estates since the late 1960s onward.
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2.3.2.1. The Listing Effect

The designation of public housing is notoriously contentious, not only for aesthetic reasons but also for the challenges related to large-scale developments, like complex ownership arrangements, on-going maintenance and local politics. In 2011, English Heritage published *Domestic 4: The Modern House & Housing*, the fourth document in a series of Selection Guides that offer more detailed information on the listing process and designation of certain types of buildings. The guide explains that it is difficult to establish criteria to judge this era of architecture against, but that architectural interest, intactness of design, influence of the design and the exemplary nature of the development would be key considerations. The document also upholds the recent changes in heritage designation, stating that it is important to know the original design intentions and that the housing development fulfilled its original brief.

For large post-war social housing estates, the *Modern House & Housing* guide recommends an area designation rather than individual listing. An area listing can cover mixed-use developments, whether public or private, and is often more suitable to late-modern estates where the buildings’ significance maybe be ‘very difficult to assess as their simple virtues are easily taken for granted.’

Thinking of estates like the Alexandra Road estate (1968-78) designed by the Camden’s Architects’ Department, the guide cautions that:

> To be listable, they have to survive reasonably intact, show special spatial imagination in the layout of roads and buildings, and in their hard landscaping and planting. Elevational treatments can be quite simple but they should be immaculately detailed.

However, this confusingly conflicts with paragraph 16 of the *Principles of Selection for Listed Buildings (2010)*, which states that:

> The state of repair of a building is not a relevant consideration when deciding whether a building meets the test of special interest. The Secretary of State will list a building which has been assessed as meeting the statutory criteria, irrespective of its state of repair.

---
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When Keeling House (Denys Lasdun, 1957) in the Bethnal Green borough of London was listed at Grade II* in February 1994, the Secretary of State for National Heritage, Peter Brooke, warned that though listed for its architectural and historic interest, it would need to be demolished if refurbishment was not economically viable.\textsuperscript{270} The tower had previously been served a Dangerous Structures Notice in 1993 due to spalling concrete\textsuperscript{271}, and so, after a few failed sales and near demolition, in 2001, English Heritage permitted the complete renovation of the interiors by Munkenbeck + Marshall Architects for resale on the private market as long as the exterior was restored to its original appearance. The original low-rise maisonettes accompanying the tower were not listed and were replaced by 77 new homes of mixed tenure, of which 40 are affordable housing. Designed by Karakusevic Carson Architects, who specialise in estate regeneration, the Claredale Street project was designed around a pedestrianized street that runs through the scheme, where upon a visit in 2013, the pint-sized bicycles strewn haphazardly in the well-tended front gardens presented a sense of community, safety and vibrancy in an area which had been overrun by gang activity not so long ago. While the visual history of Keeling House as a council estate has been erased in the conversion, in this case, a change of character and clientele was necessary in 2001 to secure its continued use, and over a decade on, the estate still proves popular with residents from all economic brackets.


The Anniesland Court tower block in Glasgow by Jack Holmes & Partners (1966, listed Category A in 1996) is the only example of post-war mass housing that has been statutorily listed in Scotland. Predating the iconic detached services tower at Erno Goldfinger’s Trellick Tower\textsuperscript{272}, the slender 22-storey tower quickly became a landmark of Glasgow. Where many council estates have been listed and redeveloped in England, Anniesland Court will likely be the only one listed in Scotland and has also remained council housing after its renovation. Of Glasgow’s Red Road Flats (1962-69; demolished 2015), McDowell does not feel that the buildings were architecturally special and says the fact that they were the tallest buildings in Europe at the time of their construction is of historical interest, but that alone is not enough to substantiate a reason to keep them.

As a listed building, Historic Scotland was brought in to oversee the renovation of Anniesland Court in the early 2000s. As council housing, the funds for renovation works were limited, but the project aimed to preserve as much original material as possible on the given budget. Along with the unusual external lift shaft, the tower exemplifies the best of high-rise planning at that time, boasting split-level accommodation and an

\textsuperscript{272} Trellick Tower underwent a £17 million refurbishment, starting in 2003, which was guided by the government’s Decent Homes Standard. Beginning in 2000, the Decent Homes Standard was a New Labour incentive designed to ensure that all social housing tenants had homes that lived up to the standards for airtightness, warmth, a reasonable state of repair and modern facilities by 2010. The Coalition government continued the programme on a similar basis with the added initiative to make all social housing self-financing by transferring government owned properties to housing associations and other social housing providers (Webb, Town and Country Planning in the UK, 15\textsuperscript{th} ed., p. 433). As of March 2010, it was revealed that 10% social housing still did not meet the minimum decent housing standards, however the private-rented sector fared the worst with 1.4 million non-decent homes in England compared to 660,000 non-decent social-sector homes in 2011 according to a study by the DCLG (Webb, 2015, p. 432).
exceptional use of decorative pre-cast concrete mosaic panels. In 2000, before Historic Scotland became involved in the project, the original windows had already been replaced without listed building consent. Then, when the building changed hands from the public body of the Glasgow City Council to the privately-run Glasgow Housing Association, the role of Historic Scotland changed to a less influential role of advisor. From that point onward, the Glasgow Planning Authority handled any consent issues with advice from Historic Scotland.

Peculiar about this case is the residents’ involvement in the renovation. While council estate residents are often portrayed in the media as unappreciative of their housing benefits, the residents of Anniesland Court were proud of their building, and when it was decided that the original doors would be replaced with doors that met a 30-minute fire safety rating, residents fought for an in-kind replacement, arguing that the building was listed and that its listed status entitled them to design-sensitive doors. Historic Scotland responded that the doors were not an important aspect of the design and that the refurbishment would not be treating the building with the same precaution as they would a Georgian building, but Historic Scotland Inspectorate Ranald McInnes said the concern over aesthetic appropriateness caught him by surprise.

In March 2011, Harriet Bell published a study on the persuasive effect the 1998 Grade II* listing of the Spa Green housing estate (Skinner and Lubetkin, 1946) had on the perceptions held by the original residents and those who moved in after the listing. Through this study, Bell demonstrated how ‘consciously persuasive and embodied knowledges are generated before, during and after the process of a building’s listing and that they become part of the way in which heritage value is produced and performed’.

Although many flats were purchased under the 1985 Housing Act and the Conservative Government’s Right to Buy scheme, approximately two-thirds remain in the ownership of the London Borough of Islington. Before the refurbishment of the estate in 2006-2007, Spa Green was blighted by peeling paint, crumbling concrete, and blanketed with sheets of mesh to catch falling debris, yet many residents have bought flats in the Spa Green estate, before and after the estate’s refurbishment, specifically for the listed status or to live in a ‘Lubetkin brand’.

---
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Since its recognition as national heritage, many residents have become what Bell called ‘resident experts’, people who have immersed themselves in the history of the estate and feel that it is their duty to guard and perpetuate the estate’s significance and a division has since formed between the new leaseholders and the long-term social housing tenants. Some social tenants feel that the new leaseholders do not mix with the existing community, while some new leaseholders feel that the long-term tenants do not respect the special architectural value of the estate, saying, for instance that ‘the previous [residents] wrecked it… took out the fireplace, hatch, picture rail and destroyed the kitchen’. Bell found that the majority of flats owned by new leaseholders were decorated to fit the period in which it was built, stripped back to the original materials and kitted-out with décor that was appropriate to an original Spa Green aesthetic. One resident boasted that ‘Who I am and what I do has been so bound up with Spa Green… this flat’s been on TV, in magazines, my whole interior ties in… in terms of the era’.

On the contrary, the flats of many long-term tenants were decorated in a more eclectic manner, featuring Georgian and Victorian décor, mini chandeliers and a heavy application of wallpaper throughout. Though this decorative difference does not infer that long-term tenants appreciate their flats any less than the new Lubetkin-loving leaseholders, it is an interesting commentary on the place-making habits of its original residents in what would have been an aesthetic environment foreign to their upbringing and personal tastes.

During the refurbishment, the kitchens in particular became a point of contention because the listing description demarcated the kitchens as an exemplary ‘revelation for working class housing’ and listed building consent was thus required to replace any of the original kitchen cabinets or units. Some residents felt that kitchens and bathrooms should be exempt from listed building consent requirements, while others felt the smaller details were essential characteristics of the estate’s ‘special interest’. One resident questioned the rhetoric of a ‘restored’ kitchen, arguing that ‘the concept of a fitted kitchen is more important than the fittings’. However, on the whole, the new lease-holders seem ready to accept minor inconveniences for the sake of authenticity, while the long-term social tenants felt the estate’s listed status should not keep them from making contemporary upgrades. Here the concept of authenticity grows more complicated: if we are to conserve the character of the estate, and not just the original aesthetic, is it not betraying the history
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of the occupants to clear accretions and adaptations to re-establish the original design intent? Can an architect’s design intent ever really determine how a structure should be lived in and used? While some ‘resident experts’ feel they are protecting and perpetuating the original aesthetic through appropriate décor and the reinstallation of original features or fittings, other residents feel they are protecting the character of the original Spa Green community through a physical record of adaptations.

Architect John Allan has written of his 25-year involvement with renovation works at Lubetkin’s Grade I listed Highpoint housing estate (1935) in north London, which has ranged from providing general consultancy advice on the replacement of the lifts and other services to refurbishing individual flats, including Lubetkin’s own penthouse. Over time, Allan said the demographic has gradually changed from a ‘preponderance of elderly residents, some of whom had occupied the buildings from when they were first completed and who were therefore disinclined to regard them as heritage, to a younger generation who are highly sensitive to Highpoint’s architectural significance and who aspire to live there precisely because of its heritage value.’ Through research he conducted for the development of Management Guidelines for the Golden Lane Estate and the Barbican Estate, Allan found that, contrary to expectations, flats that had retained their original fittings and features held a market value as high as those that had been recently modernized. These new architecturally-informed residents are acting as protectors of the estate and are thus creating an atmosphere considerably more supportive of conservation measures, so maintenance is approached more systematically and residents monitor the works and condition of the estate closely.

2.3.2.2. THE BRUNSWICK CENTRE, LONDON

The Brunswick Centre (1963-72), located in central London just northeast of Russell Square, underwent a refurbishment in the mid-2000s to reinvigorate the image of the estate primarily by upgrading its shopping centre and public amenities. The low-rise, high-density estate containing 400 flats in a modernist 7-storey reinforced concrete and brick structure is one of Britain’s most iconic post-war housing estates but has long been regarded as ‘one of those buildings’ - ‘known to many, admired by some and loved and
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loathed in equal measure”. In ‘Living in the Brunswick Centre: A Personal Account’, Stuart Tappin, a civil and structural engineer and Brunswick Centre resident, recounts the troubled history and mismanagement of the estate, along with its more recent reinvention as a hip shopping and dining destination.

The Brunswick Centre received planning permission in 1963 as a high-quality, mixed-income ‘village’ with high-end shops, restaurants and accommodation ranging from penthouses to student hostel accommodation. However, with its conversion to a council estate in 1964, architect Patrick Hodgkinson was asked to redesign the estate on the principle of ‘value engineering’, and anything surplus was omitted as well as some essential elements that would later greatly effect the condition of the estate. One such unfortunate cost cutting move was the omission of the retractable glazed roofs over the indoor/outdoor ‘winter gardens’ during the construction phase. Since the spaces were designed to be covered, the floors were insufficiently sloped, which allowed rainwater to pool and caused the patio junctions to leak water into the flats below. Also omitted from Hodgkinson’s design during construction was the glass-covered shopping hall over the plaza and the top-level enclosure over the housing access ways that was necessary to
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provide shelter and a proper cornice for the buildings.\textsuperscript{281} The absence of insulation in exterior walls, an inadequate central heating system and single-glazed windows have also caused problems with heat retention, cold bridging and condensation. The exterior was not painted ‘Crown Commissioners Cream’ as instructed, so the reinforced concrete was left exposed to the elements and subsequently began to corrode and crack. Aesthetically, the residents found the appearance too drab, so they began to paint the exterior of their own flats in various shades of white, lending the estate a ramshackle look.

Hodgkinson resigned from the project in 1969 and has since vehemently placed blame for the degradation of the estate squarely on the freeholders (Marchmont Properties) and on the leaseholders of the housing (London Borough of Camden, who managed the estate from 1970 onward), citing both their cost-cutting decisions during development and their subsequent failure to conduct even the most basic maintenance over the last 35 years as the root of the estate’s problems.\textsuperscript{282} When developers Allied London Properties (ALP), who specialise in shopping centre developments, purchased the Brunswick Centre in 1998, the estate had been marred by controversy for the past decade. ALP hired Hodgkinson, who with Stubbs Rich Architects, developed the first regeneration scheme through which Hodgkinson understandably planned to correct many of the shortcuts that had been taken during the buildings construction. After the original proposal was rejected for being too aggressive, Hodgkinson reassembled the original design team with Levitt Bernstein Associates and in September 2003, consent was granted for their £22 million regeneration scheme.

Building records and drawings can sometimes provide clues to how the original architects would have expanded the properties in later phases or can reveal where plans were changed during the construction process. In the fortunate case where the original architects can still be consulted, Susan MacDonald of the Getty Conservation Institute has said that when faced with the conservation of their building, the architects often want to improve them, to right wrongs or to introduce new architectural ideas and to let the original work evolve.\textsuperscript{283} This, understandably, can be highly contentious if the conservation professionals are seeking to conserve the structure as a monument to the certain design principles around which it was originally constructed. The designation of

\textsuperscript{282} Ibid. (p. 40).
\textsuperscript{283} Macdonald, "Modern Matters: Breaking the Barriers to Conserving Modern Heritage."
the Brunswick Centre at Grade II on 14 September 2000 was actually unwelcomed by Hodgkinson, who felt the estate was ‘on the cusp of a potentially transformative renewal’.  

The first phase of the regeneration project has been primarily cosmetic and has focused heavily on the outward appeal of the estate. The exterior was painted a cream colour as originally intended and the upmarket grocer Waitrose replaced the discount grocer Safeway in a new and much larger store on the north end of the interior shopping street. Shops were extended to the edge of the arcade to create more interior square footage and higher-end shops like French Connection, Hobbs, Starbucks and Carluccio’s moved in. The public spaces were re-landscaped and a metal sculpture by Susannah Heron was installed. In 2007, Tappin noted that the number of people shopping and sitting in the outdoor public spaces was proof that the renovation had worked, at least from a commercial point of view, but regretted that the developer preferred to bring in high street shops like Starbucks rather than a more eclectic mix of local retailers. On the same note, he also felt the upmarket Waitrose was inappropriate for the low-income tenants and retired pensioners who make up at least one-third of the residents on the site. Nevertheless, four decades after construction, the character of the estate has swung back closer to the mixed community that was originally intended.

Tappin has sat as the chair of the Tenants & Residents Association (TRA) since 2002 and during the renovation, he set up a monthly meeting schedule with all major parties

involved. The TRA has continued to deal with issues that have arisen after the completion of renovation works, but residents also use TRA to plan community events, to involve visitors with the centre, to raise awareness about issues involving the estate in the media, and to generally voice their concerns about the future of the estate. For the London Open House of 2003, residents organised an art project to address the issue of rough sleepers, drug addicts and prostitutes who were entering the estate through the underground parking and fire escapes so regularly that the caretakers were forced to move on more than 20 people per night. Tappin involved the police and was surprised to find that neither the freeholder nor Camden Borough knew who was responsible for the security of the estate. It was decided that these underused areas should be filled with sheds for resident storage and with £5,000 from the Camden Artist-in-Resident funding scheme, 19 artists were selected by Hodgkinson to enliven the spaces with artwork in time for the London Open House. Over 700 people attended the launch party and 200-300 people visited the estate over the next three days of the open house.

Despite the many improvements, many residents were frustrated by the developer’s public-centric focus, which left the broad extent of internal repairs to the housing blocks to a later phase of the project. Residents are still waiting for improvements to be made to the slope of their balconies, for windows to be replaced, for the internal walkways only seen by the residents to be painted and for the original and inefficient central boiler heating system to be upgraded. The TRA has asked for the instalment of solar panels on the flat roof, but Camden Borough has denied this request on the basis of budgetary constraints. Tappin suspects, however, that the freeholder still has plans to increase the revenue of the estate by building another storey of private flats atop the building.

The Brunswick Centre has since been subject to further commercial proposals. In July 2014, the Twentieth Century Society joined a group of residents to oppose the addition of a new restaurant, designed by Levitt Bernstein Associates, to be wedged into the main entrance portico and overtop the long-residing Renoir Cinema. The ‘Eyecatcher’ restaurant resembled the rectangular glass box designed for the Southbank Centre addition, and was equally controversial here. The Twentieth Century Society instigated a petition calling Camden Borough Council to refuse planning permission for the project. By the time the petition closed, it had only gained 736 supporters, but included within the list was the notable Richard Rogers who argued against the development and in favour of saving the portico’s sublime architectural qualities created by its scale and transparency.
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On 18 March 2015, Camden Borough Council refused planning permission for the ‘Eyecatcher’ restaurant on grounds that the scale and design would have a detrimental impact on the architectural character and appearance of the Grade II listed estate and that the proposed external lift and stairway would add unnecessary visual and physical clutter along the prominent façade.
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**Figure 2-9. Levitt Bernstein’s restaurant proposal, rejected by Camden Council in March 2015. Image: Leviit Bernstein Associates**

The high street shops will inevitably come and go, but the lively mix of coffee shops, restaurants and the long-running art house Renoir cinema have helped to rebrand the Brunswick Centre as a pleasant outing without necessitating the full gentrification of the estate into luxury flats. A balance between commercial and non-commercial space has been attained for the time being, making it a notable renovation model that supports a mixed-income, mixed-use community enjoyed by residents and outsiders alike. Patrick Hodgkinson’s utopian modern vision has, in many ways, finally become a reality, and as long as the estate retains a mix of low- and middle-income rents, we may still see a re-emergence of that eclectic, avant-garde village atmosphere that Tappin and Hodgkinson were hoping to preserve.
Figure 2-10. View across the re-landscaped inner courtyard through the portico that could have been blocked by the ‘Eyecatcher’ restaurant. Image: Levitt Bernstein Associates.

As Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 have demonstrated, the valorisation of modern movement buildings in Britain is very much tied up with statutory designation. Thematic studies have predominantly been conducted by the statutory heritage bodies with the intent to place modern movement buildings within a context so that more modern movement buildings and sites will be included on the national lists in England and Scotland. As modern movement public housing was the most controversial building type to be reviewed through a thematic study, Section 2.3.2 looked at how the listing of some of these estates has facilitated their revalorisation by professionals and the public at large. In Section 2.4, we will see how the increased number and increased size of modernist estates on the national lists in England and Scotland have led to changes in heritage management procedures and agreements.
Section 2.4 addresses the management of post-war modern movement buildings after they have been recognised as heritage, either through statutory designation or a process of revalorisation. As we have seen in the previous two sections, specialist interest in an undervalued modernist estate can lead to a greater appreciation of the buildings by its residents who had perhaps not known the architectural significance of their homes beforehand, or in the case of the Brunswick Centre, by the public at large. This greater appreciation often then leads to greater expectations in terms of care and maintenance. Recognising that many of these post-war modern movement buildings are long overdue upgrades and maintenance, or have been insensitively retrofitted in the interim, Section 2.4 analyses a number of agreements and statutes introduced by Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland to assist with the management and renovation of larger post-war complexes like commercial properties, universities and housing estates. As it is not the intention of the international heritage organisations to recommend prescriptive conservation policies, the establishment of day-to-day management policies and practices for modern movement heritage is left to the national statutory conservation bodies and more often to the local planning authorities and building owners.

In 2001, Edward Hobson declared that conservation had ‘been consolidated in the British Planning System as a fundamental strand in the treatment of urban form’, but cautioned that since the late 1990s, English Heritage has been enthusiastically working to overhaul ‘its former image of heritage protector to portray a new role promoting the economic revitalisation of historic buildings and areas’. Hobson questioned whether this shift toward a flexible, regeneration-focused conservation system on a national level might undermine the public’s trust in their conservation officers. In this section, the effects of this increased flexibility in the heritage protection system will be discussed through the working agreements and management plans that have been specifically developed to assist with the management of large post-war modernist estates. Though these heritage management agreements have relinquished some of the regulatory powers formerly held by Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland to the local authorities, the

---

agreements have provided greater clarity around what can and what cannot be changed in the associated listed buildings, which helps to better facilitate necessary repairs and upgrades by negating the need for building owners to apply for Listed Building Consent in many instances. In doing so, building owners and administrators are better informed of the particular characteristics that contribute to the building’s significance, which is especially important for modern movement buildings since these special characteristics are often not readily apparent to the untrained eye.

Since the first DOCOMOMO International conference in Eindhoven in 1990, John Allan has been warning of the difficulties in promoting the conservation of modern movement architecture to an ill-informed public:

> It is quite common for the owners of early modern buildings to be unaware of, or unconvinced by, their interest and importance as works of architecture. They are understandably more preoccupied with the value of the building as an operational amenity, and may well find that its usefulness is constrained by the same characteristics that are the basis of its cultural significance. As the Modern Movement proliferated and lost its early idealism, so also developed the process of alienation between its practitioners and the public. Those promoting a new conservation initiative in modern architecture must be careful to prevent history repeating itself.²⁸⁸

Allan argues it is fruitless to try to ‘convert ‘sinners’ by evangelical fervour’ through an art historical approach and instead advocates for an approach that incorporates the users’ current needs into the conservation plan. Just as the original proponents of modernism and functionalism used economic and social arguments to convince their clients of the merits of their motives, these arguments again almost always make more of an impact than to argue for building’s cultural significance, especially in the instance of the less-monumental modernist buildings. Marathon House and the Alexander Fleming House, two modernist post-war office buildings in Elephant and Castle, London, had both been proposed but rejected for listing in the 1990s. Both were then subsequently converted into private flats, which Allan says liberated their commercial potential, and therefore allowed them to survive long enough to permit their later revalorisation.

When Ernö Goldfinger’s Alexander Fleming House (1963, renamed Metro Central Heights in 1997) was eventually listed at Grade II on 8 July 2013, Heritage Minister Ed Vaizey defended his decision, saying ‘Goldfinger considered this to be his most

²⁸⁸ Allan, "Momo’s Second Chance: The Revaluation of Inner Urban Housing in Britain," in Modern Movement Heritage. (p. 19).
significant work. Acclaimed when it was first built, it subsequently divided opinion but has now – 25 years after first being put forward for listing – clearly passed the test of time. I am pleased now to be able to give it the recognition it deserves.²⁸⁹ *The Standard*, however, held that ‘Few normal people regard the concrete high-rise blocks… as architecturally aesthetic’ and that ‘The tendency to list eyesores such as this is as baffling as ever’.²⁹⁰ Journalist Ben Webster of *The Times* covered the story in a similar manner, sardonically titling his article, “Goldfinger’s ‘ugly’ tower block joins list of national treasures” and questioned English Heritage’s authority on such cases where there is ‘an impossibly subjective criterion so soon after its construction.’²⁹¹ While the public and media response to the listing has been mixed, Catherine Croft of the Twentieth Century Society said that the overwhelming response was surprise that Alexander Fleming House had not already been listed, and these sentiments were echoed by an article in *The Guardian*, titled ‘Goldfinger’s Alexander Fleming House finally gets Grade II listing’.

In Section 3.4, we will see that the management of modern movement buildings in the United States is rarely ever dealt with on a national level and instead the building owners or administrators are most often directly responsible for maintenance and conservation. No such management agreements exist between the federal, state or local statutory heritage bodies and the owners of any modern movement estates; however, universities are increasingly commissioning architectural firms to prepare management plans that combine a preservation and development agenda. As we will see later, it is not designation on the National Register of Historic Places that provides protection for listed buildings, but it is the access to historic tax credits that listing provides that has become one of the most practical tools used to preserve modern movement buildings in America.

### 2.4.1. CONSTRUCTIVE CONSERVATION

The 2008 publication of *Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance* coincided with an approach Historic England had already adopted called ‘Constructive Conservation’.


Rather than taking a reactionary or defensive approach to heritage conservation, Historic England has said it hopes to use a collaborative approach to ‘actively manage’ the ‘changes necessary to ensure [the] continued use and enjoyment’ of listed buildings by helping owners and users to understand the heritage value of historic buildings from the earliest phase of development onward.\textsuperscript{292} Accusations of inconsistency have led Historic England to develop a set of principles that would be ‘universally adaptable, intellectually robust, and reflect the positive approach [they] adopt in helping others to manage change to historic places.’\textsuperscript{293} Steven Bee points out that the principles are not precise, but rather they acknowledge the ‘inappropriateness of preventing change or freezing the evolution of places at a particular point in history.’\textsuperscript{294}

Conservation Principles is based on the understanding that change cannot and should not be resisted in historic properties, and it is in this view that Historic England argues that very few circumstances exist where alteration or adaptation would lead to an irreversible loss of historic significance.\textsuperscript{295} Thus, by identifying the principal heritage elements of a building, the adaptation of historic buildings can be viewed as an ‘opportunity for one period of history to add its contribution to the heritage values of a place.’\textsuperscript{296} Since the adoption of Conservation Principles in April 2008, each new listing entry must now include a statement of the building’s significance, based on the following four ‘Conservation Principles’:\textsuperscript{297}

1. **Evidential value**, giving a glimpse of how we used to live: this is of great importance for archaeological remains;

2. **Historical value**, or a building’s association with past people and events;

3. **Aesthetic value**, or its sensory and intellectual qualities;

4. **Communal value**: the meaning of a place for its users, or how it features in the collective memory

So far, Historic England as published five supporting documents in the ‘Constructive Conservation’ series: *Capital Solutions* (2004), *Shared Interest: Celebrating Investment*


\textsuperscript{294} Ibid. (p. 625).

\textsuperscript{295} Ibid. (p. 630).

\textsuperscript{296} Ibid. (p. 631).

\textsuperscript{297} Harwood, “Keeping the Past in England: The History of Post-War Listing.” (p. 681).
in the Historic Environment (2006), Constructive Conservation in Practice (2008), Valuing Places: Good Practice in Conservation Areas (2011) and Sustainable Growth for Historic Places (2013). Case studies are used to exemplify ‘best practices’ and the publications present Historic England as an up-to-date national body that is sometimes willing to accept drastic alterations, contemporary additions/alterations or even the demolition of listed buildings. Historic England’s defence of unpopular modern architecture over the past two decades has, for some, painted an image of an elitist organisation out of touch with reality, so its reorganisation on 1 April 2015 may have been an attempt to rebrand itself as a ‘market friendly’ conservation body. In the 15th edition of Town and Country Planning in the UK, John Pendlebury argues that Historic England has extended its ‘market friendliness’ a degree too far, remarking on the oddity of a national conservation organisation to state in the opening line of Capital Solutions that ‘Sometimes demolition is the best solution’. Acknowledging that different conservation approaches may be necessary for large modernist estates exhibiting both physical and social problems, Pendlebury believes that Historic England is also ‘very anxious to be positively perceived by developers and its political paymasters; to demonstrate conservation as a socially beneficial agent of change and, conversely, not as an impediment to development.’

The redevelopment of the Park Hill housing estate (Ivor Smith and Jack Lynn, 1958-61) featured in Constructive Conservation in Practice as a possible design solution for problematic post-war council estates across Britain. Though listed at Grade II* in 1997, Historic England has supported the heavy-handed ‘reinvention’ by developers Urban Splash (to whom ownership of the estate was transferred free of charge in 2004), which has consisted of stripping the buildings back to their concrete frame and kitting them out with completely new facades and interiors to appeal to private market buyers. At Park Hill, Historic England decided that material authenticity was not essential to the housing estate’s historical significance, but instead that the site’s significance was ‘in the scale and vision of the original council housing scheme, in the expressed reinforced concrete frame and the relationship of the building to the landscape in which it sits.’ The estate remains Europe’s largest listed building in the New Brutalist style, covering seventeen acres and with 985 flats. Sheffield Council’s inability to cope with years of anti-social behaviour and crime at the estate has meant that gentrification remained the only real
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option to save Park Hill from demolition. Urban Splash plans to redevelop approximately 200 flats for social housing and the remaining for market rate rentals, however, with two-bedroom flats going for well above the average local rate at £147,000 a piece in August 2015, the desired clientele is clearly defined and Owen Hatherley called their plans a front for ‘class cleansing’.  

The first phase of the redevelopment (flanks B and C) was completed in March 2015 and the 263 refurbished flats are now fully occupied. To revitalise the neighbourhood, Urban Splash has promised a ‘high street’ of sorts, with all the traditional trimmings: ‘butchers, newsagents, greengrocers, a chippy, a doctor’s and dentist’s… a Grace Owen children's nursery, …bars, pubs and cafes …a village hall and a village green, plus new workspace for businesses, artists or students, as well as dedicated secure provision for carparking.’

Reading the glowing testimonials on Urban Splash’s webpage, it’s hard to fault what they have done to reposition this ‘eyesore’ within the public opinion, but at the same time, one cannot help but be cynical of a conservation model that converts social housing into designer ‘concrete-chic’ flats while the city’s poor are likely shunted on to another poorly maintained dwelling further from the city centre. At the end of the day, an important building has been saved – at least in its most basic form, but of the four assessment criteria set by Historic England, it is clear that the estate’s communal value was sacrificed for the aesthetic value attributed to it by the conservation elite. This begs the question: for whom are we conserving modernist public housing?

### 2.4.2. COMMERCIAL HERITAGE & THE ENTERPRISE AND REGULATORY REFORM ACT OF 2013

The controversial nature of post-war commercial building designations in Britain has led to a general expectation that their listed status would not inhibit necessary alterations and upgrades. Bracken House (1959, listed Grade II* in 1987) has been completely remodelled internally as has the Smithson’s Economist Buildings in London (listed Grade II* in 1988 and refurbished in 1990). Of Bracken House, English Heritage wrote in 1996 that it is a ‘model demonstration of how listing can stimulate exciting design and new
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use’. The rebuilding of its central printing room was given mention in the 2013 update of the listing statement, which states that the architectural interest of the building has been ‘compounded by the sophistication of the later Michael Hopkins-designed phase, which demonstrates the structural exuberance of High Tech design’, and argues that change can sometimes enhance a listed building’s importance. However, DOCOMOMO US president Theo Prudon has argued that ‘the facadism at Bracken House demonstrates the potential misunderstanding of both the significance of this architecture and its preservation’. During the 1990s, English Heritage was advocating for general ‘sensitive restoration and upgrading’ of post-war buildings, citing stimulating public interest in the best of the era as its main task. David Jenkin and John Worthington supported this position through their article, ‘Making the Recent Past Fit for the Future: Change in the Commercial World’, stating that since three-quarters of Britain’s office buildings were constructed since 1900 and over 30% of these were built since 1972, a conservation scheme that supported adaptation and development was necessary. For the post-war commercial building stock, they offer only two scenarios – refurbish or rebuild. Jenkins and Worthington wrote that the IT boom of the 1980s signalled a death warrant of many post-war office buildings due to a lack of space for wiring and bulky computer systems, but as technology has progressed, this is no longer the case. Nestled below the castle in Edinburgh, an unlisted typical 1960s office block of pre-cast panel construction now houses a number of IT and start-up companies for whom the open plan layout and cheaper rents suit their needs.

On 28 January 2015, the Secretary of State for the Department for Culture, Media and Sport announced the designation of 14 post-war office buildings across England at Grade II, including the Civil Aviation Authority House (1964-68) by Seifert & Partners, the IBM Pilot Head Office (1970-71) by Foster Associates and 1 Finsbury Avenue (1982-84) by Arup Associates. The designation followed an 18-month survey by Historic England of modern and postmodern commercial buildings constructed between 1964 and 1984. Chosen from a shortlist of 23 buildings proposed by HE, these 14 were designated for their particularly special architectural or historic interest. HE Director of Designation, Roger Bowdler, explained, ‘These offices show how architecture has adapted to recent radical changes in how we work: they show how the open-plan working space for
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computer-led work came about, and how architects responded to the need for lettable, attractive spaces with ingenuity and a deep understanding of human needs.306

The designation of these buildings is a step forward in providing protection for a sector of buildings that are typically under the greatest redevelopment pressure, but to what extent is yet to be seen. Modern post-war office buildings have been listed in the past, but were readily granted Listed Building Consent for drastic alterations. Designation at Grade II now allows for the careful adaptation of aspects of the buildings that have not been considered of value in the listing statement. These new powers have been granted as part of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (ERR) Act of 2013 and with this in mind, all 14 buildings have been given detailed listing descriptions to advise on future alterations.307 Historic England has said the ERR Act is particularly pertinent with regards to office buildings where the significance may only lie, for instance, in the lobby, boardroom or façade. However, as legislation currently stands, buildings constructed less than 30 years ago are only eligible for listing if they are deemed to meet the standards of a Grade I or Grade II* listing and are under threat of demolition. Catherine Croft, Director of the Twentieth Century Society, argues that this criterion should be waived going forward given the susceptibility of office buildings to change or demolition.308

For the office building at 30 Cannon Street (formerly Credit Lyonnais, 1974-77), by Whinney, Son & Austen Hall, the listing outlines all significant aspects of the building, most notably that 30 Cannon Street was the first building to be fully clad in glass-fibre reinforced concrete (GRC). When improperly fabricated, installed or protected, this material is prone to cracking, and for this reason, it is thought that few other GRC clad buildings of the same age still exist in Britain. The original design calculations carried out by structural engineers Ove Arup in 1970 predicted a 25-year lifespan for the original GRC panels with the knowledge that natural exposure to the weather would eventually result in embrittlement. Five-year and ten-year weathering tests completed in the 1970s revealed that the ultimate strength of fully aged GRC would decrease by approximately 40% and the strain capacity would decrease by 20% through natural exposure. However, the tests also revealed that by protecting the material from damp conditions, these changes in composite behaviour could be drastically reduced.\(^\text{309}\) After similar GRC

\(^{309}\) Chris Peaston and Bob Cather, "Properties and Service Life Predictions of Cem-Fil Grc Cladding after More Than 25 Years of Service" (paper presented at the 13th Congress of the International Glassfibre
cladding began to fail in the late 1970s, Arup undertook an internal review of the panels used at 30 Cannon Street, and subsequently treated the panels with a clear water-repellent sealant to delay natural weathering and facilitate exterior cleaning. To maintain its effectiveness, it was recommended the sealant be reapplied every seven years, though it is not known if this recommendation was followed. In 2002, 28 years after construction, Arup Materials Consulting removed several sections of cladding and subjected the panels to a four-point bending test. They concluded that the water-repellent sealant had indeed protected the strength and ductility of the panels and any further significant loss in ductility was thought to be unlikely. Thus, because panels on 30 Cannon Street were found to be preforming better than expected, it has been made clear in the listing statement that the material itself is significant in this case and must not be altered or removed without Listed Building Consent.

Concluding all future listing statements, Historic England now also makes clear what is not considered of historical or architectural importance in each listed building. At 30 Cannon Street, it has been concluded that:

Pursuant to s.1 (5A) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (‘the Act’) it is declared that the ground floor layout and finishes including reception area; upper office floors; stairs; lifts; and basement including plant and strong rooms are not of special interest. Also not of special interest are the infilling of the former Bread Street entrance and the replacement glass canopies to the Cannon Street and Queen Victoria Street entrances.

The ERR Act of 2013 is a deregulatory act intended to make heritage protection more effective and more efficient. Some changes made to the existing heritage protection system include:

1. Heritage partnership agreements may be entered into between local authorities and owners setting out works for which listed building consent is granted (excluding demolition).
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2. Local or national Listed Building Consent Orders may be set up by a Local Planning Authority or the Secretary of State, respectively, under which works of the type described in the Order (excluding demolition) will not need listed building consent.

3. A certificate of lawful proposed works is introduced (valid for 10 years) that categorically confirms that the works described in it do not affect the character of the listed building and do not therefore require consent.

4. The extent of protection of a listed building can be better defined by excluding attached buildings and structures and those within the curtilage of the principal listed building from protection, and by stating definitively that some feature of a listed building is not of special architectural or historic interest.

5. A certificate of immunity from listing may be applied for at any time.

6. Conservation area consent has been replaced with planning permission.

The ultimate aim of these reforms is to reduce the occasions where listed building consent is required by identifying works that can be carried out under a Heritage Partnership Agreement (HPA) specific to each building or conservation area. In regards to commercial buildings, which regularly go through cycles of renewal and redevelopment as they are leased and sold, Historic England argues that protection and the need for change need not be mutually exclusive, since ‘a key characteristic of the late 20th-century office is an in-built flexibility which facilitates new functions and technologies. An office building can therefore be listed for its flexibility, something with which the listed building consent system was not designed to deal.’ Historic England’s 2015 publication *Introduction to Heritage Assets: the Late 20th-Century Commercial Office* highlights instances where HPAs can alleviate the need for individual listed building consent applications in commercial buildings. As part of a programme to upgrade and modernise the designation base, Historic England examined and revised the list entries for 28 previously listed post-war commercial buildings to better indicate areas of greater and lesser significance, and to document changes made to the buildings since they were listed. These revisions have led to the drafting of a HPA for the Lloyd’s Building (Grade I listed in December 2011), which will serve as a working model for similar commercial buildings under risk of unsympathetic redevelopment measures.
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2.4.3. MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS FOR LARGE MODERN MOVEMENT ESTATES

As part of the ERR Act, Listed Building Management Agreements have been devised to support the partial devolution of heritage protection from Historic England into the remit of the local authorities. The first listed building management guidelines were developed in 1992 for the Willis Faber & Dumas Company office building in Ipswich (Foster Associates, 1973-75) after it was spot listed at Grade I in 1991, making it the youngest structure in Britain to be statutorily protected at the time and only the second to be listed less than 30 years after its construction (the other being The Economist Building (1964) by Peter & Allison Smithson). The company was initially strongly adverse to the listing with fears that it would inhibit their need to expand as the company grew, so a formal agreement between the company, the local authority and English Heritage was drawn up to clarify which alterations would or would not require Listed Building Consent. Along with a set of guidelines, detailed drawings were made to reveal the alterations that had already been made since the building’s completion, and to set a benchmark against which future alterations could be assessed. The guidelines were adopted in February 1992 and are thought to be the first set of conservation management guidelines set up for a twentieth century building. A similar and more extensive set of Listed Building Management Guidelines was established for the Barbican housing estate and arts centre in 2005 to guide the refurbishment of community buildings within the estate and to help residents know when to seek advice or approval for internal upgrades to their flats (see Section 2.4.3.3). Listed building management guidelines have and continue to be used primarily for post-war buildings or for buildings under constant pressure for change.

The 2008 Conservation Principles document also introduced the opportunity for owners of large estates to apply for Heritage Partnership Agreements, through which, after a management plan had been developed, could free estate owners from requirements to apply for numerous consents for change. Social housing was one of the most intellectual

318 A Heritage Partnership Agreement would most often be an agreement between the local planning authority and the owner, but other parties could be the Secretary of State, English Heritage, other local planning authorities, or other persons involved in the management of the estate. (Harwood, Historic Environment Law, (p. 278).
and inspired areas of the modern architectural movement and as Keith Knight, historic buildings architect for English Heritage, explained in 2001, ‘For the first time in the history of architecture the housing of the ordinary man and woman became the term from which it was through a great architecture could be generated.’ England’s best examples have largely been designated as representations of a historical period, however, the designation of some housing estates like the Alton Estate in Roehampton or Byker Wall in Newcastle has not been popular with local councils, who found that the statutory designation impeded their ability to make necessary repairs and upgrades. When these estates were listed in the late 1990s and early 2000s, English Heritage was reacting to drastic alterations and mass demolitions, and did not yet have an economic plan for their future.

In England and Scotland, efforts have been made over the course of the last decade to relieve the associated statutory heritage bodies of work relating to the management of listed buildings and estates. The expansive nature of many post-war building typologies – university campuses, business complexes, housing estates, hospitals and so forth – has necessitated management tools further than what a listing statement can provide. In this section, three different management tools are discussed through their application to large post-war modern movement estates. The Heritage Partnership Agreement in England was established based on the conservation plan developed for Denys Lasdun’s buildings at the University of East Anglia. Likewise, the collaborative design process used at the University of Edinburgh, which involved Historic Scotland, the Edinburgh City Council, the architects and the University Estates Department, established the foundations of what would become the Joint Working Agreement. Finally, the Barbican Listed Building Management Plan served as an early and influential solution to the management of highly significant, but expansive modern movement estates. Subsequent management plans have been written for other modern movement estates including the Basil Spence Canongate Housing and University of Stirling Footpath building design by RMJM, to name a few.

2.4.3.1. HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS & THE UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA

The University of East Anglia (UEA) was one of seven new universities constructed in England during the post-war period of expansion under the Welfare State. Architect

Denys Lasdun was appointed in 1962 to design the masterplan and campus buildings of UEA and by 1966, the first of his buildings was in use. Lasdun left the project ‘when initial euphoria was replaced by funding cuts and architectural compromises’, at which point local architectural practices took over and built a more miserly version of Lasdun’s plan.\(^{320}\) When public funding dried up in 1972, Lasdun’s plan was approximately one-third complete, but despite the compromises, the University of East Anglia is generally regarded as the best of the seven new universities.

In late 2003, the best Lasdun buildings at UEA were listed at the recommendation of English Heritage – the teaching wall, library and the raised walkways were all listed at Grade II, and the residential ‘Ziggurats’ were listed at Grade II*. University administrators understandably feared the designations would necessitate applications for Listed Building Consent for any minor works, meaning delayed projects, greater expenses and further administrative burdens. To minimise such disruptions, UEA commissioned the Cambridge Architectural Research Ltd to research and design a Conservation Development Strategy (CDS) in early 2004.

The Conservation Development Strategy at UEA became one of 24 Heritage Partnership Agreement (HPA) pilot schemes undertaken by English Heritage in 2004-2005 to test the effectiveness of the newly proposed non-statutory agreement that ‘sets out an understanding of the significance of the heritage asset or assets and in particular what is not of special interest in listed buildings (i.e. those parts that can be altered without detriment to their significance).’\(^{321}\) HPAs are designed to streamline the process of accessing applications for Listed Building Consent by reducing the number of occasions where consent is required, thus saving time and money for the building owners, the local planning authority and English Heritage. Only nine of the pilots were completed because it became apparent to English Heritage early on that many of the pilots were either not going to work or were not going to save the organisations any money or time.\(^{322}\) The HPA pilot programme was reviewed in the April 2008 Draft Heritage Protection Bill published by the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), which was designed ‘to unify heritage protection regimes, allow greater public involvement in decisions, and
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place heritage at the heart of the planning system'. \(^{323}\) UEA told reviewers that the HPA pilot programme led to an enormous saving in resources, time and cost for all three stakeholders—UEA, the local planning authority and English Heritage’ and that though it cost £70,000 to set up, it had already at that time saved the University approximated £250,000 in statutory and professional fees on small-scale or repetitive works that were compliant with the HPA, and therefore did not require listed building consent. \(^{324}\)

HPA agreements were found to be beneficial to a number of other organisations that took part in the pilot programme, including Rochester Cathedral, London Underground and British Waterways. However, as UEA pointed out, HPAs required a substantial start-up investment and therefore, English Heritage concluded that HPAs are best suited for large listed multi-building estates with a single owner. Since a true estimate of the financial savings of an HPA cannot be accurately predicted from such a small number of pilot studies, the usefulness of HPAs is not yet known and they may therefore only be enacted with agreement from the local planning authority. An Impact Assessment of the programme found that of the 500,000 listed building sites in England, only 250 had made more than six or more applications for listed building consent in the past three years, so the number of HPA eligible estates is rather small in reality. \(^{325}\)

In August 2012, English Heritage responded to the DCMS consultation with Improving Listed Building Consent, in which they agreed that a significant amount of applications for Listed Building Consent are made for works that would not harm the valued character of the listed building, and that these applications are ‘likely to be made out of caution given the criminal sanction for failing to apply for consent when it is needed.’ \(^{326}\)

However, English Heritage voiced strong reservations about handing over the authority to judge the impact of alterations to local councils that may not have any heritage experts in their planning sector, and strongly urged the Secretary of State to consider a system of consultation with local amenity groups, English Heritage and the appropriate National

\(^{323}\) Ibid. (p. 3).
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Amenity Societies.  

English Heritage also voiced concern over the cumulative effect of small, justified alterations, stating:

> The proposal suggests the ‘deemed consent’ system could be limited to applications where levels of harm are ‘low’ or justified in the interests of keeping the building in its optimum viable use but it is difficult to imagine how ‘low’ harm could be clearly defined and consistently applied. In any event, successive poor decisions of low impact could have a serious detrimental impact overall.

English Heritage did concede that the consultation procedure and the information requirements should be proportional to the level of the listed building, yet they fear that the removal of consultation altogether is not worth the monetary savings given the potential threat to listed buildings. English Heritage did enthusiastically support the development of Heritage Partnership Agreements (or class consents) if the powers and boundaries were fully and explicitly defined, and listed these requirements to ensure the safeguarding of listed buildings:

1. They can permit alterations and additions only (not demolition).
2. They are subject to consultation as if they were a listed building consent application.
3. The Secretary of State has a power of veto, so as to protect the national interest in the same way as applies to listed building consent.
4. They are subject to a maximum review period at the end of which a full consultation will need to take place again before re-adoption, so as to ensure that the scope of works consented is still benign or justified.
5. The statutory duty to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving the building (s16 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990) applies to consideration of local class consents.
6. The policies within the NPPF apply to class consents as they do to individual listed building consents.
7. Both the local authority and the Secretary of State can revoke the consent at any time, subject to compensation being payable if it is done immediately, but no compensation if notice is given before the revocation (see procedure for article 4 directions under the General Permitted Development Order).
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327 Through the Town and Country Planning Act of 1968, the Government directed that any applications for the partial or complete demolition of listed properties in England and Wales should be notified to the appropriate amenity societies for comment.
328 English Heritage Response to the Dcms Consultation Improving Listed Building Consent (p. 1).
329 Ibid. (p. 2).
330 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) replaced the 2010 Planning Policy Statement (PPS) and while English Heritage said it maintained protection levels for the historic environment, the greater focus on sustainable development raised concerns with many.
Section 23 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 stipulates that a local planning authority may revoke or modify any Listed Building Consent granted on an application before works are completed. However, Section 24 stipulates that an order by the local planning authority may not go forward until the Secretary of State confirms it. Now, after the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Heritage Planning Agreement) Regulations 2014 came into force on 6 April 2014 for England, any local planning authority can apply for an HPA. However, once an HPA is established, local planning authorities will still be required to consult the English Heritage Commission on certain occasions, including:

1. Any building of special architectural or historic interest which, when last notified to the authority, was classified as a Grade I or II* listed building; or
2. Any listed building owned by the local authority.  

In either of these cases, the local planning authority must send all plans and documents detailing the proposed works and a statement of reasons to the Commission, in addition to staging a public consultation period of no less than 28 days. These documents must also be made available to the local public for review during this time on the local authority’s website and in a location near the proposed works, and extracts from the HPA that pertain to that particular project must be included.

Though Heritage Partnership Agreements are not limited to large estates like the University of East Anglia, they are designed to aid in the understanding of the heritage value in substantial assets or groups of assets such as historic landscapes, battlefields or gardens. By reaching an agreed understanding of heritage value, it is hoped that HPAs will ensure suitable maintenance measures, better management, less confusion and stronger applications when consent is needed. In Scotland, Joint Working Agreements function in a similar fashion, allowing Historic Environment Scotland to work with large estate owners like the University of Edinburgh on their renovation programmes.

2.4.3.2. **JOINT WORKING AGREEMENTS & THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH**

In Scotland, the national heritage listing levels begin with buildings of local significance. The 32 local councils in Scotland have control over these Category C listings, which often includes the vernacular and modest buildings that may not warrant a higher listing status, but create a sense of place and are thus significant to the local context. As of 1987, all councils have been able to make decisions regarding Category C listed buildings without referring applications for listed building consent to the Scottish Ministers. Further to this agreement, since 2009 the larger councils – Glasgow, Edinburgh, Perth, Aberdeen – now have what are called ‘Joint Working Agreements’ with Historic Environment Scotland, wherein they are allowed to make decisions on Category B listed buildings as well. By working in partnership with the local planning authorities, the agreement was designed to allow HES to reallocate resources to focus on more significant cases, other pre-application discussions, and the publication of best practice guidance notes.³³² The agreement was designed to give the local councils autonomy in the right measure, however, in some cases, Deborah Mays (former Head of Listing and Programme Manager with Historic Scotland) has said that the relegation of building management has proven inadequate to protect the special character of some buildings, as their management depends on the resources and the application of these resources on the part of the local planning authority.³³³ In these instances, HES retains the right revoke their privileges.

Part of the agreement is the removal of duty to notify HES in planning decisions where the planning is straightforward and does not include major changes or demolition. This move is part of the Government’s continued pursuance of sustainable economic development through the streamlining of the government planning processes. By handing over some of the responsibility to the local councils, planning decisions are made more swiftly, which is intended to save money and resources. With regard to development in the areas directly surrounding Category A listed buildings, the General Development Procedure Order of 1992 has since required local authorities to refer the cases that may affect the character of the setting to the Scottish Ministers. This motion has since been incorporated within the Town and Country Planning (Development Management

Procedures) (Scotland) Regulations of 2008. The protection provided through this Order has led a number of building owners to request that their Category B listed properties be upgraded to Category A in the instance of proposed development in the vicinity.\textsuperscript{334}

The Planning (Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent Procedure) (Scotland) Regulations 2015, which came into force on 1 October 2015, have clearly stated that local planning authorities still have a duty to notify HES of applications for listed building consent involving Category A and B listed buildings, demolitions or listed buildings within the local authority’s possession (see Figure 2-12). These stipulations apply also to those local authorities with which HES has already set up Joint Working Agreements. However, where there is sufficient expertise and resources in the local planning authority, an agreement can be struck wherein HES will not provide detailed individualised advice for certain types of applications pertaining to certain categories of listed buildings.\textsuperscript{335}

\textsuperscript{334} Ibid., (p. 16).
\textsuperscript{335} Historic Environment Circular 1. (p. 26).
Figure 2-12. The process by which an application for listed building consent/conservation area consent is handled. Source: Historic Environment Circular 1.

HES Head of Listing Dawn McDowell has said the Joint Working Agreements have worked to great success except in the case of post-war buildings where local authorities
may not know the value or significance of what they have.\textsuperscript{336} To address this, HES has been proactively working to disseminate information through publications and lectures and as a result, McDowell said an increasing number of local conservation officers have asked her to assess the significance of post-war buildings within their district for potential listing. Local authorities are expected to develop local development plans and local strategic plans. By consulting with HES on any buildings of question during the early stages of these plans, planning authorities can ensure that their plans reflect national policies regarding the historic environment and can reduce the potential of objections from HES in later stages.\textsuperscript{337}

Knowing they potentially had some significant buildings in their possession and to avoid costly disruptions, the University of Edinburgh asked HES in 2002 to assist with its refurbishment plans for the modernist post-war buildings around George Square, prior to the establishment of a Joint Working Agreement with Edinburgh City Council. While a formal conservation statement has not been written for the University of Edinburgh, the post-war buildings around George Square were assessed by HES and were listed at Category A as a group in January 2006, with the Main Library (Sir Basil Spence, 1967) and David Hume Tower (Robert Matthew, 1963) individually designated at Category A.\textsuperscript{338} The Adam Ferguson Building and its matching partner the William Robertson Building were both individually listed at Category B, but are considered significant contributors to the grouping and environment.

The refurbishment of the Adam Ferguson Building by LDN Architects LLP was guided by the listing statements and by HES Senior Inspector of Historic Buildings, Steven Robb, who was involved to ensure that the most appropriate solutions were found for the structural and functional shortcomings of the building. Project architect Dermot Patterson has said that the building’s refurbishment even proved controversial because many local citizens still regret the day these buildings were built.\textsuperscript{339} The University’s redevelopment of George Square from 1949 onward, which required the demolition of traditional Georgian houses on three sides of Edinburgh’s earliest comprehensively planned neo-

\textsuperscript{336} Engel, "Interview with Dawn McDowell, Head of Listing at Historic Scotland."
\textsuperscript{337} A Joint Working Agreement between Historic Scotland and Planning Authorities in Relation to Statutory Casework and Consultation. (p. 9).
\textsuperscript{338} The University of Edinburgh Arts Faculty Buildings include: David Hume Tower (Block A) and Lecture Theatre (Block B), William Robertson Building (Block C), Adam Ferguson Building (Block D), George Square Lecture Theatre (Block E), Main Library and the stepped podium. Architects: Block A, B, D, C and E: Robert Matthew, Johnson-Marshall and Partners; Main Library: Sir Basil Spence, Glover and Ferguson. Refurbishment: 2006 – present; A-listed as a group on 17 January 2006.
\textsuperscript{339} Caroline Engel, Interview with Dermot Patterson of Ldn Architects (Edinburgh: 2013).
classical square, directly led to the formation of The Georgian Society in Edinburgh and the birth of the conservation movement across Scotland. Because of the virulent debate that surrounded the construction of these buildings, their significance as part of the Edinburgh cityscape is not only judged based upon their own merits, but also on those of the buildings that came before them. This enduring regret and the general unpopularity of the buildings has perhaps influenced the conservation programme for the George Square modern buildings too heavily, leading to some rather drastic compromises and changes, however the refurbishment project does represent HES’s view that the historic environment is dynamic and that ‘conservation relies on carefully managed change based on an understanding of cultural significance’.

The overall aim of the refurbishment was to improve the energy efficiency and services of the Adam Ferguson Building while being careful not to compromise the historic value of the architectural design. When these buildings were constructed, energy was cheap but materials were expensive, so cavity wall construction gained popularity because it provided thickness and stability at a fraction of the cost to build a solid wall of the same thickness. Though rainwater could permeate through the outer wall, cheap heating kept the dampness from permeating the second inner wall. As the cost of fuel increased, people have naturally used heating more sparingly and damp related problems within many post-war structures began. McDowell advises that conservation should be driven by the performance of materials and feels that certain design elements of modernist buildings, such as how it looks or how it was built, allow them to be more receptive to the introduction of new uses and upgrades. She denies claims that HES allows post-war architectural heritage to be altered more than earlier listed buildings, but argued instead that the special interest of each building must be determined regardless of the age and that these special interests will lead to individualised conservation plans.

Improving heat retention and the indoor quality of the building were the main concerns of the University of Edinburgh Estate Department and the building’s users. Upon inspection, very little insulation was found in the exterior walls and the timber-framed windows were badly weathered and rotted beyond repair. It was decided by HES and LDN Architects that the most suitable option to both reduce cold bridging and preserve historic character was to replace the windows in-kind with new double-glazed, timber-framed windows.

---

341 A Joint Working Agreement between Historic Scotland and Planning Authorities in Relation to Statutory Casework and Consultation. (p. 5).
342 Engel, "Interview with Dawn Mcdowell, Head of Listing at Historic Scotland."
The rhythm of the window pattern was deemed more significant than the windows themselves, so this was carefully recreated (Figure 2-17).³⁴³

Greater liberties were taken with the interior of the Adam Ferguson Building, even though interiors can be protected with designation in the UK. The plan had originally been laid out with a circulatory movement pattern, with services clustered at the centre and offices at the exterior. This layout let very little natural light pass beyond the rooms bordering the exterior, so planning permission was granted to extend the building upward by one floor and to open up the core of the building with a light well, which both reduced the reliance on artificial lighting and improved user satisfaction with the building (Figure 2-15). The building was also further opened up and reoriented toward George Square with the installation of a new entrance and new ground floor glazing where there had originally only been small clerestory windows (Figure 2-17). HES permitted the extensive gutting of the interior on grounds that the finishes and furnishings were deemed of lower quality than those found in the individually Category A listed David Hume Tower and Main Library.³⁴⁴

³⁴³ In a similar project, the Category A-listed headquarters for the Lanarkshire County Council in Hamilton was completely reglazed with double glazed windows and re clad with a new curtain wall. Ranald Mackinnes was the Historic Scotland specialist in charge of that project, and though the alterations were extensive, it was felt that the improved performance of the building was more important, and that the alterations did not change the building enough to delist it or even downgrade its listing.

Figure 2.15. Initial natural daylight and ventilation environmental strategy proposal.
Source: LDN Architects.

Extension plans to the south of the building were legitimised by a 1958 sketch by the original architect Robert Matthew, and as it turned out, construction uncovered an unfinished lower level passageway that would have connected the two buildings. An earlier proposal by LDN Architects for a long, low 2-storey extension was rejected for a 3-storey building with a smaller footprint, and though the latter hides more of the façade of the Adam Ferguson Building from a street level viewpoint, HES felt that the lower building obscured the Acropolis-like ‘plinth’ upon which the university buildings were ceremoniously raised. Through numerous review meetings with the Edinburgh City Council, LDN and HES, an extension was agreed upon that satisfied HES’s request for appropriateness in scale and form. Earlier renderings by LDN Architects depicted the glass box extension with timber fins matching the timber frames of the main building, which could have been a key feature to tie the new extension back to the original building in a refined yet contemporary way, however matte grey metal fins used in the end.
Figure 2-16. Expansion plans to the south of the Adam Ferguson Building were guided and legitimised by a 1958 archive drawing by the original architect Robert Matthew that illustrates a small indeterminate (unbuilt) square building in that location. Source: RMJM Archives (accessed by LDN Architects).

Figure 2-17 and Figure 2-18. (left) The refurbished Adam Ferguson Building facing George Square with replicated window pattern, new ground floor windows and rooftop extension; (right) southern extensions in relation to the Adam Ferguson Building and David Hume Tower. Images: Caroline Engel (2014).

Though the George Square refurbishment project began before a Joint Working Agreement had been established between HES and Edinburgh City Council, it reflects and perhaps encouraged the early-engagement conservation model HES has been working to cultivate with large organisations and estate owners throughout Scotland, as discussed in Section 2.2.2.2. By empowering local planning authorities to make decisions
and provide advice on listed buildings within their vicinity, Joint Working Agreements are democratising conservation and moving it away from its elitist foundations. Though each local authority must still consult a heritage specialist and work in accordance with national heritage legislations and policies, one must remember that many of these specialists became involved with the conservation movement in reaction to the modern movement, so it is ever more important that the significance of modern movement heritage is communicated to the planning professionals and the wider public to ensure they are judged fairly.

2.4.3.3. **THE BARBICAN LISTED BUILDING MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES**

![Image of the Barbican](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

*Figure 2-19. An artist’s impression of the Barbican completed (Derek Steward Productions Unlimited). Source: Barbican, 1971.*

At the same time the Heritage Partnership Agreement pilot studies were being conducted at UEA and elsewhere, a management plan was being drawn up by English Heritage and Avanti Architects for the Barbican Housing Estate and Arts Complex after it had been designated in September 2001. The vast size and brutalist style of the estate necessitated a set of guidelines that recognised the estate’s heritage assets and provided a system to
manage necessary upgrades. The development and use of this management plan is outlined in this section with reference to the refurbishment of Cromwell Tower, the Barbican Arts Centre and the new cinema complex.

The Barbican Estate is a highly unique development covering 37.5 acres (15.2 hectares) in the Cripplegate area of the City of London, covering a swath a ground that was largely cleared by German bombing raids over the summer and winter of 1940. After the war, the City of London became an ‘urban thrombosis’ of business by day and an eerily vacant ‘City of cats and caretakers’ by night. At this time, only 48 people were recorded living in Cripplegate, whereas a century before, there had been 14,000 inhabitants at roughly 350 people per acre. In 1955, the City of London Corporation commissioned architects Peter Chamberlin and his partners Geoffrey Powell and Christof Bon (architects of the adjacent Golden Lane Estate) to prepare a preliminary report for a housing scheme within the adjacent area known as the Barbican. The 1947 Holden-Holford Plan guided post-war redevelopment in London with designs to create a traffic-free city by redirecting much of the traffic to an outer ring road and by elevating pedestrian traffic to the first floor level. The Barbican Estate was planned to coincide with the subsequent Martin-Mealand Plan, which concentrated on the bomb-devastated area north of St Paul’s Cathedral, but was never fully realised. Unlike many of the less successful post-war housing estates planned during that time, it was important to Chamberlin Powell and Bon that the Barbican cultivated a individualised character. To develop a sense of place and to keep the estate from feeling like a vast dormitory, the residential blocks were fitted with permanent concrete plant boxes, reflecting the original intent of the architects to create a post-war garden city. Despite the high overall density of 570 people per hectare planned for the estate, 9.5 of the 15.2 hectares was given over to open space, of which, 3.25 hectares were ornamented with landscaped gardens, a lake and a conservatory for resident use.

At the time of construction, the tower blocks were the tallest in Europe, but the site also paid tribute to the history of the area through the conservation of the church of St Giles and sections of the Roman Wall, which were made features in the landscaping. The City of London School for Girls was modelled after the church in scale and material to blend what little remained of the old with the new. The complex also hosted a hostel with 200
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346 Ibid. (p. 7).
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single rooms for young working people\textsuperscript{348}, a school of music and drama, underground parking for 2500 vehicles and a petrol station, pedestrian walks, a canal, and a full-fledged arts centre complete with a concert hall, a main theatre, a studio theatre, an art gallery, a library, restaurants, and office space.

\textbf{Figure 2-20. Barbican Site Key. Source: Barbican, 1971.}

The Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) listed the Barbican Estate (1955-82) at Grade II on 5 September 2001, four years after the neighbouring Golden Lane Estate (1953-57, also designed by Chamberlin Powell and Bon) was listed. The Barbican Estate is listed in its entirety, safeguarding both internal and external spaces. Published in 2005, the Barbican Listed Building Management Guidelines (BLBMG) – volume I\textsuperscript{349} and volume II\textsuperscript{350} – were developed to clarify which elements of the design are considered to be of special architectural or historic interest to a greater degree of detail than the listing description could cover. Section 7 of the 1990 Listed Building and Conservation Area Act requires that Listed Building Consent must be granted for all alterations that would

\textsuperscript{348} The construction and furnishing of the youth hostel was fully funded by the Common Council, who then handed it over to the Board of Management representing the YMCA, the City Parochial Foundation and the Corporation, from which time it was to be run as a self-supporting independent unit from the Barbican estate. (Barbican, p 29.)


\textsuperscript{350} Architects, Barbican: Listed Building Management Guidelines.
affect the character of the listed building, but what this may include was relatively vague for the owners and occupiers of the estate. Thus, the Listed Building Management Guidelines also intended to set best practice standards for maintenance works undertaken by the City of London Corporation and to provide clear guidance on the implementation of change throughout the estate.

The City of London Corporation acts as the freeholder and landlord of the Barbican Estate and any alterations undertaken by leaseholders must first receive consent from the Corporation through the Barbican Estate Office. As noted in the Management Guidelines, Listed Building Consent does not automatically guarantee Landlord Consent. As the heritage legislation prohibits local planning authorities from determining Listed Building Consent on its own buildings, HES must advise on all applications submitted by the City of London Corporation. HES would usually only comment on applications where the proposed alterations would significantly impact the character of the estate, so the City of London Corporation’s Department of the Built Environment, under the advice of HES, has been given permission to handle individual household applications from residents. Officers of the Department can also give pre-application advice to occupiers, prospective buyers or building managers.

Although many of the flats within the Barbican Estate are let on long lease tenancy agreements and are essentially privately owned, the interiors are also listed as part of the Grade II designation and any alterations to the interiors therefore require consent from the Barbican Estates Office. Volume II of the BLBMG states that the interior layouts and fittings of the flats are ‘also an intrinsic part of the original Barbican vision of urban living’ and a suggestion was made to designate a small number of heritage flats that retained the original features, however this was never done, probably due to the estate’s meteoric rise in popularity and value after its designation. In September 2008, the City of London released a guidance booklet for long leaseholders and their contractors, which outlines the general approval process, timeline, and guidelines for conducting the works and places responsibility on the tenant to secure the proper approvals and consents before any proposed alterations begin. While the City of London says it does not ‘police’ the tenants, the document warns residents that if they proceed with alterations without first securing the landlord’s approval and other necessary consents, they may find it hard to

sell their flats down the line as a certificate of alteration approval is required with any sale.

To ease the confusion over which type of alterations require Listed Building Consent, volume II of the BLBMG supplies a colour-coded traffic light system of typical alteration requests, with permissible alterations listed in green, those needing further assessment in amber, and those needing Listed Building Consent listed in red. Alterations that will clearly adversely impact the special character of the estate are listed in black and residents are warned they are likely to be refused permission. The traffic light advisory system is subdivided into external elements, common areas, flat interiors and private balconies, with additional sections providing best practice advice and a proposed conservation plan for heritage flats. For each category, the document includes typical alterations and guidance notes to accompany all alteration examples. For instance, the BLBMG document advises that the replacement of the kitchen cabinets would not require listed building consent unless the works require alterations to the room shape, size or location. Any kitchen alterations would however require the landlord’s approval from the Barbican Estates Office. For those looking to reinstate original features, a salvage store has been started by a group of volunteer residents who take in and catalogue discarded fittings from light switches to complete cabinet units. All items are provided free of charge to long leaseholders to encourage the retention or reinstallation of original features designed specifically and solely for the Barbican Estate.

The Barbican Listed Building Management Guidelines are scheduled for review in 2017, and further reviews will continue at 5-year intervals. This is done to ensure that the guidelines remain relevant and effective, and to identify and address any issues that have arisen from the use of the document or from the application and granting of Listed Building Consent. The Department of the Built Environment will carry out the ongoing monitoring of the document and for each review, all original parties involved in the document’s development will be reconvened.

**RESTORATION AND REFURBISHMENT WORKS**

All of the works to communal areas of the Barbican Housing Estate and Arts Centre detailed in this section would have required Listed Building Consent and demonstrate the extent to which the complex has been altered despite its listed status. All in all, the works have rectified some of the estate’s navigational faults due to its design being based on the
otherwise unrealised Martin-Mealand Plan, however, some would argue that English Heritage was too eager at the time to promote commercial development and allowed alterations that would not have been allowed in a more historic Grade II listed building. Yet, the 2006-10 refurbishment of Cromwell Tower has revealed a preference on the part of the tenants to return the common areas to their original condition by selecting an architectural firm that reinstated the original colour schemes in the common areas and designed a new reception desk based on Chamberlin Powell and Bon’s original designs.

In 2006, architects Allford Hall Monaghan Morris (AHMM) completed a £12.6 million renovation of the Barbican Arts Centre. The main objective of the work was to clarify access points from the street and circulation routes within the venue. A concerted effort was made to differentiate the new from the old and to take influence from the original architecture and materials. In the process, AHMM worked with lighting, graphic and furniture designers to ‘reinforce the essential qualities of the original building’ by

Figure 2.21. The Barbican Arts Centre in cross-section, showing the theatre for the Royal Shakespeare Company and the conservatory surrounding the fly tower - the only portion of the Arts Centre not located underground. The conservatory also links to the residential accommodation in Frobisher Crescent (Block V). The complexity of circulation routes throughout the estate is acutely evident in this drawing. Source: Barbican, 1971.
stripping away unnecessary and unsuitable accretions from years past.\textsuperscript{352} For their work, AHMM received the 2007 RIBA Award for Architecture and the 2007 Design Week Wayfinding & Environmental Graphics Award.

The Barbican Arts Centre was designed as the focal point of the whole residential complex and was therefore tailored to the particular requirements of the Guildhall School, the Royal Shakespeare Company, the London Symphony Orchestra and the public library for music and fine arts.\textsuperscript{353} The principal spaces for these clients were laid out along a connecting ‘spine’ of concourses and the main level concourse was designed to be accessed from within the estate on the elevated pedestrian ‘ground level’ corresponding to the Martin-Mealand Plan. All visitors arriving from outside the estate were expected to arrive by car, so the underground car park was the only on-street entrance to the Arts Centre. Planners believed that the great majority of people arriving by foot would be from the estate or would be walking along the elevated pedestrian podium of the Martin-Mealand Plan that was to link all the City of London, and so, the entrance to the library, housing and everything else within the Barbican Estate was located up at the podium level.

As the original cross-section drawing shows (Figure 2-21), the arts complex is a very complicated structure and aside from the fly tower, the whole of the Arts Centre was constructed underground. With its six main venues spread over seven levels, way-finding issues extended to the interior, so the project brief also called for the detailing of a more easily navigable route through the Arts Centre. AHMM worked with lighting designers, Minds Eye 3D Lighting Design, and graphic designers, Cartlidge Levene & Morag Myerscough/Studio Myerscough, to firstly improve the legibility of the space, but equally to create innovative signage and an ambiance suitable for one of the world’s leading arts institutions and for the architecture itself. The bold colour scheme for signage and lighting was based on the original colours used in the predominant venues, and coloured lighting was used both to highlight the concrete forms and to subliminally light the path to each venue. New signage and architectural forms were designed for the entrances, information points and interval bars, but the signage was kept to a bare minimum by using variations in text sizes, giant arrows and super-graphics (Figure 2-22).

\textsuperscript{353} Barbican. (p. 24).
In response to the restraints implied by the Grade II listing status, project architects AHMM said they ‘were not disposed to radically changing it, rather to work with it, recognising and celebrating the building’s best qualities while dealing head-on with its deficiencies’. 354 To clarify the Art Centre’s internal circulation routes, AHMM designed a ‘single, wide, unambiguous and welcoming route [to take] visitors from the de facto main street-level entrance on Silk Street right across the centre to its other most-used entrance off the Lakeside Terrace’ (Figure 2-21). 355 The new internal bridge was deliberately overscaled to ‘sit within Chamberlin Powell and Bon’s robust spaces with confidence and [to] read as a necessary part of the architecture’. 356

Preceding this project, the Barbican Arts Gallery was renovated by AHMM in 2003, costing the City of London Corporation £1.5 million. The project involved the enclosure of the gallery space from the library and foyer below and the requisition of an additional 140 m² floor space through the demolition of a redundant 17-tonne concrete staircase that had connected the gallery to the library below. AHMM called the gallery ‘a relic of utopian 1960s cross-cultural thinking’, and argued that as a double-level open plan exhibition space, it was inefficient in terms of modern museum display standards. By

354 "Project Details: Barbican Arts Centre."
355 Ibid.
356 Ibid.
creating a fully independent space, AHMM were also able to design a gallery able to meet the strict internal environment prerequisites for world-class art displays. The double-height space of the gallery above the new floor has been retained and the pick-hammered concrete columns have been revealed and emphasised in contrast to the new resin-bound quartz and mother of pearl aggregate flooring on the lower level.

In 2007, after the completion of these first two rehabilitation projects, architect James Dunnett (former DOCOMOMO UK co-chair and casework committee member of the Twentieth Century Society) published a paper on modern movement conservation cases where a difference of opinion existed between the amenity organisations and the statutory heritage bodies that approved the works. The problem at the Barbican Arts Centre, he argues, was that, despite its shortcomings, the 1982 foyer space by Chamberlin Powell and Bon was not given the recognition it deserved as an innovative approach to movement patterns within a building. AHMM had submitted preliminary proposal drawings to the Twentieth Century Society to illustrate their intention to reorient the whole interior to the de facto Silk Street entrance that had originally been designed as a delivery and car park entrance. Perhaps because the drawings were too complicated to read, they went without comment from the C20 Society for three years, but regardless of the reason, AHMM took this lack of comment as a sign of approval. Then, when detailed drawings were presented while Dunnett was on the C20 Casework Committee, it became apparent that the rehabilitation included the insertion of a new floor within the quadruple-height top-lit foyer, completely dividing the space and diminishing its sublime aura (Figure 2-21 and Figure 2-24). Finding this, Dunnett called a meeting with the City Planners, Allford Hall, and Catherine Croft of the Twentieth Century Society to argue that AHMM must try to make the original principal Lakeside Terrace entrance work the way it was originally designed to work by building a bridge across the lake to connect the on-street pedestrian traffic to the main façade (Figure 2-25). In presenting the Piranesi drawings of great piers and flights of ascending steps that had evidently inspired Chamberlin Powell & Bon, Dunnett said he got the impression that ‘these whiz kids’ [AHMM] had never bothered to research what the original design had been based upon.

Dunnett does not deny that the original design presented major navigational difficulties, but says his interest in the preservation of modern movement architecture is ‘to enable
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people to understand an idea’, adding that it is important to preserve the original fabric, but that it is more important that the best examples are saved so that people can observe these ideas in their original form, location and scale. In 2001, when DOCOMOMO UK was approached for its opinion on listing the Arts Centre, then chair Dr Catherine Cooke had barely felt able to support it, but did recommend the listing of Gillian Wise’s murals, which were included in the listing statement and hence, were later saved from removal during the rehabilitation by AHMM. Despite the designation of the whole estate and the subsequent development of heritage management plans, Dunnett argued that English Heritage were too eager at the time to promote a new image of flexibility that they were not willing to stand up for this key architectural feature in the Barbican Arts Centre. Subdivided as it is now, Dunnett feels the space is claustrophobic and that a real opportunity was missed to highlight a fine example of sublime brutalist design in the hands of three highly skilled British architects.

Figure 2-24. The Barbican Arts Centre foyer, circa 1980, showing the chandelier-like sculpture by Michael Santry complimenting the open four-storeyed Piranesian-inspired space.
Image: The Barbican Arts Centre.
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These earlier renovation projects have led to a long-term partnership between the Barbican Arts Centre and AHMM. In 2013, AHMM completed construction of the completely new Barbican Cinema, costing the City of London Corporation £3.4 million this time. The Cinema is the first new venue built within the estate since it opened 30 years before, but it was built within the converted shell of the Barbican Exhibition Hall 2. The new cinema adds two theatres to the existing cinema in Frobisher Crescent, and provides the Barbican with a new restaurant and café along street level at the junction of Whitecross Street and Beech Street, near the Silk Street entrance. Along with the new £90 million Milton Court development for the Guildhall School of Music and Drama around the corner down Silk Street, the two projects have aimed to reconnect the Barbican Centre to the street life around it through architecture that highlights and compliments its brutalist style.
When plans to refurbish the communal areas of the 43-storey Cromwell Tower were announced in 2006, its design-minded residents invited select architectural firms to participate in a design competition, from which they chose Witherford Watson Mann.\textsuperscript{362} In line with volume II of the Barbican Listed Building Management Guidelines, the intent of the works was to reinstate the original character of the communal areas. An earlier 1980s refurbishment retained but covered most of the original features in paint or carpet, but disposed of the original reception desk on the podium level. The 2006-10 refurbishment removed the inappropriate white paint from the bush-hammered concrete walls and from the ‘R2D2-like’ stainless steel lift-call units in the lift lobbies and replaced the 1980s navy-coloured carpet with carpet matching the original dramatic red-orange colour scheme. The refurbishment also moved the reception space from the podium level to the ground floor and the design for the new ground floor reception desk was based on an original perspective drawing of a reception desk by Chamberlin Powell and Bon, which was built to match the existing original built-in brick furniture. A 10-toned green colour scheme was used throughout the communal spaces based on the discovery of an original olive green paint on the inside of the panelled doors.

As the Barbican Estate has become extraordinarily popular with architects and other design-minded tenants who have moved there specifically for its modernist aesthetic, one can expect further refurbishment works to take the same level of care as was taken to

restore the original character of Cromwell Tower. In this case, the valorisation of the estate brought about through its designation has engendered a community that values the original character of the estate and therefore supports the Barbican’s Listed Building Management Guidelines and readily abides by the restrictions it imposes. The management of the estate has undoubtedly been a learning process for everyone involved, and the 2017 revision of the guidelines is expected to reflect on the aspects of the guidelines that have worked and those that need further revision, however as a community of approximately 4,000 residents, the intricate management of the estate in its entirety – internally and externally – serves as an exemplary model for other planned post-war housing developments in Britain and abroad.
2.5. PART 2 CONCLUSIONS

As we have seen throughout Part 2, conservation in Great Britain overwhelmingly remains an elite, professionally led movement, especially with regards to modern movement heritage. Generally, conservation efforts have been pushed forward by the statutory heritage bodies on the assumption that public opinion will eventually catch up with specialists’ opinion, which it is beginning to do, as is evident from the MORI surveys commissioned by Historic England, the gentrification of Welfare State public housing and the general support seen for the designation of post-war office buildings in 2014. Because the national heritage conservation bodies in England and Scotland are expected and mandated to protect the nation’s built heritage for the people, Historic England, more so than Historic Environment Scotland, has approached modern movement conservation first through designation and spot listing, and secondly through broader valorisation efforts. With help from the associated heritage amenity groups, the statutory bodies have also worked to document and create inventories of significant modern movement buildings to support further designations - far ahead of requests from international conservation bodies to do so. For a nation that was slow to adopt modernism, it has been surprisingly quick to acknowledge its potential significance as heritage, and this is decidedly due to the legislative strength and broad public support for the statutory conservation bodies.

While continuing to function as an enforcement system, the statutory heritage bodies in both England and Scotland have been taking on an increasingly flexible, development-friendly stance since the early 2000s, in part due to the growing number of post-war designations, but also in reaction to the economic climate and the almost unmanageable number of listed buildings throughout both countries. To democratise the heritage system and lighten their workload, Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland have each devised decentralising agreements with local planning authorities and large estate owners, and by sharing the responsibility to maintain listed buildings, it is hoped that communities will come to embrace their local modern movement heritage. However, as the ISC20C has warned, post-war heritage is made particularly vulnerable through these agreements because their sheer quantity makes their unique and special attributes unrecognisable to many building owners and local authorities. Yet, since the establishment of Joint Working Agreements with the larger city councils, HES has seen an influx in queries and requests for modern movement buildings to be assessed for
historic significance, meaning that a greater number of unevaluated post-war buildings are being brought to their attention in the process.

Many would argue that the legislation brought in by the 2004-05 Pimilico School court case that allows Heritage Ministers in England to consider a building’s ‘fitness for purpose’, in addition to the traditional benchmarks of architectural and historical significance, was knowingly devised to exclude modern post-war buildings from designation. However, this view that conservation principles must be more flexible when applied to modern movement heritage has been reflected on an international level with the 2014 revision of DOCOMOMO International’s mission statement to expressly support the adaptive re-use of modern movement buildings. DOCOMOMO UK founding member John Allan has long warned of the difficulties in promoting the conservation of modernist architecture to a public that is unconvinced of its merits, and his views have been reflected in Historic England’s new ‘constructive conservation’ approach, which has been applied at Park Hill after anti-social problems persisted long after its Grade II* designation in 1997.

While World Heritage List designation lends additional prestige to a listed building, international intervention has not been needed in Great Britain because, along with the statutory heritage bodies, the Twentieth Century Society and DOCOMOMO actively monitor and campaign for threatened modern movement buildings through their local chapters. On the other hand, the broader recognition of modern movement heritage through instances like the recent addition of the architectural works of Le Corbusier to the World Heritage List has helped to reinforce the validity of modern movement listing programmes in Britain.

The ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage (ISC20C) was essentially established to share national conservation experiences, principles and knowledge, and therefore it has an indirect influence on national level modern movement conservation through its members. The 2011 Madrid Document’s recognition that ‘buildings evolve over time and later alterations may have cultural significance’ has been reflected in Historic England’s 2013 update of the Bracken House listing statement to include the later alterations made by Michael Hopkins, which HE said adds to the building’s architectural interest and ‘demonstrates the structural exuberance of High Tech design’. Article 2.3 of the Madrid Document, which states that conservation plans should clearly define areas of significance and areas where intervention is acceptable has also
been reflected in the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act adopted by Historic England in 2013. With a conservation tradition in Great Britain of making repairs identifiable to the untrained eye, HE and HES continue to advocate for an approach that supports the ISC20C’s preference for alterations that are identifiable as new, but acknowledge the existing ‘character, scale, form, siting, materials, colour, patina and detailing’ of the original structure.

So while the conservation of modern movement architecture in Britain has come to reflect international narratives in recent years, the successful application of these initiatives is due to the traditional willingness of the government to intervene in the planning sector and the willingness of the public to abide by the limitations enforced upon them through the statutory listing system. However, though conservation has been established as an essential aspect of built environment planning, Heritage Ministers have been shown to have decidedly different views on the designation of modern movement architecture and what is best for the public. The conservation of modern movement architecture therefore remains political and subject to the individual views of Heritage Ministers and local planning authorities in England and Scotland. In Part 3, under the same themes of designation, valorisation and management, we will see how the capitalist political system and the conservation movement’s philanthropic roots have influenced the conservation of modern movement architecture in a decidedly American fashion.
Part 3. **The United States of America**
3.1. **INTRODUCTION**

As we have seen, Great Britain has developed a statutorily-strong but progressively less centralised conservation system than many of its European counterparts, and through deregulatory policies and legislation like Joint Working Agreements and the ERR Act of 2013, Historic Environment Scotland and Historic England continue to place greater heritage regulatory powers in the hands of the local planning authorities. As we will see throughout Part 3, the onus of conservation advocacy and heritage protection in the United States of America is still largely left up to private amenity groups and state and municipal preservation offices as designation on the National Register of Historic Places remains largely honorific. Stubbs and Makaš wrote that it is the American take-charge attitude, philanthropic spirit and accumulated wealth through private enterprise that have led to a populist preservation approach supported largely by private donations and generosity. This means that conservation efforts favour well-liked buildings, leaving controversial, undervalued and unrecognised significant modern movement buildings without adequate support and protection. Adversely, because post-war specialists within Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland have largely led the movement to conserve of modern architecture in Britain, its valorisation has been approached through a top-down rather than bottom-up scenario. Of course it has not always worked this way, as we have seen with the failed populist attempt by a number of ‘starchitects’ to have Robin Hood Gardens listed, and in other instances where the government’s intervention in the historic built environment has been seen to be done *despite* the people rather than *for* the people.

Due to the strength of personal property rights, the value placed on economic and entrepreneurial freedoms and the philanthropist structure of heritage conservation in America, conservationists there must instead convince the local public and then the municipal or state historic preservation office of the value of modern movement architecture in order to secure its protection. In short, the ‘pragmatic, business-focused, and future oriented citizenry of the United States …requires that the preservation efforts be economically justifiable and coexist with “progress”.’ Or as Peter Hall put it, from a European standpoint, America is seen as ‘a land where rampant individualism provides
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the only guide to economic development or physical use of land. Given the US government’s traditional disinclination to intervene in the private sector, this section will study how international conservation principles have influenced modern movement conservation in uniquely American ways.

In Part 3, the initiatives of the various governmental and non-governmental agencies advocating for the conservation of modern movement architecture are discussed in relation to specific case studies and the relevant municipal, state and national protective legislation. Like Part 2, the findings are organised under the three thematic topics of designation, valorisation and management. Converse to the listing system in Great Britain, in Section 3.2 we will see that local designation in America often provides more protection than national level designation. A study of New York City reveals the different challenges and tools used to protect modern movement heritage in a city with ever-present pressure from the real estate market. While most thematic studies in Britain have been conducted by either Historic England or Historic Environment Scotland, Section 3.3 will demonstrate how non-profit grassroots groups have largely led efforts to re-evaluate and document modern movement heritage in America. Finally, though the management of modern movement heritage in America is ultimately left up to the whim and inclination of the building owner, Section 3.4 will explain why the Historic Tax Credit programme has become one of the most essential and useful tools used by architects and conservation professionals to convince owners of National Register listed modern movement buildings to refurbish rather than demolish the buildings, which they are legally allowed to do without any repercussions.
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3.2. **THE DESIGNATION OF MODERN MOVEMENT HERITAGE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

The movement to conserve modern architecture began in America much as it did across Europe in the 1980s and 1990s with a focus on pre-war and inter-war modern icons in private ownership. The curvaceous forms and soft colour palettes of the Art Moderne and Art Deco styles attracted American preservationist’s attention first as they were more palatable to the general public as heritage. The organic, pseudo-vernacular modernism of Frank Lloyd Wright, who implemented a uniquely American ‘Prairie Style’ modern aesthetic in a more acceptable combination of concrete and natural materials gained attention with the designation of Fallingwater (1936-39) in Bull Run, Pennsylvania on the National Register of Historic Places in July 1974. A number of Wright’s privately owned buildings have long been listed on the National Register, including the Robie House (designated 1966) and Taliesin East (designated 1976), and the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum (designated 2005); however, like Le Corbusier, the conservation of Wright’s buildings began with promotion by Wright himself. Wright initiated the conservation of his buildings through the establishment of the Taliesin Fellowship in 1932, through which he taught students how to repair and remodel his already constructed buildings to his own specifications. Yet, despite Wright’s celebrity status and the fact that his buildings were the first modernist buildings to be widely accepted as heritage, many of his buildings surprisingly remain under threat of demolition (see Section 3.2.2.1 Rezoning Midtown East Manhattan).

In the latter half of the twentieth century, Jane Jacobs and others led the grassroots conservation movement to champion America’s vernacular architecture and street patterns in opposition to the nationally backed urban redevelopment programmes. The vernacular conservation movement supported the idea that even ordinary buildings and sites of the built environment contributed to the cultural heritage of a place and has inadvertently paved the way for the argument now being made for the conservation of less iconic buildings of the modern movement. In downtown Minneapolis, after a tense battle that involved the Preservation Alliance of Minnesota suing the Minneapolis City
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Council over plans to demolish the modernist Peavey Plaza designed in 1975 by M. Paul Friedberg & Partners, the brutalist landscape was eventually designated as a National Historic Landmark in January 2014. However, many of Friedberg’s modernist landscapes have already been lost, including the playground he designed in 1965 for the Jacob Riis Houses (1949) in Manhattan, demolished in 2000 before any preservationists took notice. Enough of Paul Rudolph’s brutalist buildings have been demolished at this point to fill a book, and despite protracted protests backed by the World Monuments Fund and a drawn-out court case that made its way to the New York Supreme Court, his sculptural Orange County Government Center in Goshen was eventually partially demolished over the summer of 2015, with one of the three buildings completely demolished and the other two stripped back to their concrete frames. In Manhattan, even the most acclaimed and iconic modern movement buildings remain under threat. The interior of The Four Seasons restaurant designed by Philip Johnson for Mies van der Rohe’s Seagram Building was landmarked in 1989 by the New York Landmark Preservation Commission; however, the designation does not extend to the removable interior fittings and furnishings (though they were designed especially for the restaurant) and so there were no legal restrictions to stop the building owner from auctioning them off in July 2016.

In ‘The American Contrast’, Donovan D. Rypkema explains that ‘in the UK, the process [of heritage protection] is largely national, top-down, regulation-driven and carried out by the public sector; in the US, the process is largely local, bottom-up, incentive-driven and carried out by the private sector.’ Rypkema says these differences are fundamentally reflective of the American legal system’s partiality to the rights of property owners while the British system triumphs the government’s stewardship responsibilities. As we will see in Section 3.2.1, designation on the National Register of Historic Places provides no real protection at all, aside from the 106 Review process, which has a very limited scope of use. The protection of historic properties is therefore generally left up to the local communities through a local preservation commission established by the city council. Rypkema estimates that within the US, there are approximately 19,500 municipal governments but only 2,600 have local preservation commissions, leaving the vast majority of cities without any local form of governmental protection for their historic properties. By contrast, New York City has an exceptionally robust conservation body through its Landmark Preservation Commission, and for this reason, the city has been
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chosen to demonstrate the particular difficulties of designating post-war modern movement heritage in a city with exceedingly high land values and redevelopment pressures even with protective measures in force (see Section 3.2.2).

Rypkema concludes that protection for historic buildings in the US is almost non-existent on a national and state level and that ‘meaningful protection, where it exists, is on the local level, and is never completely free of risk from the whims of local politicians’. Instead, through the comfortable narrative of progress, what the federal government does provide is financial incentives for the private sector to invest in historic building conservation, most notably through the historic tax credit programme (see Section 3.4.2).

First, throughout Section 3.2, we will examine the utility of statutory heritage designation systems on a federal, state and municipal level and their ability to protect the built heritage of the modern movement.

### 3.2.1. Recent Past Heritage & the National Register of Historic Places

While architectural conservation in the United States has primarily been conducted through philanthropic and private advocacy initiatives, the US federal government has slowly became more involved, first with the Antiquities Act of 1906, followed by the creation of the National Park Service in 1916 and then by the Historic Sites Act of 1935, which created the National Historic Landmarks Program and set the precedent for a 50-year age requirement. However, it was the 1963 demolition of the McKim, Mead and White designed Pennsylvania Station (1905-10) in Manhattan, New York that spurred the federal government to devise a system to officially recognise the nation’s most cherished heritage, which ultimately led to the ratification of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Despite being viewed at the time by the architectural elite as a Beaux Arts mammoth of a bygone era, the destruction of this monumental building shocked New Yorkers and spurred the formation of stricter preservation ordinances and municipal
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372 New Yorkers still lament the loss of the 1910 Penn Station and the rather uninspiring 1968 Madison Square Gardens built atop the station exacerbates hostile feelings toward twentieth century urban redevelopment in New York. On 6 January 2016, New York Governor Andrew Cuomo announced the $3 billion redevelopment plans for Penn Station that may include the demolition of the Madison Square
laws that led to the establishment of the New York City Landmark Preservation Commission (LPC), signed into law by Mayor Robert F Wagner in 1965.\textsuperscript{373}

Reacting to the destructive nature of the urban renewal programme, headed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the interstate highway programme of the Department of Transportation, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 expanded the scope of governmental preservation efforts from buildings or sites of ‘national significance’ and from buildings and sites under federal ownership to also include heritage of local or state significance. Title II of the Act established the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), an independent federal agency that advises Congress and the President on conservation issues, while Title I of the Act charged the Secretary of the Interior with compiling of a list of historic places worthy of protection, which later became the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). According to the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the Act was primarily passed ‘to acknowledge the importance of protecting our nation's heritage from rampant federal development’, pitting conservation efforts from this point onward in square opposition to urban renewal schemes and the modern movement in general. Section 106 of the Act forced governmental agencies from then onward to assess the detrimental effects its redevelopment plans may inflict on historic properties and districts listed on the National Register through consultation with local and state heritage agencies and clearance from the ACHP was made obligatory before works could commence.

\textsuperscript{373} Prudon, Preservation of Modern Architecture. (p. 16).
Figure 3-1. Flow chart illustrating the system of checks and balances devised by Section 106 in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which governs the relationship between the local agencies, the State Historic Preservation Offices and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.


The 89th Congress was known as “the Preservation Congress” not only for the passing of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, but also for the passing of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966, which forced the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to recognise and fund preservation projects that encouraged local authorities to renew and recycle their existing building stock in urban centres. Under the 1966 Act, all ‘sites, buildings, objects, districts, and structures significant in American history, architecture, archaeology, and culture’ were to be considered for inclusion on the NRHP.\(^{374}\) William Murtagh explains the significance of the inclusion of the word *district* in the Act, for from that point onward, federal preservation grants from the Secretary of the Interior could apply not only to individual structures, but also to whole historic districts, meaning that restoration of the existing housing stock was a newly viable alternative to the urban renewal programmes.\(^{375}\)

The establishment of historic districts has since become one of the most effective and useful preservation tools in America, because the local municipality is not required to purchase the buildings within the district but is able to impose restrictions upon the


\(^{375}\)Ibid. (p. 68).
property owners regarding the types of changes they can make to their buildings. According to the definition of historic districts, all properties should date within the historic district’s period of significance or be associated with one or more buildings within the district. If a building does not fit within these parameters, an explicit explanation must be given as to why namely modern buildings belong in the historic district. Modern buildings within the interior of an historic district of earlier significance cannot be cut out and therefore need not actually qualify on their own individual merits, however, the boundaries can be drawn to exclude unpopular modern buildings on the fringe.

Some states have used the National Register Multiple Property Documentation Form to evaluate and nominate multiple properties under a binding theme such as an architectural style or a particular method of construction. As a result of the 2009 multiple property nomination ‘Post-World War II and Modern Architecture in Raleigh, North Carolina, 1945-1965’ (which followed the Raleigh Architectural Survey Update covering the same period), several modernist homes were listed on the National Register in March 2011.376 A similar nomination, ‘Iowa Usonian Houses by Frank Lloyd Wright, 1945-1965’, was put forth by the State of Iowa, under which seven houses were designated as a group in September 1988 under Criterion Consideration C (Properties that represent the work of a master and that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type period and method of construction).377

Although the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 began to move the advocacy of building conservation from a grassroots to a government initiative, the listing of buildings and sites on the National Register of Historic Places remains largely honorific and does not safeguard the sites from alteration or demolition. NRHP designation does restrict governmentally funded or licensed programmes from using tax dollars to alter or demolish the buildings, but it does not legally restrict private owners from altering or demolishing their own property, though doing so could result in the de-listing of the property and the revoking of all historic property tax incentive rights. Designation on the National Register ‘provides formal recognition of a property’s historical, architectural, or archaeological significance based on national standards used by every state’ and
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encourages the ‘preservation of historic resources by documenting a property’s historic significance’, but without statutory protection, designation on the National Register largely only augments the property value and perceived prestige of historic sites.\textsuperscript{378}

Should the owner object to the listing during the nomination process, by law, the property cannot be listed, but it will be recorded as eligible for listing, which assures its historic value will be acknowledged in any federally funded projects in the future.\textsuperscript{379}

The 50-year qualification age that guides National Register designations, and state and municipal level designations in most states, was set in order to protect against the listing of buildings and sites ‘which are of only contemporary, faddish value’, but as in Great Britain, properties of ‘exceptional importance’ may be listed on the National Register regardless of age under ‘Criterion Consideration G’.\textsuperscript{380} The 1979 National Register Bulletin ‘Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years’ (revised in 1990, 1996 and 1998) has steered the nomination and designation of properties of ‘exceptional importance’ that are so outstanding that designation should not risk waiting until the buildings reach the required 50 years of age. The guidelines interpret ‘exceptional importance’ as events or categories of resources ‘so fragile that survivors of any age are unusual’, and therefore, under this definition ‘exceptional importance’ is difficult to prove for many modern movement developments like suburban shopping malls, office buildings, transportation environments and modernist urban renewal plans.\textsuperscript{381} However, as architectural historian Alan Hess has pointed out, ‘in population, area and innovative urban concepts, the growth of decentralized suburban metropolises was the United State’s most significant urbanist trend in the mid-20th century’ and it is with respect to this achievement, he argues, that the best of these common modern movement developments should be protected and conserved.\textsuperscript{382}

\textsuperscript{382} Alan Hess in Koller, "Listed, Obliterated or Status Unknown: An Analysis of the 50-Year Rule, 1966-2010." (p. 55).
To protect the very buildings whose arrival led to the abrupt and widespread demolition of complete urban neighbourhoods would most definitely be viewed as ‘preserving the enemy’ to a great number of preservationists in America. In 1991, Dr Richard Longstreth, cofounder of the Recent Past Preservation Network warned that any attempt to preserve post-war shopping centres ‘would likely be hampered by a wide-spread prejudice’ because it seems ‘preposterous to claim a parking lot as historic’. Though many of these mid-century developments maintain a high degree of significance culturally and architecturally, until recently the public and the preservation community has largely felt that shopping centres were exactly the ‘sort of thing that preservation should be against’. Thematic studies have since begun to re-evaluate the heritage value of shopping malls (see Section 3.3.1), and in May 2016, the listing statement of the Davenport Bank and Trust in Davenport, Iowa was extended to include the multi-storey car park completed in 1971 in the New Formalism style.

By the end of the National Park Service’s fiscal year in September 2010, 86,256 properties had been listed on the National Register, up from approximately 64,000 in 1994, however, properties listed under Criterion Consideration G only rose from 2,035 to 2,604 during this same time period. Though records are incomplete, a further 158 properties were listed under Criterion G between 2013 and 2016, including a 1971 parking garage in Davenport, Iowa as an example of ‘the abstract monumentality and classicism articulated in the 1950s and 1960s as New Formalism’. Of those listed under Criterion G as of 1994, Kelli Shapiro found that 464 reflected some important aspect of the nation’s history since 1950, and of these, 77 reflected an aspect of history since 1974. The National Register of Historic Places is of all things a register of the nation’s most cherished places in American history, not purely those of architectural significance.

For properties under 50 years old, evaluations are generally guided by trends and anniversaries of momentous events in American history. Topics currently under
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386 Records have not yet been digitized for Arkansas, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, and Virginia. Records have been digitised from 1966-2012, however the database does not support searching by listing criterion.
evaluation are shopping malls, suburban developments, educational and recreational facilities, and heritage related to the Civil Rights Movement, the Space Race and the Vietnam War. The Cape Canaveral Air Force Station (1948) was designated under Criterion Consideration A in 1984 for its association with the inception of the US space programme and with putting the first man on the moon. The Chrysler Building (1928-30) in Manhattan was added to the National Register 46 years after its completion for its significance as a commercial monument to the ‘machine age’ in America, but also as a monument to the brief, but uniquely American ‘Style Moderne’ movement. 389

Also related to the great advances in aviation in the mid-twentieth century, the Dulles International Airport Terminal (1962) was instantly acclaimed as an innovative representation of modern travel and though Eero Saarinen did not live to see the project to completion, the American Institute of Architects awarded Saarinen posthumously with the Gold Medal Award in 1962. As part of the 1976 bicentennial celebration, the American Institute of Architects recognised it as the third most influential building in America in the past 200 years, and two years later, the airport was listed on the National Register, just 16 years after its completion. 390 Then in 1989, having retained its overall architectural integrity, the airport terminal and its surrounding buildings and landscape were further designated as a National Register Historic District. 391 Though the historic significance of Dulles Airport was not addressed directly in the designation memorandum, Longstreth has argued that since the building was regarded as work of great importance both nationally and internationally at the time of its construction, then it could be argued that ‘no future change in thinking can eradicate the design’s past record of distinction’. 392

The 1998 version of the National Register Bulletin states that post-war public housing may be eligible for listing under Criterion Consideration G as an example of the nation’s post-war urban policy, but that the properties must be judged to be exceptional against similar properties locally and nationally. For controversial buildings types, an understanding of historical associations – social, political, architectural and so forth - is essential to support the designation of heritage under the 50-year age requirement.
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Designation proposals are also more readily accepted if the site in question has been the subject of scholarly evaluation, and for this reason, amenity groups such as DOCOMOMO US and its state and regional subchapters focus on public education and scholarly documentation as a primary means to protect modern movement heritage. In December 2010, Cedar Square West became the first post-war low-income housing complex to be listed on the NRHP\textsuperscript{393} and has established a precedent for the nomination of similar large-scale modern movement complexes (see Section 3.4.2.1).

A 2011 study by postgraduate student Emily Koller surveyed the efficacy of Criterion Consideration G and the National Register to protect modern movement and recent past properties by tracking the current status of 145 AIA award-winning buildings from 1960-1969 under the assumption that any ‘buildings awarded First Honor Awards or Awards of Merit for excellence in contemporary design solutions would likely be found exceptionally significant as the best representations of architecture of its time’.\textsuperscript{394} Koller found that 75\% of these were still standing and retained their architectural integrity, and though all could be argued to be exceptionally significant, only 6\% of the buildings had been listed on the National Register.\textsuperscript{395} Koller faults the incompatible vocabulary used on the National Register nomination forms, a lack of corresponding contextual studies and the system’s delegation to demonstrate the burden of proof for exceptional significance on the individual nominator as contributing factors to the meagre representation of even award-winning modern buildings on the National Register.\textsuperscript{396} Where modern movement buildings had been listed under Criterion Consideration G, Koller found that they were most often listed in relation to a tax credit project, as a multiple-property listing that resulted from a thematic survey or individually as a popular local icon.

Shortly after the passing of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the incumbent Secretary of the Interior Stewart L Udall directed each state governor to set up a State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to carry out the new congressional programme at state and local levels. With this devolution of powers to the State Historic Preservation Offices, the National Register became a state-led programme with oversight from the federal government in the form of reactions to nominations made on a state level. Thus,

\textsuperscript{393} The Harlem River Houses (1937) in Manhattan was the first public housing complex to be listed on the NRHP in 1979.
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the rate at which modernist heritage is recognised on a national level depends almost entirely on the stance of the state historic preservation officers.

By speaking with conservation professionals on a state and local level, Koller found that three variables influenced the nomination of recent past heritage under Criterion G: local modernism and recent past (M+RP) advocacy programmes, state rehabilitation tax credits and support from state preservation leadership. While the first two variables are easy to quantify, the bias of state historic preservation office staff or the board members that approve state level nominations for submission to the National Park Service is more difficult to pinpoint. Koller used the existence of modern and recent past context surveys (thematic studies) to judge the level of state and municipal leadership support.

![Table](image)

Figure 3-2. Top 20 States with the Most Criterion G Nominations. Source: Emily Koller, ‘Listed, Obliterated or Status Unknown’.

While one would expect that a state that has all three of these supporting variables would have some of the highest number of recent past designations, Ohio bucks this expectation, and though Alabama has none of the three, it has listed more recent past properties than
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Ohio and other states that have at least one supportive variable. Only three of the top ten states with the most recent past designations have historic tax credit programmes, showing that while this incentive is persuasive to developers and investors, it is the presence of an advocacy group and a supportive state historic preservation office that have the greatest impact on the number of recent past buildings listed on the National Register. Koller concludes however, that well-developed context surveys (thematic studies) that address national storylines and themes are essential to support independent nominators to prove the exceptional significance of their local building within a wider historical context.

3.2.2. NEW YORK CITY: THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION AND LOCAL HERITAGE LEGISLATION

Throughout Section 3.2.2, New York City is examined through its conservation legislation and organisations because, in many ways, its heritage legislation is most akin to the conservation models in Britain and those of other European countries and it is the city in which American preservation laws were first and most intensely tested. The New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) is the largest municipal conservation agency in the United States and has the power to designate and regulate individual Landmarks and historic districts. Mayor Robert F Wagner established the LPC in 1965 in the wake of the demolition of McKim, Mead and White’s Pennsylvania Station and in reaction to intensifying urban renewal initiatives across the city. Like Historic England or Historic Environment Scotland, the LPC conducts surveys to identify heritage buildings throughout the five boroughs of New York City, but it also reviews upwards of 200 Requests for Evaluation (RFEs) annually, through which citizens can nominate a site or building for consideration. Unlike the US National Register, a property can be designated as a New York City Landmark when only 30 years old and without the owner’s consent.

Los Angeles was actually the first American city to establish a municipal level heritage protection body and legislative system through the inauguration of its Landmarks Commission in 1962, followed by New York (1965), San Francisco (1967), Chicago (1968), Boston (1975) and others. With the establishment of Landmarks Commissions,
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cities were for the first time placing restrictions on privately owned buildings outside of historic districts through maintenance requirements and penalties for alterations and demolition. The New York City LPC extended this provision to include interiors in 1973 amidst mounting concern that the landmark system was in violation of private property laws. However, when controversy over the proposed modernist redevelopment of Grand Central Station landed the case in the US Supreme Court, the Court ruled in 1978 that it was within the rights of the LPC to designate any building or site within the city limits as a Landmark and moreover, to forbid its demolition or alteration.

Similar to the statutory listed building consent requirements in Britain, approval from the LPC must be gained before major repairs, alterations, new construction or demolition works can be undertaken on any landmarked buildings or buildings within a historic district. If works are undertaken without an LPC permit and are incompliant with the LPC’s regulations, the LPC will issue a Notice of Violation (NOV). If the works are not corrected in the allocated length of time, the LPC then has the right to seek civil fines or criminal penalties through the Environmental Control Board. Fines are determined by the severity of the violation and usually range between $500 and $5,000, but in cases where the building owner, tenant or contractor ignores a NOV, the LPC can issue a Stop Work Order, which is accompanied by a $250 fine for each day of continued work. An unauthorised partial or complete demolition of a landmarked building must be tried in a civil court with a judge and jury rather than through the administrative system as usual, and can warrant fines of up to $15,000 per day.

The LPC has not designated a huge number of modern movement buildings as historic landmarks, however they did start to list the most iconic modernist buildings relatively early. The International-Style William Lescaze House and Office (1934) was landmarked in 1976, followed by the Art Deco Daily News Buidling (1930) in 1981. The innovative steel and glass Lever House (Gordon Bunschaft for Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, 1950-52) in on Park Avenue was landmarked only 30 years after its completion in November 1982 in response to its proposed demolition. It was then listed on the NRHP under Criterion C in October 1983 as one of the nation’s first corporate expressions of the
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International Style. At the time of construction, Lever House had a profound effect on the people of New York, as Lewis Mumford recorded in his 1952 article, *House of Glass*:

> For a long time after Lever House opened its doors, throngs of people, waiting patiently in great queues in the lobby, demanded admission so insistently that the elevator system, designed to handle only Lever Brothers’ office staff of twelve hundred employees and a normal complement of visitors, was severely over-taxed. People act as if it’s the eighth wonder of the world…

On the opposite corner of Park Avenue and East 53rd Street, the Seagram Building (1956-58), designed by Mies van der Rohe in collaboration with Phillip Johnson, was landmarked in October 1989 but was only listed on the National Register in February 2006. The Trans World Airlines Flight Center (Eero Saarinen & Associates, 1956-62) at the John F. Kennedy International Airport was landmarked in July 1994 (NRHP, September 2005), but because it then sat empty for a number of years, the LPC declined to landmark the equally significant former Pan Am Worldport terminal building, affectionately known as the ‘flying saucer’ (1960, demolished 2013), nor I.M. Pei’s classically restrained modernist Terminal 6 (1970, demolished 2011) that rounded out the Jet Age trio of mid-century terminals at JFK Airport. On Park Avenue, the former Pepsi-Cola Building, a second modern office building designed by Skidmore Owings & Merrill with Gordon Bunshaft and Natalie de Blois, received Landmark status in June 1995, followed by the 2005 landmarking of the former Summit Hotel (Morris Lapidus, 1959-61) on Lexington Avenue.

In Queens, the Elmhurst Branch of the Jamaica Savings Bank (William F. Cann Company, 1968) was designated as a New York City Landmark on 28 June 2005. The bank was a more mediocre execution of what Eero Saarinen had achieved with a hyperbolic paraboloid roof at the Yale Ice Arena, but the LPC designated it as one of the most unique and successful examples of experimental bank design during the post-war period. However, by November 2005, the City Council had successfully overturned the LPC’s decision at the request of the owner who argued the building was prone to flooding and would be difficult to maintain with the restrictions imposed by the LPC. The building

Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties That Have Achieved Significance within the Past Fifty Years. (p. 13).
Caroline Engel, Interview with Frampton Tolbert, Board Member of the Recent Past Preservation Network (New York: 2013).
still stands, but without any of the protection afforded by the landmark status, and the Jamaica Savings Bank case has become emblematic of how difficult it can be to convince the public and its political representatives of the heritage value of many modern movement commercial buildings.

In late 2003, the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation (GVSHP) proposed I.M. Pei’s 1967 Silver Towers housing complex at New York University (NYU) for landmarking in relation to its significance as the architect’s first use of the ‘superblock’ and its correlation to Robert Moses’ rebuilding of New York City. Prominent preservationist Dr Julia Vitullo-Martin responded by denouncing the superblock as one of the worst ideas of the 20th century and said that to list ‘an architect’s first use of a truly bad idea’ as a reason for preservation ‘is itself a truly bad idea’, adding that ‘in deciding to champion the landmarking of modernist buildings [preservationists are] in effect proposing to prevent the city’s fabric from mending itself.’ 404 The towers were in fact landmarked by a unanimous vote in November 2008, and a large following of preservationists and community activists, led by the GVSHP, have since rallied against NYU’s expansion plans around the Silver Towers site and the adjacent modernist Washington Square Village (1958) faculty housing development, which in February 2011 was deemed eligible for the State and National Register of Historic Places.

The LPC is responsible for the designation and regulation of more than 31,000 historically, culturally and architecturally significant landmarked properties in New York City, most of which are part of the 111 historic districts and 20 historic district extensions. Outside these, there are an additional 1338 individually landmarked properties, 117 designated interiors and 10 scenic landmarks. 405 Of the 192 individual landmarks across Manhattan, 15 are post-war structures, of which the most recently designated are 140 Broadway (1964-67, originally the Marine Midland Bank, landmarked June 2013), the Japan Society Building (1967-71, landmarked March 2011), the Paul Rudolph Penthouse & Apartments (landmarked November 2010) and the Look Building (Emery Roth & Sons, 1948-50; landmarked July 2010). The Paul Rudolph Penthouse & Apartments, originally built in the late 1860s, altered in 1929-30, and added to by architect Paul Rudolph in 1977-82, have been recognised as a significant architectural work and for its association with ‘one of the most celebrated and innovative American
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architects of the 20th century. However, many of Rudolph’s public buildings and housing projects across the country have not been given the same support (see section Error! Reference source not found.). Urban plazas can also be notoriously difficult to protect because of their potential for redevelopment, yet the 60-storey International Style tower and elevated plaza of the former One Chase Manhattan Plaza (Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, 1961) were landmarked together in February of 2009.

Of the 93 interior landmarks within Manhattan, 22 are modern 20th century designs ranging from Art Nouveau and Art Deco to Streamline Moderne and late-modernism. Six modernist landmarked interiors date from the post-war period, including the Seagram Building lobby (Mies van der Rohe, 1958; landmarked October 1989), The Four Seasons restaurant within the Seagram Building (Philip Johnson, 1959; landmarked October 1989), the ground floor interior of the Guggenheim Museum (Frank Lloyd Wright, 1959; landmarked August 1990), the Ford Building landscaped atrium and lobby (Kevin Roche, 1967; landmarked 1997) the Time & Life Building lobby (Michael M. Harris, 1960; landmarked July 2002) and the full interior of the former Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company (SOM: exterior by Gordon Bunshaft, interior by Eleanor H. Le Maire, 1954; landmarked February 2011).

The exterior of the Manufacturers Trust building was landmarked in October 1997, but because of the sanctity of the private properties in America, the interior was not landmarked until 2011, despite the fact that any alterations to the interior would greatly alter the building’s exterior appearance as well. With its floor to ceiling glass façade, the former Manufacturers Hanover Trust building was designed to give the public an open view into all banking operations. Upon its completion, Lewis Mumford wrote that it was an almost ideal symbol of the modern world, writing that it was ‘a formal expression of the culture that has explored the innermost recesses of the atom, that knows that visible boundaries and solid objects are only figments of the intellect’.

When J.P. Morgan vacated the building in 2010, the Harry Bertoia-designed 70 foot-long enamelled steel screen and hanging sculpture were removed along with the teller’s counter. Even after the interior was landmarked, the building’s subsequent owner, Canadian clothing company Joe Fresh, demolished the ground floor vault walls, leaving
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the vault door designed by Henry Dreyfuss standing in empty space. The free-standing
twin escalators that provided access to the cantilevered upper floor were also replaced
and relocated. However, in May 2012, its current owner lent the Bertoia screen back to
the building on the condition that it remains there as long as the building stands.

As for The Four Seasons restaurant, though designated nearly three decades ago,
preservationists have found that landmark designation can only protect the fixed fittings
of an interior. In September 2014, the building owner, Aby Rosen, removed the
monumental ‘Le Tricorne’ canvas by Pablo Picasso that had hung in the restaurant since
its opening, calling it a ‘schmatte’ – Yiddish for a rag. The LPC held a hearing on the
future of the restaurant in May 2015, which Rosen did not attend, but at which Edgar
Bronfman Jr., former executive of the Seagram Building, warned that ‘What is at stake
here is whether ownership trumps preservation,’ and ‘whether deception triumphs over
transparency and whether the wealth, power and influence of a building’s proprietors can
trample both the fundamental integrity of an historic space and the commission created to
protect and preserve such spaces.’\textsuperscript{408} The Picasso is now in the possession of the New
York Landmarks Conservancy, but on 26 July 2016, the remaining unfixed furnishings
and tableware designed by the likes of Eero Saarinen, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Hans
Wegner, Garth and Ada Louise Huxtable and Florence Knoll specifically designed for the
restaurant was auctioned off.\textsuperscript{409} As The Four Seasons’ lease ended in July 2016, the
future of the space remains uncertain, but the recent events may not bode well for the
future of the neighbouring Lever House, which Rosen also owns.

\section*{3.2.2.1. Rezoning Midtown East Manhattan}

Perhaps the greatest threat to modern buildings in New York is the astronomic land
values and pressure to reap the greatest profit from each plot. A now defeated proposal to
rezone the Midtown East district in Manhattan was put forward by the New York City
Department of City Planning in 2012 to encourage the construction of larger buildings in
the city’s most commercial district. The proposed rezoning of Midtown East would have
undoubtedly directed additional redevelopment pressure toward the over 200 unlisted
post-war office buildings in the area. Post-war commercial buildings are some of the
most difficult to protect in Manhattan because the structural designs often no longer meet

\textsuperscript{408} Robin Pogrebin, "Landmarks Commission Rejects Plan to Change Interior of Four Seasons," The New York
Times, 19 May, 2015, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/20/nyregion/landmarks-panel-rejects-changes-to-
four-seasons-restaurant.html.

\textsuperscript{409} Belmont Freeman, "The Four Seasons Restaurant Auction," Architectural Record, 16 May, 2016.
the city’s strict building codes and because they often do not suit the tastes of real estate developers. Commercial buildings in England face many of these same pressures, yet as we saw, Historic England was able to list 14 post-war commercial buildings in January 2015 as the result of a thematic study.

The Historic Districts Council (HDC), an advocacy organisation that represents over 500 local community groups in New York, works to preserve historic neighbourhoods and has been behind the designation of nearly all of the 110 historic districts encompassing approximately 30,000 buildings. Over the autumn of 2012, the HDC surveyed the entirety of Midtown East and compiled a list of historically or architecturally significant buildings that would be eligible for landmark designation and that would be put at risk if the rezoning proposal were passed. With the support of the New York Landmarks Conservancy and the Municipal Arts Society (MASNYC), the HDC then submitted official Requests for Evaluation to the LPC for the 31 most remarkable buildings within the proposed rezoning area. Of these, eight post-war commercial office buildings were selected by the LPC for consideration.410

In a letter to LPC Chairman Robert Tierney on 29 April 2013, the HPC highlighted the abrupt recent demolition of the 1954 Frank Lloyd Wright designed interior in the former Hoffman Auto Showroom at 430 Park Avenue and urged the LPC to act quickly to protect similarly threatened historic buildings in the district. The Chicago-based Frank Lloyd Wright Conservancy and DOCOMOMO Tri-State had sent an official Request for
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Evaluation (RFE) to the LPC in August 2012. Then, on 22 March 2013, the LPC contacted the building owners to inform them of the possible Landmark designation of the auto showroom, and on 28 March, the building owners applied for a demolition permit from the city’s Department of Buildings, which was granted the same day. The interior was completely dismantled one week later.

In this case, it was within the building owner’s right to request a demolition permit and to act on these plans, and the LPC could do little to stop them once it had been granted. In a similar case in 2008, the Institute of International Education privatised its formerly public conference space designed by Alvar Aalto to avoid the possibility of landmark designation.\textsuperscript{412} The Hoffman Auto Showroom was effectually lost due to disengagement between heritage agencies and the Department of Buildings in New York. Had the Department of Buildings been aware of the LPC’s intentions to landmark the interior, they may not have issued the demolition permit so readily.

In November 2013, the Bloomberg Administration withdrew their bid to rezone Midtown East amidst widespread criticism from the preservation community and a lack of support from City Council members. None of the modern office buildings proposed by the HDC have been landmarked yet, however 12 of the 31 buildings proposed for evaluation have been ‘calendared’, which is the first formal step in the designation process. Though the Citicorp Center is the only post-war building to be included in this set, it seems that within current negotiations of the rezoning proposal, more attention is being placed on the protection of the district’s historic architecture while promoting opportunities for development that would reinvigorate the district as one that is competitive with other leading commercial districts worldwide.

3.2.2.2. PROTECTING MODERNIST PUBLIC HOUSING ESTATES: SPECIAL PLANNED COMMUNITY PRESERVATION DISTRICTS

The post-war urban renewal programme has been recognised as a significant event in American history, but designation of the built heritage from this era remains controversial. Also taboo is the designation and protection of post-war low- and middle-

income mass housing that often coincided with mass clearances and the demolition of historic neighbourhoods, yet provisions have been made to recognise the value of large-scale inter-war housing projects across the boroughs of New York. Effected in July 1974, the Special Planned Community Preservation Districts designation status was developed by the Department of City Planning to protect inter- and post-war neighbourhoods that had been planned and developed as a single unit. Under this designation, demolition, new construction or alteration of existing buildings or landscaping is not permitted without a special permit from the City Planning Commission. The purpose of Special Districts was to preserve the character and integrity of these planned communities, including circulation plans, landscaping and the use and relationship of buildings and open spaces as superior examples of town planning or large-scale development.\textsuperscript{413} The protection of these Special Districts also served to protect the continued liveability of New York City for a wider variety of residents, but their designation also protected the city from further redevelopment measures on such a grand scale. Under the rules established by The Department of City Planning, to qualify as a Special District, developments must:

(a) Have a land area of at least 1.5 acres

(b) Contain a minimum of three buildings

(c) Have been designed and substantially developed as a unit under the regulations of the Zoning Resolution prior to December 15, 1961; and

(d) Include considerable clustered open space and related commercial uses available to all residents of the District.

Perhaps surprisingly, this legislation was passed when public opinion of Robert Moses and the urban renewal programme was at its lowest, yet, designated Special Districts included Fresh Meadows (1946) in the Borough of Queens – built by the New York Life Insurance Company for WWII veterans, The Harlem River Houses (1937) in Manhattan – New York’s first federally subsided public housing, Parkchester (1938) in the Bronx – built by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and Sunnyside Gardens (1924) in Queens – built by the City Housing Corporation and designed by architects Clarence Stein and Henry Wright. The Harlem River Houses were landmarked in 1975 and were listed on the National Register of Historic Places on 18 December 1979. When the

Harlem River Houses turned 50 years old in 1987, a laudatory article in the New York Times said they wore their age softly and called it a ‘gentle oasis in a rough and ragged edge of town’. In September 1984, Sunnyside Gardens was also listed on the National Register, but by 2003, a grassroots group developed to call attention to the widespread unsuitable changes being made to the estate and called for further protection through its designation as a New York City Historic District. After a contentious public hearing in April 2007, the LPC granted the designation.

Harlem River Houses was a public housing development in the most definitive sense (and remains so today), but Parkchester, like Stuyvesant Town and Peter Cooper Village in Manhattan, was developed through private funding by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company. Planned and built from 1938-42, Parkchester is a 129-acre private development that originally rented affordable units to working-class and middle-income residents. Designed according the tower-in-the-park model, it contains 171 square-plan towers of 8 and 13 storeys, currently housing over 25,000 residents in 12,271 apartments and at 68,807 people per square mile, it is nearly double the density of the surrounding areas in the Bronx. After the development was sold in 1997 to the Community Preservation Corporation (a not-for-profit group that redirects financing from banks into troubled neighbourhoods) a $220 million major rehabilitation focused on detaching the development from the stigmatised image it gained after years of poor maintenance, antisocial behaviour, violence and drug trafficking within the grounds. The rehabilitation also righted a botched attempt to convert the apartments of Parkchester North and South into condos in 1974 and 1986 respectively, but preserved the allocated 1,557 rent-stabilised flats for its current tenants. The Parkchester Preservation Corporation (PPC) – set up by the Community Preservation Corporation to manage renovation works – owns 6,365 units and 500,000 square feet of retail space, while the remaining flats are owner-occupied or owned by outside investors. The value of individual units rehabilitated by PPC nearly tripled in Parkchester South, jumping from $22,000 per one-bedroom unit in

416 The Special District designation does not protect the interiors of the buildings, since this would overstep the private ownership boundaries.
1996 to $60,000 in 2005 after renovations. In 2009, a one-bedroom apartment was valued at upwards of $100,000.

In opening the 2012 Fitch Colloquium ‘Why Preserve Public Housing?’, Andrew Dolkart, Director of Columbia University’s Historic Preservation programme, relayed that not only has New York led the way in constructing public housing in America, but it has also led in its recognition and designation. The First Houses development (1935-6) was landmarked in 1974, and as the first public-sponsored low-income housing project in America, the development was later listed on the National Register on the same day as the Harlem River Houses in December 1979. The Williamsburg Houses (1936-8) were then eventually landmarked in June 2003, after first being presented before the commission in 1981, however when the local preservation group Landmark West petitioned the LPC in 2007 to call a public hearing on the potential designation of the 1947 Amsterdam Houses, the LPC declined saying they did not have the knowledge to judge its value in relation to other projects at the time. While the LPC’s commitment to the conservation of modernist architecture and public housing has been sporadic over the years, their change in attitude in just four years seems odd and was perhaps related to development and real estate concerns.

Facing decades of backlogged repair and maintenance costs across the city’s public housing estates, in autumn 2012, Mayor Michael Bloomberg and the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) announced their controversial Land Lease Plan. The plan would lease open land on eight public housing estates to developers for the construction of new luxury high-rise housing developments, with 80% of flats to be sold at market rate and 20% reserved for affordable housing. To avoid displacing current residents, the NYCHA promised that any new developments would be built on car parks or playground areas, however, current residents felt this plan would infringe on their right to natural light, green space and fresh air – the ideological pillars behind the original modernist tower-in-the-park design. As a case in point, the new 50-storey high-rise tower proposed for the Smith Houses estate would have been monstrously out of scale with the existing 17-storey housing blocks (see Figure 3-4). Tenants Associations across the estates also feared that this was a first step toward the replacement of public housing in Manhattan with upscale, market-rate housing.

419 Barbanel, "Still a Beacon, Parkchester Climbs Back."
The New York Environmental Law and Justice Project (NYELJP) brought a lawsuit against the NYCHA in November 2013 in an attempt to stop the Land Lease Plan and was filed on the grounds that the NYCHA solicited bids from private investors before they had completed the required environmental reviews and floodplain analysis and therefore violated state and federal laws. To support the lawsuit, students in Pratt Institute’s postgraduate historic preservation programme researched the historic and architectural significance of five post-war public housing estates located in Manhattan’s Lower East Side neighbourhood: the Wald Houses (1949), the Jacob Riis Houses (1949), the Alfred E. Smith Houses (1953), the LaGuardia Houses (1957), and the Baruch Houses (1959). The Wald and Jacob Riis Houses were not included in the Land Lease Plan, but were included in the Pratt study as they are located directly adjacent to the Baruch Houses. Having been built between 1949-59, all five estates were potentially eligible for designation on the National Register and as Special Planned Community Preservation Districts, so the students were asked to determine whether more action could be taken to promote and protect the sites.

Figure 3-4. NYCHA Land Lease Pre-RFP Discussion Document for the Alfred E. Smith Houses. Image: Small Town In Town: Preserving Public Housing in New York City webpage

The students proposed two courses of action: 1) that National Register designation be sought for each site so that a Section 106 review would be required; and 2) to seek Special Planned Community Preservation District designation to preserve the
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neighbourhoods as collective units. In the first instance, designation on the National Register would require consent from the NYCHA, which is unlikely to be granted because of the restrictions that could be placed on their expansion proposals. The second proposal is a New York City zoning resolution that could be used to impede any additional building on the estate, but a district designation can only be obtained after a formal public review of the application through the Uniform Land Use Review Procedure (ULURP), which is a long process that requires approval from the Department of City Planning (DCP), the City Planning Commission (CPC), the City Council, the Mayor and the associated Community Boards, Borough Boards and Borough Presidents. Either form of designation is highly controversial, tedious and unlikely to go through, but as has been shown at Parkchester, a Special District designation does not impede interior refurbishment measures or the conversion of low-income flats to market-rate real estate, but it would most likely quash the NYCHA’s plans to fund estate maintenance through the construction of new luxury high-rise buildings on the estates’ open spaces.

A noteworthy alternative to the Land Lease Plan has been proposed in a master’s thesis in urban design by Mahammad Shamsuddin Momin, which reconnects the Baruch, Lillian Ward and Jacob Riis Houses to the Lower East Side community through the reestablishment of the street grid through the estates, but also honours the innovation of post-war public housing in New York by renovating and expanding the existing housing blocks. By restoring the transit corridors to the waterfront, increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic would naturally improve safety on the estates. The plan also proposed rezoning Avenue D and frontage along the waterfront for commercial purposes to bring vitality and work opportunities to the community’s doorstep. Like the Land Lease Plan, Momin’s design advocates to infill some greens spaces along FDR Drive with high-rise mixed-income housing to generate revenue for estate refurbishment and redevelopment, however it also proposed the expansion of the existing public housing with lower-level affordable housing and different community amenities to individualise of the blocks and to create more traditional streetscapes within the estates (see Figure 3-5 and Figure 3-6).
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Figure 3-5. Infill and infrastructure proposal for the Baruch, Lillian Ward and Jacob Riis Houses on the Lower East Side. Image: Mahammad Shamsuddin Momin, ‘From “the projects” to a sustainable community: Re-envisioning public housing in Lower East-Side Manhattan’. 
In May 2015, newly elected Mayor Bill de Blasio announced his own plan to channel money back into New York’s public housing after the Bloomberg Administration’s Land Lease Plan stalled. As of 2015, the NYCHA had an operating deficit of $98 million and a backlog of repairs totalling over £16 billion across its 178,000 flats. As a Democrat, de Blasio ran his mayoral campaign on the promise that he would make New York City liveable for the poor, but similar to Bloomberg’s unpopular Land Lease Plan, Mayor de Blasio’s proposal to lease land to developers within certain public housing estates is estimated to generate $500 million in profits over ten years. However, de Blasio’s plan would require half of the new flats to be let at an affordable rate to low-income tenants who earn no more than 60% of the area’s median income, while Bloomberg’s plan only allocated 20% of new flats as affordable housing.

HUD regional administrator, Holly M. Leicht, has said that to cope with federal disinvestment, ‘this kind of entrepreneurial, self-sufficient approach is necessary…
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reality is that the budget climate in Washington doesn’t support public housing. Mayer de Blasio has recognised inequalities in the plan, stating, ‘Will the building built in 1965, that has been put through hell, be as nice as the new building built in 2017? No! No. Will we keep making the building built in 1965 better with the new money we have? Yes.’

Though the 13,500 below market-rate flats of the 17,000 proposed would still be financially out of reach for the majority of current public housing residents, the Mayor has assured the public that the plan would not lead to the demolition or privatisation of NYCHA public housing or to increased rents or eviction for its current tenants.

Given the financial situation and backlog of repair currently prevalent in NYCHA public housing across the city, the designation of any further public housing estates as Special Planned Communities is unlikely. The history of racial segregation, whether institutionalised or consequential, in NYCHA housing projects and privately funded housing estates like Stuyvesant Town, also acts as a formidable unpalatable barrier to its recognition as heritage. Protection for post-war public housing in New York is most likely to come through a quasi redevelopment/refurbishment of the housing estates that would hopefully subsequently reinvigorate the neighbourhood and ignite discussions about the value of the built heritage of the public housing programme to the city and people of New York.

---
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3.3. THE VALORISATION OF MODERN MOVEMENT HERITAGE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

One does not have to look far to find dissidents of post-war modern buildings in America. On 9 February 2016, ahead of a talk at the Smithsonian on the modern architectural heritage of Washington, D.C., the Washington Post petitioned readers to vote for the city’s ugliest building, choosing from the following selection: the J Edgar Hoover Building (1975), the James V Forrestal Building (1969), the Robert C Weaver Building (1968, listed on the National Register of Historic Places in August 2008) and the Hubert H Humphrey Building (1972). All of these buildings were designed by prominent modernist architects of that time and were constructed under the auspices of the General Services Administration. Of the 1156 respondents, 79% of votes were equally split between the Hoover Building and Humphrey Building, while the remaining 21% was split equally between the two younger buildings. This trivial poll has however shown that the American public generally associates architectural heritage with age value, and is, at this point, more likely to accept mid-century modern architecture as heritage than buildings from the 1970s and 1980s.

Outlined in this section are attempts by governmental and non-governmental heritage agencies to identify, document and raise awareness for post-war modern movement architecture across the United States. Under Section 3.3.1, among other smaller and more locally based thematic studies, a thematic study of buildings constructed by the General Services Administration across the country from 1949 onward has revealed a greater public interest in these buildings than the federal government had perhaps imagined. As a whole, non-profit and grassroots groups have been found to lead the reValorisation of modern movement heritage across the US, with the National Trust’s Modernism + Recent Past leading as the most collated and active nationwide initiative. Finally, we will look at the struggles and progress made in Boston by preservation groups working to reawaken its residents to the significance of the city’s post-war building programme.

3.3.1. **THEMATIC STUDIES**

Thematic surveys have not been used as predominantly by the US National Park Service to identify and subsequently statutorily designate significant modern movement buildings as they have by Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland. Instead, thematic studies and surveys of modern movement heritage have been largely prepared by local non-profit heritage organisations that rely on volunteers, students of architectural preservation programmes and pro bono work from conservation professionals. DOCOMOMO US has also provided a platform for the documentation and discussion of significant buildings of the modern movement through its newsletter, journal and academic conferences. A number of these newsletters have been devoted to certain themes, building types or architects, and therefore function as sort of survey. For instance, the Spring 2007 newsletter surveyed the current state and existing threats to a number of significant post-war buildings across the US designed by brutalist architect Paul Rudolph.

However, in response to a growing body of academic research on America’s suburban movement and its built environment, in September 2002, National Register historians completed an extensive report titled *Suburbanization of Metropolitan Areas in the United States, 1830-1960* and published their findings as the National Register Bulletin, *Historic Residential Suburbs: Guidelines for the Evaluation and Documentation for the National Register of Historic Places*. The bulletin established an important national context for suburban built heritage from 1830 to 1960 and like other NR bulletins, it provides guidelines to assist applicants with the identification, documentation and nomination of historic suburbs and suburban properties to the NRHP. In association with the report, the NPS also submitted the Multiple Property Submission, *Historic Residential Suburbs in the United States, 1830-1960*, with the intent for additional properties to be listed in the future under one of the four categories: Railroad and Horsecar Suburbs, 1830 to 1890; Streetcar Suburbs, 1888 to 1928; Early Automobile Suburbs, 1908 to 1945; or Post-World War II and Early Freeway Suburbs, 1945 to 1960. The Post-World War II and Early Freeway Suburbs, 1945-1960 subcategory is the most comprehensive national level thematic survey to specifically address post-war modern movement architecture in
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America and has therefore given SHPOs and municipal preservation commissions a framework by which to identify and designate their local post-war residential heritage.\textsuperscript{432}

To support the Route 66 Corridor Preservation Program, the National Park Service commissioned the 380-page \textit{Route 66 National Historic Context Study} (2004) written by Michael Cassity, however, according to Emily Koller, Arizona, Illinois and New Mexico had all submitted Multiple Property Submissions prior to the publication of the study, thus ‘suggesting the federal report was inspired by local and state level preservation needs’.\textsuperscript{433} Without a coordinated effort on a federal level to survey the architectural heritage of the recent past, most SHPOs approach nominations and surveys in an ad-hoc fashion, driven largely by the interests of individuals, advocacy groups or historic tax credit projects, which is demonstrated in the diversity of Multiple Property Submissions made for recent past buildings and sites across the country through 2010 (see Figure 3-7).\textsuperscript{434} However, Koller found that most SHPOs do not have adequate staff to complete such nominations, so property owners or historic consultants generally prepare the nominations with advice from NRHP staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US</th>
<th>Suburbanization of Metropolitan Areas in the United States, 1830-1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postwar Modern Housing and GIS Study of Scottsdale Subdivisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scottsdale Postwar Multifamily Housing Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tucson Post WWII Residential subdivision Development 1945-1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Cultural Resources of the Recent Past Historic Context Report: City of Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego Modernism Historic Context Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Arapahoe Acres Historic District (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspen Postwar Context Papers: Chalet, Rustic, Pan Abode, and Modern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historic Context of Littleton Colorado 1949-1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Suburbanization in the Vicinity of Wilmington, Delaware, 1880-1950+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Lustron Houses in Georgia (1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The American Small House Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ordinary Iconic Ranch House: Mid-20th-Century Ranch Houses in Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Modern and Recent Past Context Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Recent Past Survey – Northern Cook County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Modernism in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Design, and Art in Bartholomew County, 1942-1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa Usonian Houses by Frank Lloyd Wright, 1945-1960 (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Lustron Houses of Kansas (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana Architecture: 1945-1965 Post-War Subdivisions and the Ranch House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Armour Boulevard Post-World War II Apartment Building Historic District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Lustrons in New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Twentieth Century Suburban Growth of Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Post World War Two Survey: Charlotte-Mecklenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Development of Modernism in Raleigh, 1945-1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In 2008, Jeanne Lambin and Janine Duncan conducted a different sort of thematic study through which they documented and collated the variety of terms used to describe the architectural styles of the recent past (1945-2007). The ‘Naming Names’ study was supported by the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions to aid municipal preservation commissions across the US with the identification, evaluation and nomination of post-war architecture through the creation of a comprehensive and expanding inventory of existing style names. A rich variety of architectural styles formerly unknown outwith their regional use were recorded, totaling 159 new styles within the study period, from the ‘Workman’s Shack’ in Monterey, California to the ‘German Vernacular Revival’ in Hagerstown, Maryland. Other regional styles included ‘Ozarks Giraffe’, ‘Machine-Cut House’, ‘Structural Aesthetics’ and ‘Mountain Chalet’, revealing that post-war architecture in America was much more than Brutalism, Neo-Brutalism, Roadside Kitsch and Googie architecture.

In 2010, with help and funding from the Getty Conservation Institute, the City of Los Angeles began an extensive survey of the whole city to identify its historic and cultural resources that broadly fall within the period of 1850 – 1980. The significant sites identified are now being logged into a specially created HistoricPlacesLA digital archive, which has a section specifically devoted to ‘L.A. Modernism (1919-1980)’ under which 739 sites were already listed as of May 2016. The Los Angeles Conservancy has compiled a similar online search archive of over 350 modernist buildings, sites and neighbourhoods as part of its Curating the City: Modern Architecture in LA initiative.

During the spring of 2013, students in Columbia University’s postgraduate historic preservation programme assessed the significance of 88 public schools built in Manhattan.

---

from approximately 1945 to 1975, which was the first study of its kind. Though all of the buildings surveyed would have been eligible for landmark designation based on age, the students found that educational buildings of this era have been overlooked by the LPC and other heritage amenity groups and that most of the buildings suffer from insensitive alterations, deferred maintenance or threats of demolition. Adding to their vulnerability, a public review process is not required before municipally-owned properties are demolished, meaning they could be demolished quickly and quietly without requirements to notify the public of their plans to do so. Even if a public school has been landmarked, the report explains that since the School Construction Authority (SCA) is a state-funded government agency charged with the maintenance of the public school facilities, it is not required to notify the LPC before any alterations are made to the buildings. The survey concluded that 60 of the 88 schools surveyed would be eligible for a Multiple Property Designation on the NRHP under Criterion A and C. Of these, the authors found that eight were of extraordinary significance and recommended that they be submitted individually for local landmark designation, if not for the further protection that the LPC could typically provide, but for the recognition and prestige that accompanies designation.

The most comprehensive survey of post-war buildings undertaken by a federal agency resulted from increased public interest in the heritage value of the General Services Administration (GSA) buildings following the announcement of the federal government’s plans to renovate the buildings. President Harry Truman established the General Services Administration in 1949 to manage existing and new governmental buildings across the country. Fifty years later, the First Impressions initiative set out to improve the public’s perception of the General Services Administration by refreshing the image of its public buildings designed during the 1950s-70s. The renovation initiative inadvertently instigated a public-led preservation movement, which reawakened the government to its history as a patron of modern design. Between 1960 and 1976, the GSA launched over 700 building projects across the country including libraries, museums, courthouses, research laboratories, border crossing stations and office buildings and employed some of the most notable modernist architects to design the most important buildings, including Mies van der Rohe (Everett M. Dirksen U.S. Courthouse, Chicago, 1964) and Marcel
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Many GSA buildings serve as the interface between the government and the public, and were therefore designed to present a certain image. The Public Buildings Act of 1959 handed over sole responsibility for federal construction projects to the GSA, and subsequently, in 1962, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan penned what would become the Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture, wherein he advocated against the development of an official style, but instead for buildings that embodied ‘the finest American architectural thought’. Federal buildings were designed to be efficient, economic and flexible in function, but Moynihan was clear that the design principles should flow from the architectural profession to the Government, not the other way around, and that the Government should be prepared to pay more for the employment of distinguished architects and artists.

Three of the four large-scale federal complexes selected for the First Impressions renovation initiative were designed and built in the 1960s in a late-modern style, including the William S. Moorehead Federal Building in Pittsburgh, the Peter W. Rodino, Jr. Federal Building in Newark and the Byron Rogers Federal Building and Courthouse in Denver. The fourth, the Wilbur J. Cohen Federal Building in Washington, DC, was completed in 1939 in a stripped down Egyptian Revival style and has been subsequently listed on the National Register of Historic Places in July 2007 as a result of the GSA survey. The $1.65 million dollar First Impressions improvement project at the Byron Rogers Federal Complex was halted in the design phase by an unexpected outcry from Denver citizens who feared the removal of the artistic bronze column and character-defining canopies linking the buildings, which would undermine its potential historic significance. Interest in the building coincided with the publication of Denver: the Modern City, which recognised the Byron Rogers Federal Complex as the city’s best example of Late-Modern Formalism. The historic merit of the building was assessed against the National Register Bulletin 22: Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties That Have Achieved Significance Within the Last Fifty Years and though it
was not deemed significant enough to merit its listing under Criterion Consideration G in 2001, the committee anticipated it would fully meet the designation requirements for buildings over 50 years old (2015 marked the 50th year of the complex and it is not yet designated on a local or national level). Though these findings meant the GSA was not obligated to consider the building’s historic significance in its renovation scheme, the assessment modified the original scheme in the following ways:

- A revised glass entrance pavilion was designed, incorporating greatly improved queuing and security screening. Within it, original water features with a modified pool design - which provided a distinct amenity - were reinstated.

- The bronze art column, which was difficult to incorporate into the entrance pavilion space, was moved to the plaza and incorporated into its landscape design.

- The canopies, as key design element that linked the buildings, sheltered pedestrians and established a sense of scale for the buildings, were retained. The position of the new entry pavilion was adjusted to start just behind the existing canopy. A small glass canopy was designed between the new pavilion and the existing covered walkway.

- The plaza’s landscape design incorporated a new diagonal path (with landscaping) to provide clear pedestrian circulation to the new entrance pavilion. Other plaza modifications included the reinstatement of original flat lawn panels, benches, and trees.

The public outcry surrounding the renovation of the Byron Rogers Federal Complex highlighted a need for a better understanding of the GSA’s post-war architectural heritage, so the GSA brought together 75 leading preservation and heritage experts for a symposium titled ‘Architecture of the Great Society: A Forum on Public Architecture from the 1960s and 1970s’ at Yale University on 5 December 2000. A panel of experts reconvened the following February and its first initiative was to commission a study of GSA buildings and their heritage value, the findings of which were later published as Growth, Efficiency, and Modernism: GSA Buildings of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s. With over 550 modern-era buildings in the GSA’s inventory, David Winstead of the GSA Public Buildings Service said that in regards to evaluating modern federal properties of
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During the survey, the Chicago Federal Center was recognised as one of Mies van der Rohe’s finest works and as the ultimate realisation of the principles he employed at Crown Hall and the Seagram Building. In consultation with the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency, the GSA determined it was eligible for National Register designation and that the significant features of the Dirksen Courthouse in particular should be preserved. Though other Chicago buildings attributed to Mies - the IBM Building, Crown Hall and 860-880 Lake Shore Drive - have all been listed as Chicago Landmarks and on the National Register of Historic Places, the Chicago Federal Center is yet to be designated on either. Marcel Breuer’s Robert C Weaver Federal Building (1968), however, was designated on the National Register on 26 August 2008 and though interior alterations have been made, much of the interior retains its original finishes and the exterior is well maintained and has not been altered.

The Yale symposium had advocated for the development of an inventory of the GSA’s modern buildings that included a schedule for evaluation based on architectural merit, which would then be divided into three categories: those to be preserved, those that could be sensitively renovated and those that could be extensively renovated (if not replaced). A large number of GSA buildings were individually evaluated, which included selective condition assessments, and the findings were sent to the relevant SHPOs, but this analysis also ensures that the GSA will be able to make informed conservation decisions going forward. For the modern buildings ‘in the middle ground—neither great nor hopeless’, the report advocated that the GSA take a creative approach to renovation, and that designs should embrace functional changes and the introduction of new commercial spaces and a general redesigning of the buildings so that ‘while they are respectful of their Modern roots, they give a positive impression of the Federal government and the public services the buildings support’. With the symposium proceedings, a list of 254 GSA buildings (larger than 25,000 ft²) constructed between 1960-1980 was compiled by state, and in 2007, the Historic Building Poster and Brochure Series highlighted 11 of the
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most distinguished modern era GSA buildings. A full inventory for modern GSA buildings has yet to be developed, however an assessment checklist was published as part of the *Growth, Efficiency, and Modernism* document to help GSA regions evaluate the eligibility of their buildings for the NHRP.⁴⁴⁸

### 3.3.2. THE ROLE OF NON-PROFIT PRESERVATION ADVOCACY GROUPS

Numerous local modernist preservation advocacy groups exist throughout the United States from the Save the Signs mid-century neon sign preservation group in Denver, Colorado to the municipal preservation organisations like Preservation Houston, which teamed up with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Houston Mod in 2015 to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the opening of the Houston Astrodome stadium. These grassroots conservation groups can sometimes instigate great change, as was the case with the threatened demolition of Frank Lloyd Wright’s Robie House (1910) in Chicago. When the house came under threat in 1957, community activism led to the creation of the Chicago Landmarks Commission and the house was the first building it designated.⁴⁴⁹ The house was subsequently listed on the National Register in 1966 and was restored to its original state by the Frank Lloyd Wright Preservation Trust in 2003.

On a national level, the Recent Past Preservation Network (RPPN) was originally established in 2000 as a national non-profit advocacy group to protest the demolition of Richard Neutra’s Cyclorama Building in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Despite its failed campaign, the organisation has continued to promote collaboration and networking between independent grassroots modernist preservation groups dispersed across the country. Co-founded by Richard Longstreth (Director of the Historic Preservation graduate programme at George Washington University and former President of the Society of Architectural Historians) and Michael Tomlan (Director of the Historic Preservation Planning graduate programme at Cornell University and Project Director for the National Council for Preservation Education), the advocacy measures of the RPPN rely primarily on its network of professionals, students and interested members of the public to raise awareness and advocate for the preservation of underappreciated but important


modernist and recent past buildings across the country. The organisation also coordinates a number of educational events and a quarterly magazine, *Connections*, and provides support for local preservation initiatives through letters of support, advice and promotional support through its wider distribution network.

New York RPPN board member Frampton Tolbert explained during an interview in 2013 that the RPPN has evolved into a ‘more scrappy, grassroots [advocacy] group’ to protest the demolition of other significant modern buildings because DOCOMOMO US and its regional and state chapters generally remain a high-style, high-minded organisation that prefers to address modern movement conservation through scholarly articles, conferences and research. Given DOCOMOMO’s focus on serious modernism designed by acclaimed architects, the founders of RPPN felt there was room for a conservation group that championed the lesser-known regional modernisms, the kitchy Tiki-inspired architecture of cocktail lounges and the amateur googie roadside diners and drive-ins of the 1950s and 1960s.

As of June 2013, the RPPN discontinued paid membership fees on the basis that other organisations like the National Trust had taken interest in recent past heritage. Since then, the RPPN has gone rather quiet, but it continues to run under a board of volunteer directors scattered across the country and remains focused on the development of a few specific initiatives. The RPPN’s 2014 list of Endangered Recent Past Properties published in the Winter 2015 edition of its magazine was the first endangered list compiled of specifically modern movement buildings anywhere in the United States, however this list has not yet been published on its website or updated since 2014. Its State Representatives programme aims to recruit one representative from each of the 50 states whose job would be to feed news of modern movement conservation initiatives or threats to the RPPN for greater distribution. Through the State Representatives programme, the RPPN also hopes to provide an outlet for local enthusiasts to discuss the future of recent past heritage in the states not currently represented by one of the 14 established local DOCOMOMO chapters.

Section 3.3.2.1 will look at the National Trust’s growing interest in modern movement heritage through its recently established Modernism + Recent Past programme and the effects this nationally coordinated programme has had on the local valorisation of modernist architecture. Section 3.3.3 will then look at the effect of the TrustModern
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initiative and other more local conservation advocacy groups on the revalorisation of long-loathed modern movement buildings in Boston.

3.3.2.1. **The National Trust Modernism + Recent Past Programme**

Preceding the creation of the National Trust by three years, Ronald F. Lee, the northeast director of the National Park Service, addressed the American Association for State and Local History, warning that the technological nature of post-war America demanded a unified national preservation movement with clear objectives in order to safeguard the nation’s heritage. The National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) was created on 26 October 1949 after President Harry S. Truman signed a congressional charter establishing it as a non-profit organisation charged with encouraging public participation in the preservation of historic sites through education and advocacy. Modelled partly after the National Trust of England, the NTHP was designed to function as a central support organisation for other non-profit, private and grassroots conservation groups. Reflecting a growing nationwide concern, by the late-1950s, the Trust’s focus had already begun to turn away from championing private house museums toward the more litigious endeavour of establishing historic districts in an attempt to stem the advance of post-war urban renewal schemes and the interstate highway programme.

Although the NTHP was established to protect earlier heritage from modernist developments, the Trust actually acquired its first modern property in 1964 when Frank Lloyd Wright’s Usonian Pope-Leighey House (1941) was moved onto Woodlawn Plantation in Mount Vernon, Virginia to save it from demolition in relation to a new highway scheme. The National Trust next acquired Philip Johnson’s 1949 Glass House in 1986 (also listed on the National Register in 1997) and Mies van der Rohe’s 1951 Farnsworth House in 2003. As a national property steward, the Trust continues to focus first on safeguarding the most significant private homes and individual works of
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452 After the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Trust became a receiver of federal funds through a grant-matching programme and membership grew exponentially in correspondence and remains the single largest national organisation through which private citizens can become involved with the preservation of their own local heritage.
453 Following the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act, the National Trust was granted federal funding, but after thirty years, this agreement was terminated by mutual agreement and the organisation now functions off private donations.
modernist design and would typically have little interest in public housing or any other publicly owned buildings.

The National Trust first formally addressed modernist heritage in 2003 at its annual conference *New Frontiers in Preservation* in a session titled ‘Recent Past Advocacy: You want to save what?’.

Kelli Shapiro writes that this title accurately conveyed the preservation community’s bewilderment with the growing conservation movement, but despite the title, the very existence of this session and four other related sessions, plus a number of modern site visits, was evidence that the movement had already taken root. A marked change for proponents of this conservation movement was that age-value was no longer held as a central indicator of significance. Instead, proponents advocated for a more broad, multi-faceted reading of significance that included values such as social and cultural contexts to embrace working class heritage and lower-pedigree architecture like the quirky roadside architecture of the mid-20th century.

In 2009, the National Trust inaugurated the Modernism + Recent Past Programme, also known as TrustModern, with an aim to reignite the American public’s interest in the architecture and heritage of the modern movement through the creation of an action network of interested individuals and organisations, and to establish stronger protection policies from a local to federal level. From 2009 - 2011, TrustModern supported the Modern Module programme, which aimed to gain public support and incite conversations about the nation’s modern heritage in three cities – Minneapolis, Los Angeles and Boston (see Section 3.3.2.2). Since the publication of the Minneapolis Modern Module document, M. Paul Friedberg’s Peavey Plaza (1975) has been listed as a National Historic Landmark and Ralph Rapson’s brutalist Cedar Square West housing estate (1974) was listed on the NRHP, both likely due to a greater research base and wider public interest. Also with support from the Modernism + Recent Past Programme in 2009, grant writer and preservation planner Seth Tinkham travelled to twelve major American cities in 30 days to document local efforts to conserve modernist architecture. From speaking with
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city officials, directors of non-profit organisation and local residents, Tinkham made the following observations: 458

Surveys: Although some communities do have architectural surveys that identify significant Modern buildings, most existing surveys are outdated. Local governments and preservation non-profits have little information on the breadth of Modern resources in their communities.

Materials: Property owners struggle to find appropriate replacement materials and fixtures for their Modern era properties. There is a need for professional guidance on material conservation and suitable replacement materials. Design guidelines for recent past resources are almost nonexistent.

Social Media Use: Many of the organizations visited found social media is a highly effective outreach tool for individuals interested in the preservation of Modern resources. Social media is also an effective way to reach interest groups and demographics not traditionally engaged with preservation groups.

Public Engagement: There is a need for programs that support public engagement with Modern era resources. Many organizations have a difficult time setting more recent resources within a historical narrative, particularly one that likely includes their membership’s own lifetimes. A number of organizations have developed educational programs to provide individuals with a better understanding of Modern architecture, but the need exists to draft national contexts for the Modern movement.

Defining “Historic”: Property owners are confused about what “historic” means. The requirements for a building in terms of the age at which it becomes eligible for historic designation differ at local, state and national levels. Many feel the National Register of Historic Places criteria that a structure be older than fifty years and that the architect most closely associated with its construction be no longer living unfairly limit the listing of newer resources.

Thinking About Preservation in New Ways: The vast number of Modern and recent past resources dictates the need for new, more creative ways of conducting preservation. A less curatorial approach – say, saving half a building in its original condition and renovating the other half – requires a diminished focus on the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties but strives toward the ultimate goal of allowing a larger number of buildings to remain in use and in the landscape.

Tinkham’s findings are interesting for a number of reasons. First, rather than seeing the National Register’s 50-year rule as a useful tool to judge heritage from an impartial

distance, it is largely seen as an unfair limitation which leaves a vast number of significant buildings unprotected, modern or otherwise. Secondly, those working with modern buildings are asking for more guidance on which aspects are considered to be contributing factors to the building’s significance and which materials and products are recommended for the replacement of typical failures. This request for greater detail in listing descriptions reflects the requests that created the need for the Constructive Conservation programme recently enacted by Historic England. And finally, professionals and building owners are calling for a more fluid concept of conservation to confront the all-or-noting mentality in American preservation practice.

During his visit to New York, Tinkham raised an interesting point about the current popular interest in modern movement heritage: ‘Why did the complete refurbishment of 2 Columbus Circle (Edward Durrell Stone, 1964) not have as profound of an effect on the conservation movement in America as did the demolition of Pennsylvania Station?’ This, however, is not exactly true. In fact, a fight had been waged to save the building and it became one of the most controversial landmark cases since Jackie Kennedy Onassis petitioned for the designation of Grand Central Station in 1978. Edward Durrell Stone had broken code with his Venetian Gothic-inspired modernism, but loved or loathed, it became an iconic building in Manhattan. Discussions about the designation of 2 Columbus Circle as a New York City landmark began in 1996, just after the building turned 30 years old. In November 1996, influential New York architect, professor and writer Robert A. M. Stern included 2 Columbus Circle in his New York Times article, ‘A Preservationist’s List of 35 Modern Landmarks-in-Waiting’. However, the LPC had turned down an application to hold a public hearing on the future of the building that same year and continued to do so for the next decade. Without a public hearing, a property cannot be designated as a NYC Landmark. At the end of 2003, New York Times architectural critic Herbert Muschamp wrote:

The refusal of the New York City Landmarks Commission to hold hearings on the future of 2 Columbus Circle is a shocking dereliction of public duty. Unacceptable in itself, this abdication also raises the scary question of what other buildings the commission might choose to overlook in the future.
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In March 2005, conservation advocacy group Landmark West submitted a formal nomination for 2 Columbus Circle to the State and National Register of Historic Places, and two months later, they filed a second Request for Evaluation to the LPC and called for Chairman Robert B Tierney to step down due to his conflict of interests. On 25 May 2005, Landmark West filed an Article 78 lawsuit against LPC Chairman Tierney, the Museum of Arts and Design (which resided in 2 Columbus Circle) and its affiliates Laurie Beckelman, Holly Hotchner, and Jerome Chazen for ‘conspiracy to obstruct and subvert the lawful functioning of the New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission’ and accused Tierney of colluding with the buyer to prevent 2 Columbus Circle from being landmarked. The ‘Landmarks Hearing’ Bill Intro. 0705-2005, also known as the Perkins Bill, would have empowered the City Council (with the attainment of a majority vote) to force the LPC to hold a public hearing on a proposed landmark and would have ensured that buildings that received substantial public support received a democratic public hearing.

Despite the aggressive, high-profile petitions, op-eds and protests attended by world-renown architects and preservation activists, the Department of Buildings approved the permit to remove the building’s façade on 29 June 2005, just days after it had been included on the World Monuments Fund’s 100 Most Endangered List. The destruction of Pennsylvania Station sparked the creation of federal preservation laws, but on 3 January 2006, the New York Supreme Court, Appellate Division, denied Landmark West’s appeal in the lawsuit against LPC Chair Robert Tierney et. al, and Tierney was reinstated as chairman. Like Pennsylvania Station, 2 Columbus Circle was just under 50 years old when it was heavily altered, and though the Landmarks Hearing Bill did not pass, the 2 Columbus Circle case has united preservation activists and incited a greater urgency to recognise and protect New York’s modern architecture in all its forms.

In 2011, the Trust announced a new programme, National Treasures, through which it aims to highlight significant endangered buildings and places across the country. Though this programme does not focus specifically on modern movement heritage, modernist post-war heritage on this list includes the 1963 Miami Marine Stadium, Bertrand Goldberg’s 1975 Prentice Women’s Hospital in Chicago (demolished October 2013) and the 1965 Houston Astrodome. The Trust has also begun to focus on the future of less iconic post-war constructions like the roadside motels that sprung up along Route 66 in the era of automobile tourism from the 1920s-1950s.

3.3.2.2. **BOSTON BRUTALISM: RE-EVALUATING ITS SIGNIFICANCE AND CONTINUED VALUE**

David Eisen, author of *Boston Modern: Spirit of Reinvention* (funded by the TrustModern programme), has argued that perhaps more so than any other American city, Boston’s post-war ‘cultural aspirations found expression in structures of unrivalled sculptural ingenuity’. Boston’s economy boomed in the 1960s and 1970s and its financial
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robustness and pioneering business strength was reflected in the robust architectural forms of some of its most important civic and institutional buildings of that time. Though architectural enthusiasts flock to Boston to see its tangle of inner-city highways and monumental concrete modernist buildings, Boston’s citizens have long been uncomfortable with the remains of its post-war urban renewal programme. In an article for a special National Trust journal issue focused on the Modernism + Recent Past programme, architectural historian Alan Hess wrote that as modernism came of age in the 1960s, the tumult of styles, from the formulaic corporate modernism of universities and business headquarters to the neo-formalism that let architects experiment with the reintroduction of traditional features like symmetry and ornament, ‘leaves today’s cities with something to offend nearly everyone, especially proponents of International Style minimalism.’

The Boston City Hall, designed by architects Gerhard Kallmann and Michael McKinnell, opened in 1969 to considerable acclaim, both from the professional field and the public, however it has since failed to be fully accepted by the community it served and has been under threat of demolition for years. While on a historic Freedom Trail walking tour with his daughter, Greg Galer, Executive Director of the Boston Preservation Alliance (BPA), said the guide stopped in front of the Old City Hall (1865) and exclaimed, ‘This is Old City Hall, which is a great looking building, and in a little bit I’ll show you the ugliest building in the City!’ - referring of course to the newer City Hall. Biased views like this being propagate through organised architectural tours is systemic and the National Trust has acknowledged that it must be addressed within their scope and at their historic properties. Galer says this group think mentality is a huge burden for advocates of modern movement conservation in Boston, but he also said that if Boston residents are spoken to one on one and he can explain that the Alliance is not advocating that City Hall should be kept as-is, then people tend to think more openly about it.

Galer admits that Kallmann and McKinnell’s City Hall is not his own favourite building ‘by any stretch’ and that there are a few people on the BPA board who spout out comments like, ‘Why shouldn’t we just blow the darn thing up?’, but he said he enjoys the City Hall discussion because it gets at the crux of what conservation is and what it is not. For him, conservation is not about whether any one person, group or the entire majority of a city likes or dislikes a building; it is about whether the building is important to the context, to the story of a city and to its development. Part of the problem with

modern movement conservation is that the decisions are often guided by a small group of specialists to whom the general public feel they cannot relate, and thus the public resents that these specialists are making decisions for their community without their involvement. To address this and to gain a wider, more diverse audience, Galer has been working to bring as many non-architects and non-designers into the Friends of Boston City Hall advocacy group, which has been growing steadily in membership over the past few years.

Unlike organisations like the Landmark Preservation Commission in New York or Boston, the Boston Preservation Alliance has no legal authority. However, because the Boston Landmarks Commission (BLC) must act within its legal regulatory framework and often does not have the resources to contact local newspapers, to incite public interest and to follow up on every preservation issue, the Boston Preservation Alliance heads up these activism measures. As an advocacy group, Galer explained that is in the remit of BPA to ‘scream bloody murder’ and ‘to rally the troops and make a big stink’ if historic property owners or developers choose not to listen to them.\(^{464}\) However, Galer is trying to move the organisation away from this sort of reactionary response and to instead establish the BPA as the go-to source for preservation advice. Galer is also working to establish a relationship with developers from the beginning so that they can collaboratively tweak the plans where they impinge on the historical significance or character of a place. In this way, the BPA would act as the middleman between the developer, the neighbourhood groups and the BLC. This arrangement is gaining a foothold, however, the BPA’s involvement is not always welcome, and in these cases, Galer says the developers proceed at their own peril.

Preceding and during the Second World War, the universities of Boston and Cambridge attracted some of Europe’s most visionary modern architects. Walter Gropius, along with his protégé Marcel Breuer, settled in Cambridge and became influential leaders in the Harvard Graduate School of Design and through the firm Gropius established with a group of next generation modernists, The Architects’ Collaborative (TAC). Ralph Rapson, architect of the ‘New Town-In Town’ Cedar Square West housing development in Minneapolis (see Section 3.4.2.1), taught at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) from 1946-1954 until he was hired as Dean of Architecture at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities. Barcelona-born Josep Lluis Sert moved to Cambridge in 1953 to
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take a position as Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Design, where he developed
the first urban design degree programme in America, Europe and perhaps the world.
During this time, Sert designed a number of buildings for Harvard, including the Holyoke
Center (1958-65), Peabody Terrace (1962-64) and the Harvard Science Center (1969-72),
as well as a complex of buildings for Boston University including the main library, law
tower and student union (1960-65) (see Section 3.4.3.2). Le Corbusier designed the
Carpenter Center for Harvard University in 1963 and Eero Saarinen’s presence is notable
through his design for the Kresge Auditorium and Chapel (both 1955) at MIT. Many of
these buildings have undergone renovation works over the past five to ten years, with the
works at Kresge Auditorium and Chapel most abiding by a restoration approach.

Despite all the star-power behind these aforementioned buildings, none have been
designated at a local, state or national level. The first and only modernist building to be
designated as a Boston Landmark is the Christian Science Center complex (landmarked 9
March 2011), which includes the Sunday School Building (1971), the Administration
Building (1972), the Church Colonnade Building (1972) and surrounding designed
landscape. The Friends of the Boston City Hall submitted a petition in October 2007 to
landmark Kallmann and McKinnell’s City Hall building, and as of June 2016, the
application is ‘under study’, which means that the petition has been accepted by a
preliminary hearing, but a public hearing to designate the property has not yet been
held.

The City Hall is not the only monumental modern building in Boston to be
underappreciated and slated for demolition or redevelopment. Architect Paul Rudolph
had a prodigious career and many of his finest, most experimental and most humanist
brutalist buildings are located in Boston. Architect and DOCOMOMO member David
Fixler has described Rudolph’s Government Services Center as otherworldly and as
having a ‘Piranesian quality that both awes and intimidates’. Controversial and iconic
equal measures, the Government Services Center (1962-71) has featured in numerous
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blockbuster films and television series, yet, along with the BC-BS Building (1960), Boston City Hall (1969) and the twin towers of the Gropius-designed JFK Federal Building (1966), it was elected by Boston Globe readers in 2010 as one of the most ugly buildings in Boston. Against the tide, Fixler agues for the GSC’s continued presence in the city through an innovative transformation:  

It is easy to point to this complex as an act of architectural hubris; flawed and perhaps dystopian from the perspective of the pedestrian either experiencing the complex at street level or trying to navigate its labyrinthine plans – but it is nonetheless heroic in its formal virtuosity, manifesting a utopian ideal about the ability of architecture to mold one’s experience of both the institution and the city. …In order for this complex to remain a viable component of Boston, it will have to change – especially in its engagement with the city at street level. This will demand creative, even visionary transformative thinking that we, as preservationists, should advocate. By doing so, we can then actively inform a process that will ensure that transformation does not obscure the enduring essence of this powerful work.

While the fate of the Government Services Center remains untold, attitudes toward Boston’s post-war architectural heritage are slowly changing. Shortly after Mayor Martin Walsh took office in January 2014, he announced the Rethink City Hall programme and called for design proposals to reinvigorate the City Hall as the civic heart of the city. The associated webpage says the campaign is looking for strategies to create ‘a greener environment’ and for proposals that envision ‘more welcoming, engaging and collaborative spaces.’ The original architects considered its style to be part of the New Monumentality movement, not brutalism, and the campaign fittingly aims to reinstate City Hall as a monument to the people of Boston. While the futures of many other modern movement buildings in Boston remain uncertain, the BC-BS Building - one of Rudolph’s most innovative works - is currently under study by the BLC for landmark designation after years of being under threat of demolition.

469 Ibid. (p. 7).
In March 2007, the New York Times alerted readers to the impending demolition threat to the Blue Cross-Blue Shield (BC-BS) office building (1956-60) in downtown Boston at 133 Federal Street. At the time, Mayor Thomas Menino had backed design proposals by developer and current owner of the building, Steve Belkin of Trans National Properties, who had secured Renzo Piano as the lead design architect on the project. Piano’s 80-storey (1,000 foot tall) tower would have been part of Mayor Menino’s pursuit to re-establish downtown Boston as a hub of contemporary architecture. Not wholly adverse to the plans, David Fixler, speaking for DOCOMOMO New England, expressed how the new construction and the original building could compliment each other, saying,

We are not opposed to the new development, but we would like to think there is a solution that could accommodate the preservation of Mr. Rudolph’s building. It is a very significant piece of Boston’s architectural heritage and deserves a complete hearing. …There is a spirit of structural and system experimentation associated with the Rudolph building that is very close to Renzo Piano’s. If it could be saved, it would make a good neighbor to his tower.

---


According to DOCOMOMO New England, the 14-storey BC-BS Building was the first modernist office block to be built in downtown Boston, but more importantly, it was the first to address its surrounding 19th century streetscape through a new modern design context. Moving away from the glossy neutrality of the International Style, Rudolph looked to the existing street for inspiration and based his window dimensions on those of its traditional neighbours and arranged them vertically rather than in horizontal bands, which had become a trademark of modernism.474 In a speech given for the 1954 annual American Institute of Architects meeting in Boston, Rudolph expressed his early philosophies on urbanism and on developing a more humane modernism, declaring that ‘Modern architecture’s range of expression is today from A to B. We build isolated buildings with no regard to the space between them, monotonous and endless streets, too many goldfish bowls, too few caves.’475 Rudolph was not alone in believing that purely mechanical solutions to architectural problems were leading to the degradation of the modernist ethos. In the panel discussion, Eero Saarinen asked, ‘Have we gone overboard on too many big windows, creating too many thermo-problems? Is the flat roof really the answer to all problems?’ The panel agreed that the modern movement was lacking inspiration and failed to ‘respond to the “human response”’. Josep Lluis Sert had already by this time begun to incorporate traditional elements like arches and vaulted walkways into his designs, of which he said, ‘Today we need a new vocabulary, rich and flexible… By now we should have something more than mere practicality, which need not conflict with the functional but should add other elements to it.’476

Architectural historian Vincent J. Scully Jr. applauded the BC-BS Building’s ‘excellent relationship to the pre-existing street’ and said it foreshadowed the Smithson’s refined Economist Building in London, which was listed in 1988.477 Scully credited Rudolph’s singular design intuition, saying he ‘has continued to pursue his lonely compulsions, a solitary performer, whose buildings always tend to look better than most of those around them, the work of man with remarkable optical gifts and an unerring instinct not so much for creating space as for positioning objects in it’ and further said that his Government Services Center was ‘one of the few elements of that redevelopment area which give the impression of even minimal competence in urbanistic design’.478 The Architectural Forum, however, was not as convinced of the merits of the BC-BS Building, writing in
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1960 that it was ‘one of the most controversial structures put up in the U.S. in some time’.\textsuperscript{479}

Through the BC-BS Building, Rudolph was moving toward a ‘mechanical exhibitionism’, exhibiting his belief that all structural and mechanical aspects of a building should be truthfully displayed.\textsuperscript{480} In the BS-BC Building, the systems were run through the inside of hollow exterior concrete panels to free up space on the interior, similar in concept to Renzo Piano and Richard Rogers’ Pompidou Centre (1977), where the systems were proudly displayed on the exterior. In this way, Fixler believes that through thoughtful and creative adaptation, the BC-BS Building could be a complementary partner to the new building. Piano has said that he always admired the work of Paul Rudolph and that he endeavours to keep buildings as architectural memories if at all possible.\textsuperscript{481} However, in this case, Piano felt that a large public plaza beside the new tower was crucial to offset the aggressive height of his tower, and that the Rudolph building would have to be sacrificed.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3-11}
\caption{Integration of heating and cooling systems within the structure of the BC-BS Building. Source: \textit{Progressive Architecture}, April 1960.}
\end{figure}
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The BC-BS Building has now surpassed the city and national 50-year age requirement for designation, but the architecture of Paul Rudolph is in no way secured as heritage. Rudolph’s Shoreline affordable housing complex in Buffalo, New York are currently being incrementally demolished and Rudolph’s Orange County Government Center in Goshen, New York has been partially demolished and completely gutted despite being placed on the World Monuments Fund watch list of threatened cultural heritage sites in October 2011. The BC-BS Building even divides opinions amongst modernist supporters, with some questioning whether the controversial nature of the BC-BS building is worth devoting extensive conservation resources toward. Fixler has already stated that he would like to see the building creatively incorporating into any new construction, but he questioned whether it would be worth a full-scale conservation advocacy campaign that would take attention away from other buildings and projects. He agreed, however, that it should certainly be fully vetted, and said, ‘We shouldn’t let it slip though.’

In the end, the designs for the tower were not deemed up to Piano’s expectations, and pressure from Belkin to expand the width of the tower made the partnership crumble. The BLC granted a demolition delay in March 2007 and Kairos Shen, director of planning for the Boston Redevelopment Authority, said the City would not allow its demolition until there was ‘a signed agreement and a schedule for actual construction of the new building’.

Rudolph had been hired in 1986 to submit plans for an expansion to the BC-BS Building and Timothy Rohan, author of *The Architecture of Paul Rudolph* (2014), hopes Rudolph’s scheme, which proposed to double the building’s footprint, might provide
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inspiration for a more sympathetic redevelopment plan. With redevelopment bids in from eight other developers and none with any reference to Rudolph’s original 1986 expansion scheme, it looks like a glossy skyscraper of some sort is inevitable. Yet, even if the petition to landmark the BS-BC Building is denied, the controversy over its redevelopment has helped to establish its place within the story of post-war modernisation in Boston.
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3.4. THE MANAGEMENT OF MODERN MOVEMENT HERITAGE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Throughout Section 3.3, we have seen how grassroots valorisation efforts play a much more prominent role in the conservation of modern movement heritage in America, largely because the state historic preservation offices and municipal landmark preservation commissions do not have the resources to run advocacy campaigns or thematic studies. For this reason, designation is often not the end goal, but is instead viewed as a welcome but often unnecessary accolade. In Section 3.4, we will see how in some cases, the conservation of modern movement buildings depends on National Register designation in order to gain access to Historic Tax Credits, but we will also look at a few cases where designation on a national, state or municipal level would be viewed as a hindrance. However, first we will look at how The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation have influenced the conservation of modern movement architecture and how its conservation has in turn led to a postmodern theorisation of the conservation movement itself.

3.4.1. INTERPRETING AND APPLYING THE STANDARDS TO MODERN MOVEMENT HERITAGE

With the passing of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and the Emergency Home Purchase Assistance Act of 1974\(^488\), federal grants were provided to assist community-wide revitalisation operations and federal loans were given to private homeowners for the rehabilitation of buildings listed on or deemed eligible for the National Register. These funds were administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), but as HUD could not be expected to oversee each project, the Secretary of the Interior requested a standard set of guidelines be created to assist homeowners, architects and the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs) in such projects. W. Brown Morton III and Gary L. Hume co-authored The Secretary of the

Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation Projects in 1976, which has since been replaced and expanded upon by The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Places (1995) (known colloquially as The Standards). The Standards is comprised of the four ‘treatment approaches’ of preservation, rehabilitation, restoration and reconstruction.

The original Standards for Historic Preservation Projects were written to be flexible, using intentionally soft phrases like ‘whenever possible’. Though the Rehabilitation Standards for historic buildings became the first national conservation standards to be included in the United States Code of Federal Regulations, followed by the standards for preservation, restoration and reconstruction, author W. Brown Morton III has said that they were intended, more than anything else, to ‘form the basis for thoughtful dialogue between the National Park Service staff and private property owners’. Nevertheless, they have instead been taken by many as hard and fast rules and Morton said he has been forced to exclaim many times since their inception that ‘The Rehabilitation Standards are NOT the Ten Commandments and I am NOT Moses!’

Despite the planned flexibility of The Standards, the National Preservation Act of 1966 was ratified in reaction to post-war development and its terminology therefore is at odds with the special heritage characteristics of modern movement architecture. Article 1 [the Purpose of the Act] reflects the influence of the Venice Charter and the aim of its creators to preserve the monuments and sites that reinforce a certain narrative of American history:

The Spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage… in the face of ever-increasing extensions of urban centers, highways, and residential, commercial, and industrial developments, the present governmental and nongovernmental historic preservation programs and activities are inadequate to insure future generations a genuine opportunity to appreciate and enjoy the rich heritage of our Nation.

In this opening paragraph, the great majority of what was constructed after World War II is explicitly discounted as heritage and many Americans are therefore surprised today when organisations like the RPPN or DOCOMOMO advocate for the conservation of public housing, suburban developments, office blocks or modern educational buildings of
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the post-war period. The general public may accept that they are representative of a phase in America’s urban history, but the term heritage is reserved for monuments that tell a story of a nationally significant event or that represent a shared national identity. These buildings were built using the streamlined manufacturing techniques of mass-production that were honed during the Second World War and are therefore not considered unique by traditional preservation standards, nor would they be deemed irreplaceable. However, with the addition of the following statement as Article 1(B)(4) in 1980, the definition of heritage took on a more diverse postmodern interpretation:

The preservation of this irreplaceable heritage is in the public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, aesthetic, inspirational, economic, and energy benefits will be maintained and enriched for future generations of Americans.

This expansion of the purpose of preservation to include public education, economics and sustainability related concerns should ideally qualify most significant post-war modern movement buildings for conservation under The Standards, and it is on these grounds that proponents are arguing for their conservation until public opinion catches up with the specialists. However, the inclusion of representations of post-war urban sprawl on the National Register has been controversial with a certain camp of preservationists who argue that their inclusion would dilute the merits of finer properties already listed and that tax credit benefits should not be diverted to preserve the negative social and environmental effects that the suburbs created.

Theodore Prudon argues in *Preservation of Modern Architecture* that the four treatment methods proposed by the most recent revision of *The Standards* are not so rigid as to be inapplicable to modern movement buildings, but instead that it is the ‘traditional preservation values [that] will have to shift, or the significance of this period will be lost in translation.’491 As an advisor on several National Trust restoration projects, Fiske Kimball coined the famous aphorism: ‘Better preserve than repair, better repair than restore, better restore than reconstruct’.492 Prudon argues that this philosophy of minimal intervention and its material based value system remains a primary principle of US preservation practice, which is incompatible with the requirements of a great majority of modern movement conservation projects.

492 Ibid. (p. 67).
Henry Moss, a conservation architect based in Boston, seconds this argument, writing that conservation theory in America is now divided between those who revere original material and those to recognise that this approach is unrealistic in the face of the issues that arise in aging twentieth century modern buildings. It is for this reason that restoration as a conservation method is rarely advocated for modern movement buildings. Restoration, as defined by The Standards, is the act of depicting a property as it appeared at a particular time through the removal of objects and alterations accumulated over time. The Reitveld Schröder House (1924) in Utrecht has been restored to its original state as a representation of the most complete architectural expression of the De Stijl manifesto, but this conservation approach negated its ability to function as an accurate historical representation and is highly impractical in most situations where the buildings must continue to have a viable use and be income generating. Preservation is also only suitable for the most iconic privately owned modern properties, but it promotes the consolidation of original and new materials and emphasises accumulated patina. These signs of aging can arguably be seen as incongruous to the design intent of these modern buildings. However, as with the Gropius House (1938) in Lincoln, Massachusetts, preservation displays the ingenuity and experimental nature of the house and the house now functions as an exhibit to a particular phase in Gropius’ legacy. In instances such as this, contemporary updates would be detrimental to the value of the building as a record.

Of the four ‘treatment approaches’ proposed by The Standards, Prudon argues that rehabilitation is most appropriate, economically and functionally, for the vast majority of modern movement buildings. By definition in The Standards, rehabilitation emphasises the process that created a building over the tangible structural elements. Under this approach, a building may not be required to retain its original function if the change of use requires minimal alteration to the defining characteristics of the building, site or environment. The rehabilitation approach also allows for alterations to improve a listed building’s energy-efficiency and to reduce emissions through means that do not detract from the significance or overall appearance of the building. Given that inter-war and post-war buildings are notoriously, though not always, the worst offenders for high energy use because they were often designed with a greater reliance on mechanical systems over natural ventilation and lighting, the opportunity to improve the performance of these buildings is often one of the highest priorities, both for environmental and economic reasons. Though the rehabilitation approach allows new construction and a far greater
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level of material replacement, Prudon maintains that ‘by recognizing the intent and functionality as character-defining and essential to the significance of modern architecture, rehabilitation as it is defined for traditional or earlier architecture becomes preservation for modern buildings.’

![Energy Consumption for Commercial Buildings](image)

**Figure 3-12. Energy consumption levels for commercial buildings other than shopping malls.**


Though *The Standards for Rehabilitation* are most applicable to the great majority of modern post-war buildings, certain aspects of the guidelines remain inapplicable to modern movement heritage, such as the use of the term ‘craftsmanship’. The requirement to repair rather than replace also emphasises the value of acquired patina – something that often devalues a less-iconic modern building rather than further legitimises its claim to remain. The rehabilitation standards admonish any level of conjecture that creates a false sense of historical development, however the rehabilitation approach does allow for the integration of present-day technologies and systems. Any new construction or alteration must not destroy any historic materials or characteristics, must be differentiated but compatible, and must be entirely removable without damage to the historic integrity.
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form or environment of the original structure. This request has generally led to the
construction of glass-box appendages, which aim to sit quietly and deferentially
alongside the historic structure, but nonetheless, alter the environment, use and character
of a place. However, as advocates for the conservation of modern movement heritage like
Prudon argue, these standards are open to interpretation and should ‘craftsmanship’ be
interpreted to include not only hand-tooled crafts but the craft of design and original
intent, then craftsmanship can be understood in a twentieth century context.

In the article, ‘Is It Real and Does It Matter? Rethinking Authenticity and Preservation’,
David Fixler questions the validity of the accepted definition of authenticity and asks
whether it is instead not more important to address the impact of interventions on the
authentic aspects of a building. 496 Fixler contends that in the case of modernist buildings,
the traditional notions of authenticity and the emphasis on material conservation is
unrealistic when up against the experimental nature of the materials used and the rate at
which they are deteriorating. In most cases, he says these materials are ‘difficult if not
impossible to restore and therefore cannot in themselves be used to sustain the
authenticity of a particular work.’ 497 Yet, rehabilitation alters the way we perceive a
building in that the authentic elements are inevitably viewed differently in a new space,
time and use. As many materials are not suited to restoration, he argues for a conservation
method that allows their replacement with compatible yet more durable and efficient
materials that enable a building to retain its newness value while also retaining its
spiritual authenticity. In respect to the modern movement’s appreciation of newness and
its innovative approach to the development of new abstracted architectural forms, Fixler
notes a developing postmodern notion of conservation that acknowledges the principles
of ‘spiritual authenticity’. In this sense, he reminds us that ‘preservation is itself a
creation of modernism, and that as it evolves into a postmodern maturity, where absolutes
are rare and viewed with dangerous scepticism, what is perhaps more important is to seek
what is appropriate, as in the end this will also feel authentic.’ 498
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3.4.2. **FEDERAL HISTORIC TAX CREDITS & THE CONSERVATION OF CEDAR SQUARE WEST**

With the development of State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), each state was given the right to apply to the federal government for 50% matching grants to be used at its discretion. These federal grants could then be passed onto local public bodies, private conservation organisations or private citizens.\(^499\) Congress then created the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) in 1976 to redistribute a small portion of federal revenue earned from oil and gas drilling leases on the Outer Continental Shelf. The State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices are the primary recipients of the funds, and they are primarily used to support thematic surveys to identify and nominate properties to the National Register, to provide guidance and approval for Historic Tax Credits, to prepare and implement state conservation plans, and to develop training and public education programmes.

Though $150 million has been allocated to the HPF each year since 1976, the amount that actually reaches the SHPOs has fluctuated yearly. In 1979, just over $52 million was granted to the State Historic Preservation Offices and by 1987, this had been cut to $24 million. Incremental funding increases were witnessed through the 1990s until funding jumped to $81.2 million in 1999 and then to over $90 million in 2001. Funding has fallen again since then and for the fiscal year of 2015 Congress granted $56.41 million with an additional $500,000 for projects that will increase diversity on the National Register and within the National Historic Landmarks programme.\(^500\) Legislation for the HPF expired on 30 September 2015 and its reauthorisation requires a vote by Congress. On 17 June 2015, the National Historic Preservation Act of 2015 (Bill H.R. 2817) was presented on Capital Hill by Historic Preservation Caucus Co-Chairs Michael Turner (R-OH) and Earl Blumenauer (D-OR). The bill, if passed, would reauthorize the HPF through 2025 with annual funds set at $150 million. As of August 2016, committee hearings had been held and amendments had been recommended, but the bill had not yet been passed.

Separate from the HPF, the Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit programme was established in 1976 after Congress passed the Tax Reform Act (amended with the Tax Reform Act of
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Historic Tax Credits, as they are more commonly known, are one of the most powerful incentives used in America to influence private property owners and developers to rehabilitate ‘certified historic structures’ and since its introduction, the historic tax credit programme has leveraged over £73 billion in private investment toward the conservation of over 40,000 properties countrywide. Preceding this act, the tax-incentive system favoured new construction and thus fuelled the replacement of the existing building stock in the post-war years. The Tax Reform Act of 1976 made historic buildings economically attractive to developers, but with the 1986 amendment, qualified historic buildings were also required to be income producing, such as office buildings, apartment complexes with rental units, retail establishments or buildings used for industrial purposes. Since the amendment, historic tax credits can no longer be applied to buildings in private use, nor those owned by any level of government (public schools and universities, city, state or federal governmental buildings) or the non-profit sector (religious buildings, private universities), which excludes a great number of nationally recognised historic structures.

The application for Historic Tax Credits is a three-part process:

1. First, the owner must make a case for the designation of the property on the National Register of Historic Places or prove that it is a contributing part of a National Historic District.

2. Once approved, the owner must submit details of the rehabilitation plan to the local State Historic Preservation Office and the National Park Service to be assessed against the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

3. After the works are complete, the owner must provide proof that they were executed in accordance with the approved plans in step 2.

For those buildings that qualify, the Internal Revenue Service may grant a 20% tax credit toward qualified rehabilitation costs incurred during the rehabilitation process and throughout the year the building was placed back in service. A tax credit is essentially a dollar-for-dollar rebate in income taxes due at the end of the year. Eligible rehabilitation expenditures may include costs for the actual work to the building, engineering and architectural fees, legal fees, development fees, site survey fees and other
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construction costs, but costs for building acquisition, furnishings, new building additions, new construction, car parks, pavements or other landscaping fees do not apply.⁵⁰⁵

A separate 10% tax credit may be available for the rehabilitation non-historic (i.e. not listed on NRHP), pre-1936 buildings in a non-residential use. An added stipulation for the 10% tax credit is that rehabilitation works must retain at least 75% of the building’s original external walls (and 50% of these must remain as external walls) and 75% of the building’s internal structural framework must remain in place. However, given the non-historic status of eligible buildings, this tax credit programme allows for more alterations overall, and thus, buildings listed on the National Register are not eligible for this 10% rehabilitation tax credit on top of the 20% tax credit.

The proportionally minute number of modern movement buildings on the NRHP means that most of them are ineligible for the 20% tax credit, and the pre-1936 cut off date for the 10% tax credit excludes modern buildings after the Art Deco or Art Moderne style period. This 1936 cut-off date was set with the ratification of the Tax Reform Act of 1986, which corresponded to the National Register’s 50-year age requirement, but it is unclear why this date has not incrementally moved forward with each passing year. Even if modern movement buildings are located within a National Historic District, they must also be determined to be a contributing factor, i.e. to be of the same time period or style - which they most often are not, in order to avail of historic tax credits. The Tax Reform Act of 1986 replaced the Economic Recovery Act of 1981, which had provided tax credits for a greater variety of buildings: 25% for certified historic structures, 20% for buildings at least 40 years old and 15% for buildings at least 30 years old. If still in place, buildings built in the mid-1980s would now qualify for rehabilitation tax credits, which are also currently undervalued and under threat of demolition.

Another valuable tool, both to secure property tax reductions but also to protect the character and historic features of the exterior of a ‘certified historic structure’, is the façade easement programme.⁵⁰⁶ In most cases, a façade easement is a voluntary agreement in which the building owner transfers ownership of the façade to an appropriate qualified conservation organisation. These agreements are perpetual and binding and any development restriction the original owner places on the façade is

transferred to the organisation. Essentially, a façade easement allows the owner to retain private ownership of the property, but should they decide to sell it in the future, they are guaranteed the exterior will be protected by the conservation organisation to which it was bequeathed. The original owner may also be eligible for a Federal Income Tax reduction equal to the appraised fair market value of the easement. The federal rehabilitation tax credit and the façade easement tax credit can be applied in tandem if the property meets all the qualifications for both.

3.4.2.1. **HISTORIC TAX CREDITS CASE STUDY: CEDAR SQUARE WEST, MINNEAPOLIS**

The 2011 refurbishment of the low-income Cedar Square West housing estate (1963-73) in Minneapolis is interesting for two reasons: first, its refurbishment did not necessitate the gentrification of the estate in order to be economically viable, but instead its continued status as low-income housing actually meant it qualified for over $29.1 million in housing tax credit equity; and second, its designation on the National Register of Historic Places in December 2010 allowed developers to take advantage of a further $28.9 million in federal and state historic structure rehabilitation tax credits. In order to receive these historic tax credits, the refurbishment plans had to be approved in accordance to *The Standards for Rehabilitation* at both a state and federal level, which meant that not only would the necessary upgrades need to be in accordance with the estate’s aesthetic significance, but the process also gave the National Park Service a standard by which to judge future late-modern designation proposals and rehabilitations projects.
Development of the New Town-In Town

Over the course of the 1960s and especially during the 1970s in response to the aforementioned Acts, rehabilitation gained traction as an alternative method to tackle blighted tenements and urban neighbourhoods, however its scope was limited by its piecemeal approach. Envisioned by Harvey Perloff, the New Town-In Town was the only approach to bring together the ideals of the rehabilitation movement and the land acquisition procedures honed by the urban renewal movement. The guiding idea behind the New Town-In Town concept was to recycle urban land through large-scale projects that added to the existing housing stock, but also supported commercial and cultural activities for a multi-ethnic, multi-economic population. Projects like Cedar-Riverside encouraged the rehabilitation of existing community and commercial services alongside new construction, which often included high and low-rise housing and a variety of public and private services, emphasised that community should be at the heart of all planning decisions. While other earlier developments, like Hyde Park in Chicago, followed the New Town-In Town ideology, a lack of funding and public support limited their ambitions.

and the Cedar-Riverside redevelopment was the first official *New Town-In Town* to receive funding under Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 and hence, to follow the ideology in its entirety.

The Cedar-Riverside neighbourhood of Minneapolis has long been a landing ground for immigrants. Swedes, Norwegians and Germans laboured in the lumberyards and flourmills that developed in the 1850s along the west side of the Mississippi River, and working class housing was found in the Seven Corners neighbourhood, just a short ferry ride away on the east bank of the river. At its height, the population of the neighbourhood burgeoned to 20,000 residents and the land was densely covered in small wooden-framed houses. As its residents prospered and assimilated, they moved out to other neighbourhoods within the vicinity, which attributed to the neighbourhood’s steady state of decline as less fortunate residents were left behind and increased in intensity. Judith Martin explains that the gradual economic decline of Cedar-Riverside was inevitable, but argues it would be inaccurate to label the neighbourhood as a slum during the early 20th century. However, a 1934 Work Projects Administration survey of housing concluded it was the worst neighbourhood in Minneapolis bar one, noting the over-crowded lots, the number of outhouses, the abundance of absentee landlords and the overall state of structural decay. After the Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HRA) was created in 1947 by the Minnesota State Legislature to administer funds for urban renewal projects and the construction of low-income housing across the city, Cedar-Riverside was recognised as a neighbourhood in need in 1952, and plans for its redevelopment began to formalise in 1958.

The redevelopment of the Cedar-Riverside neighbourhood as a *New Town-In Town* began as a small investment venture by husband and wife team Gloria and Martin Segal, who along with their close friend and University of Minnesota School of Business lecturer, Keith Heller, began by purchasing and rehabilitating properties in the neighbourhood bordering the University of Minnesota West Bank campus expansion then under construction to provide decent low-income housing. The Heller-Segal partnership, known as the Cedar-Riverside Associates (CRA), purchased their first block of apartments in August 1962 for $19,000, however, with renewal talks swirling around Cedar-Riverside, the Partnership soon began purchasing more properties with plans to
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demolish substandard housing and to construct new. Ralph Rapson was brought on in 1963 as project architect and mastermind behind the innovative plan for the diverse and all-inclusive new community. By this time, the 340-acre Cedar-Riverside neighbourhood had already been isolated by the construction of two new highways – Interstate 94 and Interstate 35 – which had further contributed to its decline.\textsuperscript{510} While land prices were low, the Segal’s ambition expanded and by 1968, the Partnership already owned 75\% of the land on the West Bank not earmarked for University expansion, parkland or owned by the two nearby hospitals.\textsuperscript{511}

The Cedar-Riverside New Town-In Town project employed a multi-disciplinary panel of experts\textsuperscript{512} including, most notably, Heiki von Hertzen, planner and developer of the Tapiola New Town in Finland.\textsuperscript{513} This working group of experts set out to design a culturally vibrant, socially diverse, self-supporting new city for an economically diverse population of 30,000 inhabitants on 340 acres. It was to be a ‘city of the future’ that also retained and utilised the heritage and character of the site.

[The Cedar-Riverside New Town-In Town] was to demonstrate advanced health care plans and sophisticated communication techniques. It was to reflect advanced technology in building, in site design, in energy conservation, in transportation, and in waste disposal. Arts and culture would flourish in a community of diverse souls who would find joy in their mutual association.\textsuperscript{514}

In reality, von Hertzen played only a small role as a planning consultant in the development\textsuperscript{515}, but as the developer of arguably the most successful New Town, von Hertzen’s involvement in the Cedar-Riverside project caught the attention of the international design community. As Martin put it, ‘It was one sign among many that the “upstart” developers were quite serious about their intentions and that they were becoming capable of implementing them.’\textsuperscript{516}

\textsuperscript{510} Martin, "Recycling the Central City: The Development of a New Town-in Town." (p. 19).
\textsuperscript{511} Downie, The Midwest: An Unlikely Laboratory for New Towns. (p. 11).
\textsuperscript{512} Barton-Ashman Associates, planners and engineers; environmental planners Lawrence Halprin & Associates; economic planners Hammer-Siler-George Associates, Inc.; Bor-Son Building Corporation, experts in construction planning, programming and implementation; social planner David Cooperman; expert in urban process Arthur Naftalin; and associate architects Gingold-Pink Architecture, Inc. and Miller, Melby & Hanson Architects, Inc.
\textsuperscript{513} Hession, Rapson, and Wright, Ralph Rapson: Sixty Years of Modern Design. (p. 195).
\textsuperscript{515} Heiki von Hertzen, internationally famed developer of the Finnish New Town, Tapiola, did voice one concern after viewing the master plans for Cedar-Riversides: the proposed density. Having designed Tapiola at a density of 35 dwellings per acre, the proposed 125 units per acre at Cedar-Riverside alarmed him.
\textsuperscript{516} Martin, "Recycling the Central City: The Development of a New Town-in Town." (p. 63).
As defined by the Federal legislation, the New Towns-In Town were expected to provide:

- A broad spectrum of multifamily housing types and options for individuals of all ages, races and income levels within a strong architectural framework
- Commercial development and the enhancement of existing cultural resources
- Efficient and well-balanced transportation and circulation plans

The Cedar-Riverside masterplan divided the development programme into five projects: four housing areas and one commercial area, referred to as the ‘Centrum’ in association with the lineage of the area’s early migrants. Had the masterplan been realised in its entirety, the development would have contained 12,500 dwelling units over the five ‘neighbourhoods’ and 1,500,000 square feet of commercial space within the fourteen-acre Community Centrum that included a hotel, a conference centre, office and retail space, a performing arts facility, a community area and car parks. Everything was to be linked with pedestrian and bicycle paths, roadways and anticipating a large student population, an elevated trolley system was to run through the centre of the Centrum, around the development and the nearby university campus. In 1971, Cedar-Riverside became America’s first federally funded New Town-In Town when HUD granted the Cedar-Riverside Associates $24 million in Federal Loan guarantees. Construction of the first phase, Cedar Square West, began later that year.

Martin warns that one singular lesson can be learned from the Cedar-Riverside development: ‘delays will kill you’. She explains that the opponents of the New Town-In Town programme knew they did not have to win battles, but only to draw the arguments out long enough that the inflation in materials and labour would run the project into the ground. Cedar-Riverside residents protested the development through lawsuits and challenged the competence of the project’s Environmental Impact Statements. The recession and oil crisis also meant that many New Town projects were destined to stay on paper and in the end, only the first stage of the Cedar-Riverside development was completed – Cedar Square West.

---

517 Hession, Rapson, and Wright, Ralph Rapson: Sixty Years of Modern Design. (p. 195).
Unfortunately, most of the provisions and policy-making innovations designed to stimulate New Town development were never put into effect, except for the loan guarantees.\textsuperscript{520} By the end of 1974, 17 New Towns and New Communities had been granted loans, but many, including Cedar-Riverside, had run into ‘serious financial trouble because inflation led to escalating costs while the recession caused the demand for new housing to fall rapidly.’\textsuperscript{521} The five-stage masterplan was not only scaled back to one due to financial constraints, but the construction expenses of Cedar Square West came under scrutiny as well. Cost prohibitions dictated that only 10\% of the exterior panels could be coloured following Rapson’s design scheme, but the exterior balconies were retained after they were configured to function as scaffolding during the construction. By January 1975, HUD announced that no further loan guarantees would be granted, marking the end of the New Town-In Town and New Community programmes and revealing ‘the shallowness of federal commitment to new communities.’\textsuperscript{522}

As built, the Cedar Square West development comprises 15 buildings ranging from 2 to 40 storeys in height, housing 1,303 dwelling units. Implementing the economic diversity requirements of the New Town-In Town legislation, low-income public housing and luxury flats were constructed in the same development, ranging from economy flats to two-storey maisonettes. On par with the time, vehicular and pedestrian traffic was segregated on different levels and the whole complex was built atop an underground car park. Commercial, educational, healthcare, childcare and community facilities were integrated into the plan and, with the Minnesota winter climate in mind, all buildings were linked by climate-controlled walkways.

Cedar Square West welcomed its first residents in April 1973, but not to the fanfare the CRA, HUD or Rapson had imagined. Nancy Miller writes that throughout the construction of Cedar Square West, it was continually associated with lawsuits, financial difficulties and angry protests, so that by 1973, ‘the project was burdened with an albatross of bad news’, which it never seemed to shake.\textsuperscript{523} In 1974, HUD reported that the Cedar-Riverside project was ‘clearly not viable’ and any further federal support for the

\textsuperscript{521} Ibid. (p. 213).
\textsuperscript{522} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{523} Miller, "Arrested Development: Can Ralph Rapson’s Progressive Vision for America’s First ‘New Town-in Town’ Be Recovered in the Beleaguered Cedar Square West?" (p. 54).
However, in 1975, the development was granted numerous design awards, including the AIA First Honor Award, the AIA Bartlett Award, the Design for the Handicapped Award and the HUD Bicentennial Urban Design Award. Cedar Square West continued to struggle financially over the years and in 1986, HUD foreclosed on the property. The City of Minneapolis purchased the complex in 1987 and sold it for $15 million in 1988 to the Cedar Riverside Limited Partnership (CRLP - a legal entity created by Sherman Associates for the sole purpose of purchasing the housing superblock), at which point it was rebranded as Riverside Plaza Apartments.

**Historic Designation & Historic Tax Credits in Application**

In 2007, the Cedar Riverside Limited Partnership (CRLP) began to develop plans for a major rehabilitation in order to qualify for renewed access to the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit programme. The rehabilitation construction costs were estimated at $65 million, and with the refinancing of existing debts and interest, the project estimate was set at $132 million. The CRLP approached the Minneapolis Department of Community Planning and Economic Development (CPED) early on with preliminary refurbishment plans in 2007, but due to the financial crisis of 2008, plans were put on hold until late 2009. Funding from the City of Minneapolis spurred financial commitments from other sources, and many of these commitments were based on the size of the overall project, meaning that as the project gained funding, the scope expanded and subsequently increased the funding commitments of many of its donors.

Sherman Associates has a number of large renovation projects in its portfolio involving historic tax credits in Minnesota, but in order to secure federal funds for the renovation of the not yet historically recognised Cedar Square West, historic consultants Hess Roise and Company were hired to write the National Register nomination for the housing complex. The successful designation of Cedar Square West on the National Register of Historic Places on 28 December 2010 may be remembered as a momentous turning point in the history of the conservation movement in America, however, for some within the local Cedar-Riverside community its designation as architectural heritage was seen as ‘a

---
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525 Hession, Rapson, and Wright, Ralph Rapson: Sixty Years of Modern Design. (p. 198).
526 The CRLP functions as the property owner while Sherman Associates functions as the property manager.
527 Laney Barhaugh, Justin Elston, and Vicki Hooper, The Riverside Plaza Renovation Project Memorandum of Understanding: A Snapshot (Minneapolis: Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs, 2011). (p. 9).
528 Ibid. (p. 10).
travesty against history’. 529 Elizabeth Gales, author of the nomination, defended the nomination, saying, ‘Whether you love it or hate it, there’s no denying that it was important for what it did for the city and what it did for affordable housing’ in a city where affordable housing is still in short supply. 530

Cedar Square West is significant as the first and larger of the only two built examples of the ‘New Town-In Town’ initiative funded by Title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 and is also significant as the most monumental structure designed by the prolific modernist architect Ralph Rapson. The second New Town-In Town built was Josep Lluis Sert’s Eastwood housing development (1970-76) on Roosevelt Island in New York City531, which has been the subject of a recent preservation plan developed by graduate students of the Columbia University Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, but is not yet designated on a local or national level. 532 Cedar Square West was less than forty years old when it was designated on the National Register 10 under Criterion A, C and G, and has therefore established a precedent for the nomination of similar late-modern public housing projects and for post-war structures in general. While the old guard in the National Park Service may still be against the designation of modern architecture as national heritage, Gales feels that many within the institution are looking for projects like this to establish a system against which architecture of the late twentieth century can be assessed.

Due to the expense of infrastructure works, the Cedar Square West rehabilitation project was also contingent on the passage of the Jobs Creation Bill, which included a Minnesota Historic Structure Rehabilitation Tax Credits programme that would provide tax credits for up to 20% of qualifying rehabilitation costs on the property, on top of the 20% from the federal programme, together covering up to 40% of project costs. 533 The Jobs Creation Bill was signed into law in April 2010 and in January 2011, Sherman Associates closed on one of the nation’s largest tax credit based rehabilitation projects to date. In the years preceding the passage of the bill, an average of four projects per year utilised the federal historic tax credit programme, but by 30 June 2011, 14 historic buildings qualified

530 Ibid.
533 A grant equal to 90% of allowable credit in lieu of tax credit is also an option to registered historic property owners.
The MN Rehabilitation Tax Credit was designed to promote private investment in historic properties, and in turn, to stimulate job growth and community revitalisation. A report compiled by the University of Minnesota Extension Center for Community Vitality found that the 14 MN Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit projects directly and indirectly generated 2,948 new jobs throughout the state, generating an additional $152,430,720 in labour income payments. Of the estimated $49 million that was to be awarded across the 14 projects through Rehabilitation Tax Credits, it was calculated that for every state dollar of tax credit, $9.20 in economic activity would be generated throughout the state of Minnesota.

Finally, before rehabilitation projects can receive federal historic tax credits, all work must be completed and approved against the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation by the National Park Service and the State Historic Preservation Office (Part III approval). In this case, the two-year, $132 million dollar Cedar Square West project was primarily focused on upgrading the mechanical and electrical systems, and exterior renovation works returned the appearance to its original 1970s chromatic colour scheme. Throughout the planning process and its execution, historic consultants Hess Roise & Company advised on the suitability of all works to ensure all NPS requirements were met to receive full tax credit funding. The Cedar Square West rehabilitation project also availed of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 (IRC Section 42), which established a tax credit for the acquisition, rehabilitation or construction of new low-income housing. In this case, the tax credit was awarded at 4% for 10 years. Figure 3-14 displays a complete breakdown of local, state and federal funding and financing that was assembled to finance
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534 Brigid Tuck and David Nelson, Economic Impact of Projects Leveraged by the Minnesota Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Extension Center for Community Vitality, 2011). (p. 1).
535 Ibid. (p. 8).
536 The total projected economic impact of the 14 projects approved for the Minnesota Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit in 2010-2011 was $451 million, from an estimated $250 million in construction-related sales (including 1808 new construction jobs and $83.7 million in wage payments), $96.3 in indirect sales (including the creation of 532 jobs in all sectors of the economy and £34.7 million in wage payments), and the spending of the construction workers and other induced impacts from the tax credits was estimated at $104 million. Thus, $451 million in tax credit impacts divided by $49 million in tax credit grants equals a $9.20 gain in economic activity in Minnesota.
the $132 million rehabilitation of Cedar Square West, which more than covered the total cost of the rehabilitation project.537

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cedar Square West Rehabilitation Finances</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>$29,106,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD-Guaranteed First Mortgage</td>
<td>$49,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Historic Tax Credits</td>
<td>$14,767,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Historic Tax Credits</td>
<td>$14,126,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN Housing Finance Agency Economic Development and Housing Challenge</td>
<td>$7,016,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN Housing Finance Agency Preservation Affordable Rental Investment Fund</td>
<td>$5,083,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Minneapolis Affordable Housing Trust Fund</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Metropolitan Housing Corporation</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council Local Housing Incentives Account</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Housing Fund</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Developer Fee</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller Equity</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Flow – Operations for total development costs</td>
<td>$2,962,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Rebates</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County Environmental Response Fund</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council Tax Base Revitalization Account</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$133,638,393</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-14. Cedar Square West rehabilitation financing breakdown. Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development538

**REHABILITATION WORKS & ESTATE MANAGEMENT**

After ownership of Cedar Square West passed over to Cedar Riverside Limited Partnership (CRLP), a moderate rehabilitation was completed in 1989, which included the installation of two new elevators in building M, a new fire alarm and sprinkler system, new emergency power generators, a new air-conditioning chiller plant, a new

538 Ibid.
summer boiler, and new roofs. During this time, an unused elevated concrete walkway over Cedar Avenue was removed and the swimming pool was filled in and replaced with a playground. CRLP also converted many rental units into Section 8 or Section 42 units at that time in order to secure more stable revenue through the associated public housing programmes. Of the 1,303 apartment units, 669 are now classified as Section 8 units, housing approximately 4,400 individuals and families. In total, only 129 units are market-rate, meaning that 90% of all units within Cedar Square West are categorised as affordable housing for households earning less than 60% of the median income for the area, making it the largest affordable housing development in Minnesota.

The recent $132 million rehabilitation of Cedar Square West came with the promise to ‘enhance the quality of life for the residents of Riverside Plaza and significantly improve the functionality of Riverside Plaza by replacing failing mechanical systems, completing code-required upgrades, improving energy efficiency, and making other functional and aesthetic improvements.’ By 2007, resident complaints had grown in frequency, citing the poorly functioning heating and air-conditioning systems, the frequent breakdown of lifts, leaking and drafty windows and the overall deterioration of the buildings. The major infrastructure had not been updated since the 1970s, and Sherman Associates had noted that the original HVAC piping throughout the buildings had reached a state of heavy corrosion and was prone to major leaks. In addition, the sanitary lines had not been properly insulated so they were rusting from the inside out, leading to ruptures and ghastly and costly sewage spillages within the buildings. In the 2011-2012 Temporary Relocation Plan, Sherman Associates anticipated significant energy savings through upgrades to the monitoring systems, mechanical and electrical systems and the boiler
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540 As described in The Riverside Plaza Renovation Project Memorandum of Understanding: A Snapshot, the Section 8 housing programme provides low-income rental units at a percentage of the resident’s overall yearly income, while the Section 42 housing programme offers housing at an affordable rate based on the rates established in that particular county. In return, property owners are enrolled in the Housing Tax Credit programme for 10 years, which entitles them to tax discounts if and only if the property owner participates in a programme of upgrades, renovations and new construction. This acts as an impetus for a cycle of renewal every decade, and was a driving force behind the most recent rehabilitation project at Cedar Square West.
541 Brian Sullivan, Riverside Plaza in Minneapolis Receives National Trust/Hud Secretary’s Award for Excellence in Historic Preservation (Washington, D.C.: Department of Housing and Urban Development, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2013).
system, which included upgrading the chiller plant, replacing the boiler burner and upgrading the water circulation system throughout the property.\textsuperscript{544} Aside from infrastructure upgrades, the report stated that residents would immediately benefit from new laundry facilities in each building, new kitchen cabinets and appliances (though for select units only), rebuilt windows, and new sliding patio doors on the towers, which, during the assessment, were found to be structurally inadequate against today’s wind load requirements.

As discussed earlier, the whole Cedar-Riverside project was downscaled from four housing neighbourhoods to one, but the construction of Cedar Square West was put under budgetary constraints as well. An architect working with Rapson during those years said his first few years on the job were spent purely revising the drawings because inflation had out budgeted many aspects of their design. In the end, what was built was heartbreakingly less than the original vision, but the rehabilitation team had never expected that the scrimping would have extended to construction materials. Two small concrete commercial buildings now used as a charter school were constructed without any structural framing and there were sections in the towers where the windows butted up to jip board without proper structural reinforcement or framing. Each of these unexpected findings had to be approved for funding through an itemised report, which was organised and advised on by Hess Roise, then sent to the State Historic Preservation Office, approved and commented on before being sent to federal NPS office in Washington.

The restoration aspect of the project was limited to the exterior and the reinstatement of the original colours. Rapson had included paint schedules on his elevations, showing both the colours and the location of the coloured panels on the building. Hess Roise had also acquired an aerial photograph taken shortly after construction was completed that showed how vibrant the colours once were. Over the years, the vibrant blue coloured panels had faded to grey and the red to dull orange. Then sometime after the City of Minneapolis acquired the property, the panels were painted a ‘happier’ pallet of Pepto-Bismol pink and dark brown.\textsuperscript{545}

\textsuperscript{544} Ibid. Appendix F, (p. 2).
\textsuperscript{545} Engel, "Interview with Elizabeth Gales, Architectural Historian at Hess Roise and Company,\"
Figure 3-15. Cedar Square West in 2009 before refurbishment.

Figure 3-16. Cedar Square West shortly after construction, circa 1973, showing the vivid colouring of the original panels. Source: Nancy Miller, ‘Arrested development: Can Ralph Rapson’s progressive vision for America’s first ‘New Town-In Town’ be recovered in the beleaguered Cedar Square West?’, 2006.
A less noticeable but more essential part of the project was the repair of the mortar joints in the post-tension cable pockets. The cables ran through the end of the slabs and were thus exposed to the elements. There were a few instances of cable ends failing, and in one instance, a cable snapped back into a tenant’s living room, though luckily no one was injured. A structural engineering firm was hired to check all of the post-tension cables in the towers and it was decided that all of the pockets should be re-mortared. In the process, an elastomeric coating was put on the edges of the concrete slabs, which allowed some breathability and protected the pockets. Concrete repairs were made where it had spalled and the whole exterior was coated to protect against further anodizing of the reinforcement steel.\textsuperscript{546}

In this instance, very little work was done to the interior of the flats. The flats are essentially white boxes with a textured ceiling finish, which contains asbestos. Instead of paying for costly toxic waste removal, the flats were painted for encapsulation and anything broken out of general wear and tear was repaired. The original cabinets are made of laminate particleboard, and repairs have been needed so often throughout the 1,303 flats that a cabinetmaker was already located on site, so it was decided to continue to repair them as necessary in this fashion. A sprinkler system was installed in every unit for fire protection, accessibility improvements were made and the asbestos tile flooring was replaced with new vinyl flooring, but that was the extent of interior improvements.

The most difficult aspect of the refurbishment was that each flat had to be cleared and resettled within 28 days, which is the maximum length of time a Section 8 tenant can be living outside of government subsidised housing without losing their housing or at worst, their refugee status. Cedar Square West provides affordable housing for low-income residents, but it also provides housing for a large number of refugees from East Africa (particularly Somalia) and East Asia. According to the US Census Bureau, in 2013 57.6\% of all residents in the Cedar-Riverside neighbourhood were living below the poverty line (compared to 22.5\% in the whole of Minneapolis) and 31.3\% of residents had an annual income less than $15,000 (Minneapolis: 18.6\%).\textsuperscript{547} In order to move people out quickly, one tower was cleared and set up essentially as a fully-furnished hotel and occupants brought with them only what they would need for the next 28 days. Photographs were taken of each room so that the work crew could return everything to its correct place, then all of the tenants’ belongings were covered in protective plastic in the centre of their flat.

\textsuperscript{546} Ibid.
for the duration of the works. Since the utilities run vertically throughout the towers, the team worked systematically through each column of stacked apartments, repairing or replacing the sewage systems, heating lines and fan coil units, and finally repainting the interior of the units.

Interviews with tenants in March 2011 concluded that the overall relocation process was found to be satisfactory to the majority of residents. While most tenants found the hotel units to be well furnished and clean, interviews with the first two groups in the phased move did find complaints in the following areas: ⁵⁴⁸

- Longer waiting times than anticipated for the transport of belongings from the home residence to the temporary units
- Unsuitable hotel units for the size of the family, i.e. too many or too few bedrooms or multi-story units being assigned to the elderly or disabled
- Condition of the renovated home unit did not meet the expectation of the residents upon their return

In response to tenant dissatisfaction with their newly renovated units, modifications were made by CRLP to the rehabilitation programme, as outlined in the table below. ⁵⁴⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>The Situation</th>
<th>The Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclean Units</td>
<td>Tenants expected like-new apartments. Instead, apartments remained uncleaned.</td>
<td>CRLP noted that they had neglected to realize that the units should be in “turned” condition when tenants move back in. This was remedied for subsequent relocation cycles. CRLP noted that all units are being cleaned and repaired in alignment with what would be considered a new unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio doors not replaced</td>
<td>Tenants moved back into units that still contained patio doors original to the units that they thought were to have been replaced.</td>
<td>The new patio doors were a custom item that replicated the original doors, requiring a longer lead-time from order to shipment. CRLP noted that the patio doors are now being ordered with adequate time to be shipped and installed while the residents are out of their apartments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid. (p. 24).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holes in walls</td>
<td>Tenants moved back into units with open holes in the walls.</td>
<td>Material for the fire sprinkler piping is another long lead item, and could not be ordered prior to closing for the reasons also noted above for the patio door. CRLP noted that the fire sprinklers are now being ordered with adequate time to be shipped and installed while the residents are out of their apartments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous items not fixed</td>
<td>Tenants moved back into units with a range of broken items left unrepaired, including cabinet and closet doors, and other miscellaneous pieces.</td>
<td>CRLP noted that there is now a preconstruction checklist being completed prior to starting construction on a unit, in order to identify items that need to be repaired in the course of that unit’s renovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long wait times during moves</td>
<td>Tenants reported waiting longer than expected for movers to complete the move.</td>
<td>Moving teams take more frequent, shorter moves, leaving residents with much smaller “in-transit” times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A key aspect that contributed to the success of this project was the mandatory cultural sensitivity training undertaken by architects, contractors, construction workers and anyone else who spent any amount of time working onsite. Cultural training included informing workers about the diversity within the housing complex and of the sensitive cultural related issues of the East African community. To aid in communication, additional staff were hired for the administrative visiting office and interpreters were always kept on hand.

Cedar Square West was an experimental model city and it has played an enormously significant role in the relocation of refugee citizens for the past four decades, which befits its history as a landing ground for new immigrants. The Cedar Riverside area, affectionately referred to as ‘Little Mogadishu’ by locals, now hosts a vibrant mixed community of Somalis, Laotians, blue-collar workers, university students and lecturers. In a testimony speech to the US House of Representatives in 1969, former HUD undersecretary Robert Wood reflected on his hopes for the future of the New Town programme, referring to them as lighthouses where innovations in architecture and technology could be employed, though he had not envisioned the New Towns having a great effect on the inner-city problems at that time.\(^{550}\) The New Town-In Town was

---

meant to do more: to provide the wholesome environment of the New Towns while reinvigorating America’s urban centres. Architect Ralph Rapson remained proud throughout his life of what he and the Cedar-Riverside Associates had accomplished at Cedar Square West and citing its 97% occupation rate in 1998, he argued it was still serving its purpose well. In 2005, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) Minnesota granted Cedar Square West the prestigious 25-Year Award, sparking a reappraisal of the complex by the local architectural professionals and the wider community.

In 2013, the Cedar Square West renovation won the annual National Trust/HUD Secretary’s Award for Excellence in Historic Preservation. The award recognises projects that advance the National Trust’s historic preservation goals while supporting or expanding the existing stock of affordable housing and promoting economic development opportunities for low and middle-income residents. Using federal and state historic tax credits, the Cedar Square West project has set a precedent for the rehabilitation of other large late-modern housing estates. Minneapolis Mayor Betsy Hodges ran her 2014 campaign on the promise to reinvigorate Minneapolis by working to regain the inner-city density it held in 1950. Rapson and the Cedar-Riverside Associates based their redevelopment plans for the Cedar-Riverside neighbourhood on these ideals more than four decades ago, and the recent rehabilitation will hopefully merit a re-examination of the ambitions, assumed failures and heritage value of Cedar Square West by the wider public.

3.4.3. CONSERVING THE MODERNIST POST-WAR UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

Major restoration and rehabilitation projects currently or recently underway at the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT), the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and University are evidence that institutions of higher education believe that their modern buildings and campuses are not only valuable, but continue to be applicable to contemporary educational needs. Mies van der Rohe’s Crown Hall (1956) at IIT was listed as a National Historic Landmark in 2001 and underwent a complete restoration in 2005. A three-phase, decade-long renovation of the Yale Centre for British Art just
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reached completion in 2016, complete with a conservation and management plan published in 2011, which is said to be the first of its kind in the US, however, it was prepared by London-based architects Peter Inskip and Stephen Gee of PI+PJ Architects Ltd, who would have been well aware of similar management plans for the Barbican and other listed modernist buildings in Britain. MIT first hired Bruner/Cott Architects in the late 1980s to renovate the brutalist Stratton Student Center designed by Eduardo Catalano (1965). The renovation was perhaps less sensitive than what the firm strives for today, however the insertion of the three-storey glass atrium provided much needed natural light and a central circulation core within the building, while maintaining the visual massing and strong brutalist aesthetic on the exterior. MIT embraced their role as architectural steward when Alvar Aalto’s internationally renown Baker House student dormitory (1949) was in need of renovation works in 1996, so much so that project architect David Fixler was sent to Finland twice on MIT’S penny to study Aalto’s buildings and workshop in person.\(^5\) As much as possible of the original material at Baker House was either restored or replicated in kind, however the project did allow for some design conjecture: new lighting was designed in the spirit of Louis Poulsen and to hide the sprinkler system in the dining hall ceiling, a new slatted wood ceiling similar to the Viipuri Library was installed based on some original but unused drawings made by Aalto for the dining room. MIT does not have a conservation plan per se, but in 2014, David Fixler of EYP Architecture & Engineering was hired again to lead the restoration of the iconic Kresge Chapel and Auditorium (1955) designed by Eero Saarinen, which has required the complete replication and replacement of the glass and steel curtain walls. For Harvard University, Bruner/Cott Architects has since designed conservation-minded renovation solutions for a number of modern movement buildings, including the Peabody Terrace apartment complex, the Gund Hall architecture school and the Holyoke Center. At Boston University, using a conservation approach that combined restoration, refurbishment and renovation, Bruner/Cott Architects recently vindicated the formerly vilified Law Tower designed by Josep Lluis Sert (see Section 3.4.3.2).

Architect Jon Buono, a senior associate in historic preservation and design at Einhorn Yaffee Prescott Architecture & Engineering in New York, believes that the evolution of modern architecture in American universities has led the current appreciation of the campus as an assemblage of well-designed architecture representative of the passage of time. In the campus setting, he explains that historic preservation is ‘more broadly

understood as an act of institutional stewardship, a successful tool for strengthening diverse stakeholder relations, and a companion to sustainable development goals.\textsuperscript{554} Despite this progress, Buono argues that most of the country’s modern university heritage remains under threat, both from hasty determinations of obsolescence and insensitive or uninformed surveys and condition assessments, of which academics, administrators and architects are not exempt from holding such biased views.\textsuperscript{555} The following two subsections address how such bias toward modern movement campus buildings has been altered through architectural heritage surveys, conservation plans and refurbishment projects.

\section*{3.4.3.1. The Getty Foundation Campus Heritage Initiative}

True to America’s philanthropic conservation tradition, the most significant measures taken to document and to develop conservation plans for modernist campus heritage have stemmed from a private, non-governmental organisation rather than from the national or state government conservation bodies. From 2002-2007, the Getty Foundation ran its Campus Heritage Initiative (GFCHI) to fund the surveying of campus heritage resources across the United States.\textsuperscript{556} Since 1976, Congress has required that all properties deemed eligible for designation on the NRHP must be considered with greater sensitivity, however despite this federal requirement, academic interests have often been in conflict with building conservation and the Campus Heritage Initiative was therefore developed to assist US colleges and universities with the management and preservation of their architectural and designed landscape heritage from all eras.\textsuperscript{557}

In 2002, the University of Chicago was granted $121,000 through the GFCHI to survey and develop preservation guidelines for ten recent past buildings to help the university retain the character-defining features of these and similar campus buildings while also allowing the buildings to be altered to meet current user demands, energy efficiency


\textsuperscript{555} Ibid. (p. 101).

\textsuperscript{556} The Getty Foundation Campus Heritage Initiative ran from 2002 through 2007, and with grants totalling more than $13.5 million, it supported 86 campus preservation projects across America as well as a national survey of the heritage under ownership of independent colleges.

benchmarks and accessibility standards. All ten buildings were constructed between 1949 and 1974 and represent a who’s who list of modernist architects and major architectural firms practicing at that time, including the Laird Bell Law Quadrangle (Eero Saarinen, 1959), the Kellogg Centre for Continuing Education/New Graduate Residence Hall (Edward Durell Stone, 1962), the Laboratory for Astrophysics and Space Research (Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, 1965) and the Joseph Regestein Library (Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, 1970). Condition assessments were used to document the current performance of the buildings, issues related to the original construction and their subsequent repairs, the current availability of original materials and components and possible appropriate substitute materials where the originals could not be sourced. By focusing on specific material and structural issues, the preservation guidelines developed for the University of Chicago were meant to incorporate conservation theories with specific technical recommendations to guide the repair and maintenance of these ten buildings. For instance, at both the Laird Bell building and the Laboratory for Astrophysics, portions of the thin stone cladding panels had spalled due to the corrosion of their steel supporting members. Though Dutchman repairs are generally an aesthetically clean way to repair spalled stone or concrete, in this case, it was argued that the repairs may be too visually intrusive since the panels were designed to be an uninterrupted surface and therefore, the report suggests it would be more sympathetic to the design of the buildings to replace the panels in full.

Vassar College was granted $175,000 in 2005 through the GFCHI to survey 52 buildings that represent Vassar’s major modernist works through three eras: pre-modern, mid-century modern and post-modern. The Vassar College Historic Preservation Design Manual is intended to inform the conservation process by focusing less on the structural and material conditions of the modernist buildings and more so on the architectural meaning of the buildings to help the conservative preservation practice understand why and how this era and style of architecture should be preserved. Ten of the buildings surveyed are classified as Modern, and of these five are considered to be of major importance: the Van Ingen Art Library (Theodore Muller John McAndrews, 1937), the Balwin Infirmary (Faulkner & Kingsbury, 1940), the Dexter M. Ferry Cooperative House
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(Marcel Breuer, 1951), the Emma Hartman Noyes House (Eero Saarinen & Associates, 1958) and the Chicago Hall (Schweikher & Elting, 1959). Both the Noyes House and the Cooperative House underwent renovation works in the early 2000s, however at the time of the survey, the curtain wall and concrete of the Noyes House was in poor condition and as Vassar’s first curtain wall, the report recommends it be conserved through replacement, arguing that its importance lies in its assembly, not in its individual parts, and that ‘what matters is that we continue to be able to participate in the experiment of the creative mind seeking better ways to comparable results’.

In a similar but still larger project, New York University (NYU) in lower Manhattan was granted $180,000 in 2006 through the GFCHI to survey and develop a campus preservation plan for 96 buildings, two of which were already landmarked, and 65 of
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which were set within locally designated historic districts.\textsuperscript{562} Like many American universities, the NYU post-war campus is associated with a number of significant modernist architects, including the tower-in-the-park International Style Washington Square Village apartment buildings, Hideo Sasaki’s landscaped gardens (1958, acquired by NYU in 1964) and I.M. Pei’s 1961 University Village (renamed Silver Towers, landmarked November 2008). In 1964, NYU commissioned Philip Johnson and Richard Foster to design a masterplan that would create a cohesive architectural identity for the university, incorporating both new and acquired buildings. Three new buildings were constructed as part of the masterplan - Tisch Hall (1970-72), Bobst Library (1972) and Meyer Hall (1971) – but since that time, construction has proceeded without coherence to this masterplan or any other.

The New York University Campus Preservation Plan was subdivided into four phases: 

- **Phase I: Building Assessment**; 
- **Phase II: Treatment Guidelines**; 
- **Phase III: Implementation Strategy** and 
- **Phase IV: Education and Training**. 

In Phase II, the treatment guidelines were categorised by building type - determined by building function, age and construction materials – and were designed to work with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The treatment guidelines were further divided into subcategories of architectural features, under which the recommendations for preservation/maintenance or restoration/rehabilitation are outlined for each subsequent type of feature, such as concrete canopies or exposed-steel canopies. The division by architectural feature rather than construction material or time period was done to emphasise those features that define the character of a building and therefore to emphasise the need for the thoughtful preservation or rehabilitation of these features.

**Phase III** prioritized the necessary maintenance and preservation work for buildings with recognised historical or architectural significance. Approximately half of the NYU campus buildings are designated as New York City Landmarks or fall within the boundaries of historic districts, so any work to these buildings requires a permit from the Landmarks Preservation Commission before work can begin. Unsurprisingly, with the exception of the University Village tower blocks, the report found that all buildings from the 1940s through the 1960s were suffering from poor maintenance. Given that ornamentation is limited in these structures, the report advises that the greatest conservation threat to these buildings is the use of improper materials in replacement and

\textsuperscript{562} Murphy Burnham & Buttrick Architects and Higgins Quasebarth & Partners LLC, New York University Campus Preservation Plan (New York: New York University, 2007).
renovation works. The survey found similar inappropriate material repairs to the late-20th century institutional buildings and that the alteration of uniform interior lighting throughout these buildings has a noticeably detrimental effect on their intended aesthetic quality. The report insists that ‘the unity of the façade is critical to maintaining the buildings’ integrity’ and that any necessary upgrades or rehabilitation works ‘should always avoid any efforts that compromise the character and defining features of these buildings.’

The survey found that, in particular, lower-storey buildings had a greater backlog of deferred maintenance that contributed to accelerated decay and disproportional repair costs. In response, NYU recently enacted a policy requiring building managers to make an annual check of all buildings under six storeys (as well as those 6-storeys and above as required by Local Law 11) to ensure proper maintenance. At the time the report was published, an implementation plan had been developed for buildings that warranted special consideration for their architectural value. These Initial Restoration and Rehabilitation Projects outlined the scope of work to be done on a select number of buildings; however, it is worth noting that no buildings constructed after 1945 were included in the initial implementation plan.

3.4.3.2. THE BOSTON UNIVERSITY JOSEP LLUIS SERT PRESERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Figure 3-19. Josep Lluis Sert’s modernist central campus for Boston University with rehabilitated Law Tower by Bruner/Cott Architects. Image: Bruner/Cott Architects (2016).
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In 2008, Bruner/Cott Architects were commissioned by Boston University to prepare a masterplan to address the material and programmatic shortcomings of its modernist Central Campus designed by Josep Lluis Sert. Sert had been commissioned in 1959 to design the George Sherman Student’s Union at Boston University and without authorisation, he also prepared a speculative masterplan and model for the entire mile-wide Central Campus situated along the Charles River basin, stretching from the Boston University Bridge up to the tangle of roadways at the far end of the campus. As an active member of CIAM from 1929 onward, Sert favoured architectural elements like the plinth and the tower block and designed his buildings around the modernist pillars of natural light, fresh air and green spaces, but to these he added the new concepts of pedestrian connectivity, the civic core and the reintroduction of ornamentation. Sert deliberately avoided using materials that would hark back to traditional building methods but instead preferred to use prefabricated structural elements in a more flexible modern vocabulary that included traditional forms like arches, courtyards and vaults – much like what Sir Basil Spence was doing at Sussex University in England around the same time. Surprisingly, within six years, half of Sert’s masterplan had been built, but most intriguing was that the buildings had all been designed and built without specific programmes and the University approved the masterplan on the basis that the buildings would find a use once complete. The same was true of Sert’s design for the Holyoke Center at Harvard.

From the start, Bruner/Cott Architects approached the masterplan as a conservation and development plan, because although Boston University had first hired them to develop a feasible solution for the aging post-war buildings, what the university really needed was more space. The plan included the refurbishment of the modern buildings designed by Josep Lluís Sert for the post-war Central Campus and development plans for much needed expansion to the School of Law facilities. Though the University understood the significance of Sert’s architecture on the campus, to avoid being constrained by a conservation agenda, initially they would not allow Bruner/Cott to typify the masterplan as a conservation statement or to suggest at all that the University deserved credit for a conservation approach. However, since these early discussions with Bruner/Cott Architects, Boston University has come to embrace the conservation aspect of the project, declaring on their website in 2013 that ‘the proposed design will faithfully rehabilitate
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most of Sert's original tower while taking deliberate measures within the original architect's design vocabulary to make the existing buildings more acceptable to the 21st century needs of its inhabitants.\textsuperscript{567}

At the Association for Preservation Technology (APT) National Conference in New York during October 2013, Henry Moss, lead architect on the Sert Central Campus conservation project, joked that ‘maintenance can be a form of architectural criticism’ and emphasised the difficulties universities face in securing financial support for the renovation, much less the preservation, of modern movement university buildings where, as in this case, the stakeholders hated the look of the building and the alumni refused to allow their donations to go toward the refurbishment of a building they felt was ill-suited to its purpose. In April 2016, Leland Cott, founding partner of Bruner/Cott Architects, wrote of similar difficulties his firm has encountered with the conservation of modernist academic buildings over the years. He explained that with these projects, there are essentially four stakeholders: the building owner, the user-occupant, the municipal, state and non-profit preservation bodies, and finally the architect and design team. The building owner is primarily concerned with maintenance and running costs, while the user-occupant is concerned with comfort and the building’s fitness for purpose. The regulatory bodies then have their own set of agendas that may differ from those of the owner, users and architect. Finally, it is the job of the architect and design team to mediate these differences and ‘to design a preservation/rehabilitation scheme for the project that sufficiently modernizes the premises to current day standards while being mindful of the preservation and esthetic standards in play.’\textsuperscript{568}

The Law School faculty and administration at Boston University had been pushing for the relocation of their department for the past two decades, arguing that spatial deficiencies and accumulating maintenance issues in the tower made the building unsuitable. Cott writes that the design team ‘sympathised with those who felt victimized by [the building]’ and though he and others on his design team appreciated the sculptural quality of the buildings, it was by ‘maintaining a neutral position while also explicating [their] previous experience with Sert’s work’ that they were able to convince Boston University and the Law School to go forward with a comprehensive refurbishment of the tower along with the construction of a new 6-storey classroom building at the base of the tower.\textsuperscript{569} The
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decision to refurbish the tower was also likely influenced by economics and the fact that Boston zoning laws no longer permitted the construction of new buildings as tall as Sert’s Law Tower, so the ‘grandfathered’ tower was suddenly seen by the University as a valuable asset.

Though Sert’s buildings on the Boston University campus are all now more than 50 years old, none have been designated on a local, state or national level. Moss says this is irrelevant because what most people do not realise is that buildings on the National Register can be demolished with impunity, and that listing, in fact, provides very little legal protection. As we have seen, local legislation can be much more powerful, but this varies from town to town and state to state, and depends greatly on the political power of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Designation through the local Boston Landmarks Commission (BLC) would provide greater security than the National Register, because once a building is landmarked, any proposed changes to the building require a design review and approval by the BLC. An archaeologist had chaired the Massachusetts Historical Commission (the Massachusetts SHPO) for the previous two terms leading up to the BU project, and the current Chair of the Commission, William Francis Galvin, declined to comment on the BU Law Tower. What Moss found more concerning than their lack of experience in development is the chance that the Commission could take an archaeological stance and insist that they repair everything in the building rather than replace what had failed. Moss argues that the future of conservation for modern movement buildings is to replace rather than repair, which goes against the recommendations of the Secretary of Interiors Standards, but that the greatest challenge is that the profession has yet to reach a broad understanding how to preserve raw concrete.570

The Bruner/Cott Boston University Josep Lluis Sert Complex Preservation and Development Plan proposed development guidelines based on Sert’s urban and architectural design principles. The undulating building heights and the visual dominance of the Law Tower within the Central Campus were to be retained, and the architectural elements of the buildings would be addressed following the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Although the project required extensive programmatic changes, Bruner/Cott Architects actively advocated for the conservation of significant character-defining elements to an extent greater than many firms would perhaps attempt.

Given the controversial reputation of the building, faculty was involved throughout the design process, however, at one point, project architect Henry Moss was told he was no longer welcome at the design hearings because people felt that he would sacrifice stakeholder interests in order to preserve Sert’s design and original intent. Moss found this consultation process to be largely unbeneficial because the users tended to focus only on the aspects of the building they disliked and then to devise a design programme around the opposite of these points. He said this was an absolutely typical response to buildings of this period, but what surprised him most was that in all their discussions, not one of the faculty members ever mentioned the stunning views across the Charles River to Cambridge that the building provides.

Sert had designed the campus to face away from the traffic noise of Commonwealth Avenue and toward the Charles River to the north, a move that while being well intentioned was planned without an analysis of the expected pedestrian flow pattern and would prove problematic. Students, faculty and staff generally entered the campus from Commonwealth Avenue and thus began to use the back doors and fire exits as a primary entrances rather than the main entrance facilities located on the north side of the
buildings. Bruner/Cott Architects conducted a study of pedestrian and bicycle traffic on the campus and found that foot traffic was almost as high on the small footpath between the Law Tower and the School of Theology as it was on Commonwealth Avenue. To reorient the building to suit the foot traffic, a new main entrance was constructed in this location. The ‘glass box’ addition was designed to frame a view of Sert’s neighbouring Pappas Library and functions as an event space for the School of Law. Moss disagrees with the standard practice that any new addition must be deferential to the older structure, calling out the Coutts Bank in London as one of the worst examples of the practice. Rather than building a bland, demure structure and calling it a ‘background building’, Moss argued that it is a testament to the robustness of the Sert’s buildings that they do not require a puny apologetic associate.571

Figure 3-21 and Figure 3-22. Built on the site of an outdoor space that was often in shadow and windswept, the Sumner M. Redstone Building was designed to envelop and incorporate the existing Law Tower and showcase the adjacent Pappas Library. Images: Caroline Engel (2014).

One of the greatest faults of the Boston University Law Tower has been the programmatic arrangement within. Sert had placed the largest 100-seat classrooms on the top floors of the 18-storey tower (presumably for the view), which meant that students often had to wait up to 20-minutes for one of the six small lifts between the changeover of classes. Today, with the size of rucksacks and increased student numbers, the small lifts have half the capacity as they did in the 1960s, so the conservation and development plan proposed to move all the large classrooms to a level above or below ground level. The high water table and the location of utilities underground meant that it was too expensive to build below ground level, so all large classrooms were instead relocated to spaces between the ground and fourth floor in the Law Tower or within the adjacent newly built Sumner M. Redstone Building. The Law Tower is now divided into two

zones: the upper for faculty and administration and the lower for students, which also holds workspaces for student groups, moot courtrooms, libraries and smaller tutorial or meeting rooms. The lifts in the tower were also replaced with two new high-capacity high-speed lifts.

For most modern movement buildings, a conflict arises between the emphasis the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation places on original material retention and increasing pressure for buildings to be as energy-efficient as possible, which is forcing conservation professionals to weigh the significance of culture, cost and environment against each other. Moss contends that good conservation practice will continue to retain as much original material as possible, but predicts that the practice will shift to support replacement as a valid conservation approach as more and more post-war buildings require extensive repairs. However, if the national conservation standards and historic tax credit programmes do not support replacement-in-kind as a viable conservation method, building owners will find it financially ill-advised to refurbish their
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aging stock of modern movement buildings and more may be lost at an even greater rate over the next decade.

Moss has written that, in post-war America, building science took a backseat to aesthetic preferences as architects placed greater importance on the sculptural qualities of concrete rather than its inherent abilities as a building material. At universities and institutions across the country, architects designed entire exteriors of exposed raw, porous concrete, seeming to deliberately ‘disregard historical lessons [of the Romans] in concrete assembly’, who never left concrete exposed, but covered it with tile or clay bricks. While visiting the BU Law Tower in June 2014, Moss pointed out that the precast concrete pieces were assembled three dimensionally on site, as if they were children’s blocks, and that very little thought was put into how they would overlap and shed water. Out of the 700 precast concrete fins on the Law Tower, approximately 100 had major cracks and/or large areas of spalled and deteriorating concrete. Since the problems were largely caused by the placement of reinforcing bars at an inadequate depth, in-situ repairs and protective coatings would only provide a temporary fix and long-term repair could only be provided through the replacement of the fins entirely.

A cost study was commissioned to assess the economics of repairing the concrete panels in place versus replacing them with new precast panels, and in this case, repairing them was the more economical option. Overall, the Law Tower concrete was found to be fairing pretty well in terms of carbonation, with carbonation reaching only into the first 2-4 mm from the surface. Moss estimates that in forty years’ time, the carbonation will still not have reached the steel, but he calls these buildings ‘carbonation time bombs’ and pointed out that these buildings are special as a record of experimental, but vanished construction methods. At the Law Tower, Moss is trying to turn forty years into seventy by covering the concrete with a clear matte silane/siloxane sealant to stop water penetration and provide a layer of cathodic protection.

Where required, Moss and his team have taken a more honest approach to concrete patches. Early concrete patch techniques tended to favour a feathered edge to help blend the new with the old. Instead, Moss advocates for simple geometric shapes, like the ‘Dutchman’ patch used for limestone repairs (Figure 3-24). While people are generally

---

574 Ibid.
575 Engel, "Interview with Henry Moss, Principle of Bruner/Cott Architects."
576 Moss, "Icon or Eyesore? Part 3: The Preservationist Perspective."
less tolerant of concrete patches than they are of stone replacements, he feels that the geometric patches at least look more precise and purposeful. To find a mix of the right texture and colour, Moss’ team created a grid of 24 ‘brownies’ on the roof – 6” by 6” squares of cast-in-place concrete in which the team experimented with different aggregate, cement types, sand mixtures and finishes until they found one that generally matched every surface of the building. Another issue with concrete patching and repairs is the structure-born sound and vibrations that reverberate throughout the building and make the building uninhabitable during construction works. In the previously refurbished Holyoke Center at Harvard University (also designed by Sert), Moss said there were over 650 concrete repairs for a building that he says was in excellent shape compared to the BU Law Tower. For this reason, all faculty members were moved into the newly completed Redstone Building for the duration of the project, which allowed construction work to continue throughout the full workday.

Sert was reintroducing ornamentation into modernism through the three-part window system he designed for the Law Tower and he felt that ornament not only could, but should be reintroduced into the modern idiom, declaring that ‘…modern architecture, especially when it came into the real modern city, would have to have a vocabulary. And a lot of the things that had been thrown out would have to be carefully picked up
The three-part window pattern found at the Law Tower – one part for seeing out, one part for letting light in, and one part for ventilation – are thus critically significant to the character of the building as an example of the early reintroduction of ornamentation into late modern architecture. Japanese shoji screens influenced the window pattern, and to mimic their semi-opaque light quality, fiberglass sheets were laid between two panes of glass. As at the Pappas Library and the Holyoke Center\textsuperscript{578}, Sert used vibrantly coloured panels and small cantilevers to liven up the monolithic concrete façade of the Law Tower. Moss and his team explored different logics for colouring these panels, relating the colours to the programmatic changes they were making within the building, but in the end, they decided to reinstate the original colour pattern.

Figure 3-25 and Figure 3-26. Boston University Law Tower façade showing the window arrangement and the coloured ventilation panels before and after refurbishment. Images: (left) Caroline Engel (2014); (right) Bruner/Cott Architects (2016).

Throughout the Law Tower, the single-paned steel-framed windows had been wedged into the 3-inch vertical concrete fins without any additional framing. There was little


\textsuperscript{578} At the Holyoke Center at Harvard, a similar window system was used, but a semi-opaque panel could cover a whole office space, allowing no clear view out. Henry Moss, also project architect of the Holyoke Center refurbishment, said that people have hated that aspect of the building for fifty years and when they come to replace the glass, they will look at two options. The first option is to create a glass with a dot matrix: white on the outside to mimic the semi-opaque nature of the fiberglass sheets and black on the inside to allow transparency. In the second option, in office spaces that had two window panels, one would be swapped for a transparent pane while the other would remain opaque. The issue here is that the future layout of the interiors cannot be predicted and the window pattern may only suit the current use for a short time. The university also wanted every window transparent in case they wanted to refurbish the building as a hotel in the future, so in the meantime, Harvard is dedicating its funds toward concrete repairs and only repairing the glazing, which will not change its pattern or appearance.
thought in those days about thermal bridging because heating resources were cheap, and it was truly believed that the caulk around the window frames would keep those buildings dry forever. The caulk used in the early 1960s contained carcinogenic oil, and Moss explained that one of the great headaches associated with the conservation of these buildings is the millions of dollars spent on the disposal of hazardous contaminants. To even wash the concrete, the workers must be careful to properly dispose of the effluent as toxic waste. Needless to say, the windows were prone to drafts and water ingress, so they were replaced entirely with double-glazed aluminium frame units that matched the original mullion and transom arrangement.

The refurbishment of the Boston University Law Tower and Pappas Library was completed in the autumn of 2015 and has since won a number of design awards. Architect Henry Moss was awarded the 2015 Codman Award for Lifetime Achievement by the Boston Preservation Alliance, who said that the ‘evolution of Henry's career parallels historic preservation in general: from protecting primarily the nation's most iconic sites to preserving buildings and places from all eras that reflect the narrative of our diverse and powerful heritage’. The total cost of the Law Tower refurbishment and expansion, including financing and design fees, came to $184 million – 40% less than the cost of a whole new development according to Boston University’s senior vice president for operations Gary Nicksa. The building is also now LEED Gold registered, proving that even the most inefficient modern movement buildings can be refurbished to meet the highest energy efficiency standards while still respecting their design aesthetic.
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3.5. **PART 3 CONCLUSIONS**

This conclusion summarises the distinct differences found between the two conservation systems of Great Britain and the United States of America and why these differences have developed in two nations that have demonstrated a similar reverence for heritage over the twentieth century. Part 4 then summarises the findings of this thesis in its entirety, drawing together the developments made in modern movement conservation on a local to national level in Great Britain and the United States in order to compare them against the recommendations of the international heritage organisations outlined in Part 1. Here the question of international influence and interdependence will be discussed in its most current form.

Given the geographic breadth of America, local conservation initiatives have been absolutely necessary in order to identify the often unrecognised but significant modern movement buildings, but they have also been instrumental in garnering public support, which can in turn influence the local city council and planning board. America is a nation of ‘joiners’ and ‘doers’, with a long history of philanthropy within their capitalist structure. Jane Jacobs awoke the American public to their role as preservation activists and their duty to advocate for the betterment of their local neighbourhood or city, and she has since been honoured almost unquestionably as the founder of the American preservation movement. Taking a less polite approach to conservation activism than DOCOMOMO or The Twentieth Century Society, the Recent Past Preservation Network (RPPN) and the Boston Preservation Alliance have embraced the American preservation movement’s protest roots and are willing to ‘scream bloody murder’ and ‘kick up a stink’ if a building of interest comes under threat of alteration or demolition. However, though neither group wields any statutory power, both are looking to move away from reactionary 11th hour advocacy efforts toward a collaborative relationship with building owners and developers, much like what the statutory Joint Working Agreements and Heritage Partnership Agreements are designed to do in Britain.

The acceptance of this grassroots, ad-hoc, voluntary style of conservation has led to a system that delegates the burden to demonstrate proof of a building’s exceptional significance to the independent nominator rather than a specialist body like Historic England or Historic Environment Scotland. Though designation on the National Register remains the highest honour for historic structures, it incoherently provides very little real
protection and does not inhibit the building owner from altering or demolishing the building all together. As long as it stays this way, statutory designation will continue to play a less prominent role in the safeguarding of post-war modern movement architectural heritage in the United States than it does in Britain, except for the small fraction of cities that are represented by strong municipal preservation commissions.

New York City is the best example of the power of local conservation organisations, where the Landmark Preservation Commission has developed into a powerful body backed by regulatory powers and where conservation campaigns organised by well-established neighbourhood conservation amenity groups like the Historic Districts Council have been shown to even triumph over development plans backed by the Mayor of New York, as was the case with the rezoning of Midtown East. However, designation efforts in New York City have been, at times, surprisingly forward-thinking compared to the rest of the country, as with the designation of inter-war housing projects as Special Planned Community Preservation Districts. The City, however, seems reticent to rezone any further post-war housing estates as Special Districts. Similar to the statutory listed building consent requirements in Britain, approval from the Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) must be gained before any alterations are made to landmarked buildings or buildings within a historic district, and if works are undertaken without a permit, the LPC has the right to take penal action against the perpetrator, ranging from a Notice of Violation through civil fines and criminal penalties that can warrant fines of up to $15,000 per day. However, despite these regulatory powers, the Hoffman Auto Showroom designed by America’s most highly regarded modernist architect, Frank Lloyd Wright, was demolished quickly in 2013 to avoid landmark designation, which would suggest that the partial or full integration of conservation within the planning system is necessary in order to better monitor applications for demolition permits as they apply to yet unrecognised modern movement heritage.

Despite the regulatory weakness of National Register designation, it does contribute greatly toward the valorisation of modern movement buildings and their actual conservation through access to Historic Tax Credits. To finance the refurbishment of the Cedar Square West low-income housing estate, National Register designation was essential to gain access to federal and state historic tax credits. The designation of Cedar Square West under Criterion Consideration G supports Koller’s findings that the designation of recent past heritage is largely dependent on three variables: the presence of local recent past or modernism advocacy programmes, access to state historic
rehabilitation tax credits and support from the state historic preservation office during the application process. The Minnesota SHPO is particularly well-staffed and the Minnesota Modern module funded by the Getty Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative in 2009 perhaps brought a wider awareness to the significance of Ralph Rapson as a modernist architect and to the Cedar Square West development as the most complete example of the unique and short-lived ‘New Town-In Town’ post-war federal building programme. As we have seen, the city of Minneapolis and state of Minnesota both provide a significant number of grants and tax credits to support conservation, and as the economic studies showed, these programmes channel money back into the community many times over. While most Americans would support ‘historic preservation’ initiatives, modernist and post-war buildings are still generally not considered ‘historic’, so conservation methods that support economic regeneration and can be comfortably categorised under notions of ‘progress’ are likely to be the most successful.

While the movements to conserve modern architecture in Britain and America are divergent in their approach to designation, they have generally approached valorisation efforts in a similar manner. Both have relied primarily on documentation, publications, thematic studies and public education initiatives; however, the difference here lies in the type of organisations that are behind these initiatives. In Britain, much of this work has been led by Historic England and Historic Environment Scotland, beginning in the 1990s with thematic studies and a specially established post-war steering group to identify potential modern movement buildings for listing. Although the National Trust and the National Park Service in America have undertaken surveys of modern buildings within their possession, for the most part, the documentation of modern movement heritage has been initiated more sporadically by local non-profit preservation advocacy groups interested in a specific collection of local heritage, such as post-war ranch houses. Universities across America and Britain have begun to see themselves as architectural stewards of even recent past architecture, and postgraduate preservation programmes are increasingly using architectural surveys as part of their curriculum to identify and assess the value of local modernist heritage. For instance, in recent years, students of the Columbia University degree in Historic Preservation have conducted a survey of post-war primary schools in Manhattan and of the architectural heritage of Roosevelt Island, which includes Josep Lluis Sert’s New Town-In Town housing development.

As support for modern movement conservation grows, the pressing question becomes not whether these buildings should be saved, but how. Seeing technical uncertainties as the
The greatest obstacle in the conservation of modern movement buildings, the Getty Conservation Institute has been working to commission and collate all current technical advice that is available to practitioners working with modern movement buildings, much like the free technical guides provided by Historic Environment Scotland for mostly traditional building types and features. Regarding the vast number of ‘ordinary everyday’ modernist buildings, conservationists in the United States and Great Britain seem to have arrived at the same conclusion that conservation must work with development rather than against it. Britain has approached this conclusion through a relaxation of rules relating to listed buildings and when listed building consent is required, while America has come from an angle that increasingly regards listed status as irrelevant and often detrimental to the continued use of post-war modern buildings. Against the famous aphorism that has long guided American conservation practice, ‘Better preserve than repair, better repair than restore, better restore than reconstruct’, conservation architect Henry Moss argues that the future of conservation for the great majority of post-war buildings is to replace rather than repair, which also goes against the recommendations of the Secretary of Interiors Standards. With the refurbishment of the Boston University Law Tower, Moss explained that because university staff, users and stakeholders overwhelmingly felt that the building was irredeemably awful and unfit for purpose, he fully believes that to force a preservation agenda, as opposed to one open to extensive internal refurbishments, would have been disastrous and futile, and it is only through the development process that the University came to realise the value of what they had.

Through this research, it has become clear that the conservation of modern movement heritage in Britain and the United States continues the narrative of earlier conservation movements, most notably through their approach to statutory designation and the regulation of designated buildings. Part 4 will discuss the extent to which the similarities seen in each country’s approach to the valorisation of modern movement buildings can be attributed to the recommendations of international conservation organisations.
Part 4. **FINAL CONCLUSIONS**
Through an analysis of the roles played by international, national, regional and local organisations and discourses in the heritage valorisation and conservation of modernist architecture, this thesis set out to discover whether conservation theory and practice has continued along the lines of established national trends or whether the particular challenges presented by the conservation of modern movement heritage is leading to a reorientation of the conservation movement as a whole. The conclusion at the end of Part 3 discussed how the established local, regional and national discourses and statutory systems in Great Britain and the United States of America have informed the nationally specific processes of valorisation, designation and management with regard to modern movement architectural heritage. This final conclusion will set these findings within the wider context of the conservation movement, remarking upon the implications of the research conducted and the importance of other valuable trends emerging within conservation practice. With modern movement heritage in mind, this section will conclude by recommending areas for further research and will reflect upon the future of the conservation movement and how it may develop and adapt to meet contemporary challenges and concerns.

Given the transnational scope of the modern movement itself, this thesis first reviewed the influence of international conservation bodies like DOCOMOMO, the Getty Conservation Institute, the World Heritage Centre and the ICOMOS International Scientific Committee on 20th Century Heritage (ISC20C). These international heritage organisations have led early discourses on the value, assessment and protection of modern movement heritage on a global scale and have facilitated the identification of significant modern movement buildings around the world by supporting the development of thematic studies, conservation plans, conferences and publications at a national and international level. However, as we have seen, direct international level intervention has not always been successful or welcomed at the local level. The international heritage community’s interest in the restoration of Alvar Aalto’s Viipuri Library and in the inclusion of Chandigarh as part of the larger Le Corbusier World Heritage List nomination have both been perceived as conservation for an elite international community rather than for the local communities they serve. Yet, the attempted nomination of Chandigarh subsequently led to a local re-evaluation of the city’s architectural character and value, which then led to the establishment of the Chandigarh Heritage Conservation Committee (CHCC) in 2010. The notoriety and tourism dollars that accompany WHL designation can incentivise nations and heritage bodies to develop a regulatory system to protect and manage heritage sites, however, in general,
international conservation bodies have had limited direct influence on the statutory protection of modernist architectural heritage at a national level, as has been demonstrated by the nearly complete demolition of Paul Rudolph’s Orange County Government Center even after it had been included on UNESCO’s World Heritage Endangered List.

Next, through the comparison of national, regional and local conservation trends in Great Britain and the United States of America, we have seen that though these two nations harbour a similar reverence for the historic built environment, Britain's socialist political background versus America's capitalist history continue to influence how modern movement architectural heritage is treated, particularly through the legislative weight given to heritage designation systems versus private property rights. In Britain, the conservation of modern movement architecture has first and foremost been approached through statutory designation with the established view that the historic built environment should be conserved for public good, regardless of whether the building or architectural style is popular with the general public. This tactic has had its detractors and setbacks, as has been demonstrated by the disbanding of the Post-War Steering Group in 2002 and MCMS Minister Hodge’s rejection of important modern movement buildings from designation like John Madin’s Birmingham Central Library and the Smithsons’ Robin Hood Gardens housing estate. The designation of modern movement buildings and estates has also contributed to the development of heritage legislation in England and Scotland that permits and hopes to better manage change within listed buildings. The United States has likewise stayed true to their conservation movement’s roots as a philanthropic, community-oriented, private-led initiative, and though non-governmental groups like the Recent Past Preservation Network, the National Trust or the Getty Conservation Institute have instigated national level valorisation efforts, designation on the National Register of Historic Places or state heritage registers usually follows local advocacy efforts. In contrast to the British heritage designation systems, the strongest level of statutory protection is likely to remain at the local level through municipal landmark preservation commissions, as federal level restrictions are unlikely to be placed on private property and the future of the US Historic Preservation Fund remains uncertain. Without the ratification of the US Federal Historic Preservation Fund, the greatest federal preservation incentive - the Historic Tax Credit - would be stripped of funding and heritage activists would be left with neither legislative enforcement nor economic incentives to support their cause.
The valorisation of modern movement buildings as heritage by the general public has been slow to take hold as the harsh, otherworldly aesthetic and incongruity of many modernist buildings within their surrounding environments has meant that their conservation has not been associated with the unifying and self-reinforcing values of national identity and historic destiny that drove the conservation movement over the past two centuries. As Dalibor Vesely has so poignantly argued, ‘no amount of wishful interpretation [could] bridge the gap between the promise of meaning and its fulfilment’ and that the modern movement’s break from common culture continues to contribute to the general public’s lack of affection toward these buildings. The conservation movement’s focal shift from nationalistic monuments to the ordinary everyday modernism of the recent past has also, as Glendinning has said, undermined the communicability and urgency of the movement’s core principles of special importance, rarity and threat, and without this communicability, the conservation of modern movement architecture understandably largely remains the concern of a small group of specialists.

One could hardly expect the general public to stand up for a seemingly ordinary post-war shopping mall in the same way that they did for Pennsylvania Station or the Euston Arch, yet even just over the course of this research, a noticeable shift in the perception of certain modern movement buildings has occurred. In America, Mayor Walsh’s ‘Rethink City Hall’ design initiative is challenging the long held local contempt for Gerhard Kallmann and Michael McKinnell’s Boston City Hall (1969) and in Denver, local outcry against the government’s renovation plans for the Byron Rogers Federal Building and Courthouse (1964) sparked a nationwide survey of all post-war General Services Administration buildings, which has so far led to the designation of one building on the National Register and further buildings have been recognised as eligible for designation. In London, the best council housing estates have not only become valued for their modernist design, spacious floor plans and central locations, but the postmodern view of the built landscape as a palimpsest has assisted the re-valuation of Welfare State architecture as an important representation of modern social history. Over the past decade, a growing number of academic studies, documentaries, exhibitions and books have inspired a broader general interest in the design and history of council housing.

---

across Britain, however, its valorisation began decades earlier in England with a
government-led thematic study in 1995 that led to the then inconceivable
recommendation of 19 public housing estates for designation. The designation of the
Cedar Square West low-income housing complex in Minneapolis on the National
Register in late 2010 will perhaps have a similar effect on the perception of post-war
public housing in America, but it is worth remembering that the public housing
programme never had the same public support in America that it had during its heyday in
Britain and therefore plays a much less prominent role in the nation’s collective social
history.

Over the last few years, we have seen the designation of modern movement architecture
in England and Scotland accompanied by more descriptive listing statements, which
detail the aspects of the buildings that are and are not considered to be of significance. As
the ICOMOS ISC20C has also supported the provision of clearer guidance on
significance and acceptable change within twentieth century heritage buildings through
the Madrid Document, it is likely we will see more countries and heritage organisations
adopting a similar designation system in the future. This new demarcation of significance
within each listed building statement is designed to assist building owners, architects and
developers with the challenge of refurbishing stigmatised, problematic or simply under-
appreciated post-war modernist buildings, and should help to protect the most significant
aspects of the buildings in the process. Though it is highly unlikely that such a restrictive
designation system will ever be developed at a national or state level in the United States,
the private commissioning of conservation and management plans, similar to those
developed in Britain has become more common, most notably with the refurbishment of
the Boston University Law Tower, Louis Kahn’s Yale Center for British Art, and now the
First Presbyterian Church in Connecticut, which will use the full $130,000 granted to
them by the Getty Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative in 2016 to develop a
technical conservation plan informed by engineering consultants and material scientists.
The Getty’s Keeping it Modern grants programme has broadened its international scope
even further in 2016 to include conservation projects in Kosovo, Armenia, Ghana, India,
Uruguay, Brazil, and with its stipulation to develop a conservation plan with part of the
funding, the GCI’s conservation grants are spreading a particularly British approach to
modern movement conservation worldwide.

In The Conservation Movement, Miles Glendinning leaves us with the thought that
perhaps the Western-driven concepts of conservation are on the descent, to be replaced by
the more ‘fluid, cyclical concepts’ of the East and elsewhere, leading to a conservation ‘value-system in which the strong distinction between original and copy become almost meaningless’. The technical and material challenges presented by modern movement buildings are certainly pushing conservation architects toward solutions that go against the traditional conservation proverb of repair rather than replace. Addressing this indisputable need for change within modernist heritage buildings, the 2016 14th DOCOMOMO International conference ‘Adaptive Reuse: The Modern Movement Towards the Future’ continued the discussion begun at the 2008 DOCOMOMO International ‘Challenge of Change’ conference by showcasing the practical experience of its members based in different parts of the world with the intent to reveal that the treatment of modern movement buildings can be as varied as the interpretations and representations of modernism itself. DOCOMOMO was founded with the belief that the ideals of modernism are still alive and relevant, and many of its leading members have therefore advocated for conservation methods that permit sustainable upgrades to keep the buildings fit for purpose. Alan Powers has challenged the traditional notion that authenticity must be linked to original materials or the 'substance' of a building, and has instead proposed that the authenticity of modern movement heritage be also valued in relation to the spirit or 'essence' of the building and its method of construction. These conservation ideologies are more akin to the Japanese concept of preservation as it relates to the ceremonial rebuilding of Shinto Shrines or to the Indian concept of honouring the built environment through participation, or jugaad, so it would suggest that modern movement conservation in Europe and North America is veering toward a system based on Western interpretations of Eastern values.

The greater technical nature of modern movement conservation has exposed a knowledge gap that will necessitate the creation of technical and best practice guidance to address the common failures an unsustainability of a wide variety of experimental materials and mechanical systems within twentieth century buildings. The Getty’s Conserving Modern Architecture Initiative plans to collate specialist advice on suitable repair methods, appropriate replacement materials, and guidance on implementing programmatic changes and energy performance upgrades within its second publication of the ‘Energy and Climate Management in Modern Buildings’ series. Modern movement conservation is currently being approached in an ad hoc, isolated fashion, which has also given rise to a call for the establishment of training and accreditation modules for architects, engineers,
builders, contractors, building surveyors and any other persons involved in the consolidation of modern movement buildings. To augment the development of technical guidance, further research also needs to be conducted on the development of new products, building materials and conservation methods that will help to lengthen the life of the original twentieth century materials.

One can now confidently say that since the publication of Prudon's *Preservation of Modern Architecture*, sustainability has been established as a significant trend within conservation practice, especially with regards to modern movement buildings. Recent calls for historic and even listed buildings to be retrofitted to be as thermally and energy efficient as reasonably possible have been driven by the 2015 Paris Agreement. As the first legally binding global climate change deal, the European Commission has required the 195 national signatories to reduce their nation’s carbon emissions in order to keep the global average temperature below 2°C above pre-industrial levels, however, each national government has been left to devise their own sector targets and a plan of action for achieving the necessary emission reductions. Knowing that the built environment accounts for approximately 45% of total carbon emissions from developed nations, international heritage bodies have acknowledged that historic or heritage buildings can no longer be considered exempt from meeting energy efficiency standards and have responded by revising their heritage charters or by drafting completely new recommendation principles. For the third and most recent revision of the Madrid Document, the ISC20C has requested contributions from the ICOMOS National Scientific Committees on Energy and Sustainability to expand the document’s recommendations on environmental sustainability (Article 8). Article 8 of the Madrid Document had previously acknowledged that pressure to improve the energy efficiency of heritage sites would increase over time, but it made it clear that cultural significance should not be sacrificed for efficiency gains. It is hoped that the latest revision will support and provide more specific guidance on energy performance improvement interventions within twentieth century buildings, which will follow what architects, engineers and conservation professional working with these buildings have already largely known to be an absolute in order to protect these buildings from demolition and replacement. Within the European Committee for Standardization (CEN), the technical body for the Conservation of Cultural Heritage is currently drafting guidelines for improving the energy performance of historically, architecturally or culturally valuable buildings based on the standards of its 34 European national members. Though it has yet to be published, it is expected to outline procedures to guide the selection of appropriate
measures to improve the energy performance of heritage buildings and methods to assess the impact of those measures through pre-application risk assessments and post-intervention monitoring.

In the United States, the 2011 refurbishment of the Cedar Square West low-income housing estate has shown that a conservation programme focused almost entirely on bringing the buildings and their systems up to meet current standards can still qualify for US Federal and State Historic Tax Credits, as long as the building is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the Federal Historic Preservation Fund is reinstated for another 50 years. The only restoration aspect of that project was the reinstatement of the original colour scheme to the exterior panels, but overall, what this project demonstrates is that in order to keep many modern movement building fit for purpose, the conservation agenda must first and foremost address the energy efficiency and safety of these buildings, and more often than not, once they are dry, warm and structurally sound places to live and work, user appreciation for them will follow. The refurbishment programme of the Boston University Law Tower was much more internally invasive than what could comfortably qualify as traditional conservation, however, like the Cedar Square West project, the internal refurbishment allowed the building to retain its original use and in this case, was necessary to retain the building at all given the university administration and faculty’s disdain for it. Project architect Henry Moss feels that good conservation practice will continue to save as much original material as possible, but he believes that the Fiske Kimball aphorism of ‘better preserve than repair, better repair than restore, better restore than reconstruct’ is no longer applicable to the great majority of modern movement buildings and that the profession must therefore move toward a more flexible conservation model that ensures their future economic and environmental sustainability. Although the project required hundreds of repairs to the external concrete fins, extensive internal refitting and reconfiguration, and the replacement of the original windows with new thermally efficient windows of a similar layout, the Law Tower refurbishment and expansion cost approximately 40% less than what a new building would have cost the university. The Law Tower is also now LEED Gold certified, showing that even the most inefficient modern movement buildings can be retrofitted to meet the highest energy efficiency standards and that, if handled with care and expertise, the aesthetic and historic value of the building can be preserved and reaffirmed in the process.

As it now appears that the conservation movement is at a pivotal point in the history of its
development, it is an appropriate time to take stock of what has been achieved thus far. To do so, this research has chronicled the major governmental and non-governmental initiatives and discourses relating to the conservation of modern movement heritage at an international, regional, national and local level within Great Britain and the United States. Future research in this area will need to further document the impact of the sustainability trend and the increased technical nature of modern movement conservation on the conservation movement as a whole - two areas which this thesis has touched on through the various case studies, but was unable to cover to the extent that it deserves. To fully understand the influence of international conservation organisations on the conservation of significant modern movement architecture worldwide, future research will also need to assess the growth and scope of initiatives within the global regions of Africa, the Arab States and Asia and the Pacific, which are currently underrepresented on the World Heritage List. A study of the valuation and conservation of modern movement heritage in these regions would perhaps reveal if the conservation movement is in fact on the decline or if it is perhaps only now gaining traction in non-Western nations. An evaluation of the effect of the Getty Keeping it Modern grants over the next ten years may also reveal the extent to which these international initiatives within non-Western countries have stirred local appreciation for their modernist architectural heritage. As state membership and participation within the international conservation organisations continues to expand beyond the Western and European borders, we will see whether European approaches to heritage and the historic built environment influence conservation practices afield, or whether the European chapter of conservation was only the beginning.

This thesis has therefore come to the conclusion that the valorisation of modern movement architecture as heritage, alongside an increasing global concern with climate change, is forcing the conservation movement to adopt a more flexible, theoretically-diversified and technologically-based approach to not only the conservation of modern movement architecture, but to the historic built environment in its entirety. One could also that argue that the conservation movement is once again gaining traction and communicability by shedding the old anti-establishment, elitist, protest-oriented identity of its rebellious younger years for a more mature, collaborative, progressive approach focused on integrating conservation practice with economic development and wider environmental concerns. Referencing the commercialisation of European Old Towns and historic buildings from the 1960s onward, Jukka Jokilehto foreshadowed this more comfortable relationship between conservation and development in 1999 when he asked whether ‘modern conservation should not be redefined in reference to the environmental
sustainability of social and economic development within the overall cultural and ecological situation on earth. While the designation, valorisation and management of modern movement heritage may continue to follow national conservation conventions, consensus is growing within national and international professional architectural and conservation organisations that it is both economically and environmentally irresponsible to not try to improve the energy efficiency of our historic built environment, and furthermore, that the architectural, historic or cultural significance of a building need not be sacrificed in the process. As sustainable conservation measures become evermore synonymous with good practice, we may find that the conservation of modern movement buildings in particular will continue to drive a redefinition of what it means to ‘conserve’ a building and that a more flexible interpretation of architectural, cultural and heritage value is the key to reviving the communicability of the conservation movement.

585 Ibid. (p. 449).
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5.1.1. DOCOMOMO 13TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, ‘EXPANSION AND CONFLICT’

A Conservation Policy for Modern University Buildings

DOCOMOMO 13th International Conference
Seoul, South Korea
24-27 September 2014

Caroline Engel
Edinburgh College of Art
University of Edinburgh
United Kingdom

Abstract. The revolutionary visions of post-war university architecture are in jeopardy. Historic buildings of all ages are continuously under pressure to meet demands for technological newness and to accommodate unforeseen functions, but university buildings must also visually present erudition and innovation. While buildings of 30 years of age, and sometimes those only 10 years old, are listed in Britain, the United States still only lists buildings that were constructed more than 50 years ago. Modern buildings in both countries are commonly seen as intruders on the typical Collegiate Gothic campuses, and over the years, campus administrators have shown their distaste for them through deferred maintenance and ad hoc, temporary repairs. Yet, despite their reputation, a number of universities, like New York University, have begun to address the needs of their post-war architectural heritage through conservation plans.

Whether or not these buildings are deemed ‘fit for purpose’, the sort of ‘compromise conservation’ that has been demonstrated through the on-going refurbishment of the modernist George Square Campus at the University of Edinburgh is characteristic of the rather free interpretation of heritage value often applied to these buildings. In the short history the conservation of Modern Movement heritage, have we given up advocating for preservation or are the less iconic modern buildings truly only worthy of refurbishment? Conservation measures should allow for much needed energy-efficiency upgrades, but we must be wary of an acceptance of ‘pick & mix’ conservation, whereby historic characteristics unsuitable to current tastes are discarded in a trade-off to save others. The modern redevelopment of George Square continues to be regretted by many Edinburgh residents; however, we must address whether full-scale refurbishment is the most appropriate conservation policy for controversial Modern Movement buildings, or if we as professionals are catering too greatly to the business demands of the University at the expense of historical integrity.

Post-war University Architecture, Modern Movement, Conservation Theory, Refurbishment, Rehabilitation

1. Conservation Theory and Advocacy for Modern Heritage in the UK and the US

The conservation of less iconic post-war modern buildings is gaining support across the United Kingdom and the United States, yet modern post-war public buildings and spaces remain a challenge for conservation professionals in terms of appropriation of restoration expenses, the building up of public support for an often long disliked structure and the lack of legislative support.
for the widening of the preservation agenda.\textsuperscript{586} The recent designation of the Peavey Plaza in Minneapolis (M. Paul Friedberg & Partners, 1975) as a National Historic Landmark bodes well to the expanding recognition of modernist heritage, yet the preservation of a post-war university library is still controversial to say the least. The pressure upon universities to keep relevant in time with modern technologies and educational theories is greater than those on most other buildings, plus there is great pressure to aesthetically appeal to the students and their guardians. Since the turn of the 21st century, the heritage value of these innovative and ambitious universities have come into the focus of academics and architects, producing documentation such as Stefan Muthesius’ extensive study of post-war universities\textsuperscript{587} and the documentation and conferences that resulted from funding provided through the 2006 Getty Foundation Campus Heritage Grants. These studies and the practical need to update facilities have driven a growing number of discussions on what sort of conservation approach should be applied to post-war university buildings, and what level of conservation is appropriate to safeguard their heritage value. As a result of the Getty Campus Heritage Grants programme, New York University developed a campus-wide conservation plan that aimed to not only evaluate and document the architectural heritage within NYU’s possession, including post-war apartment buildings and late-20th century commercial buildings, but also to develop management guidelines and ‘a rational strategy and schedule for performing necessary preservation work on all of NYU’s buildings’.\textsuperscript{588} It comes as no surprise that all buildings from the 1940s through the 1960s were found to be suffering from poor maintenance.

In Theodore Prudon’s 2008 publication, \textit{Preservation of Modern Architecture}, he argues that of the four ‘treatment approaches’ proposed by \textit{The Secretary of Interiors’ Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties}, rehabilitation is the most applicable economically and functionally. ‘Preservation’, in the traditional sense, is suitable for some iconic, privately owned, modern properties as it promotes the consolidation of original and new materials with an emphasis on accumulated patina. These signs of aging can arguably be seen as incongruous to the design intent of these ultra-modern, eternally new buildings, and Prudon argues that traditional preservation practice may miss the larger significance of the period.\textsuperscript{589} By definition in \textit{The Standards}, rehabilitation emphasises the process that created a building over the tangible structural elements, thus, allowing for alterations to improve a building’s energy-efficiency. Through this treatment approach, the building’s original function may be altered if the change requires minimal modification to the defining characteristics of the building, site or environment. While the approach still values original historic materials and features, it does permit exterior alterations and additions as long as these changes are differentiated but compatible, and can be reversed without negatively impacting the integrity of the original structure.

\textit{2. Conservation Policy in Practice: The Refurbishment Program for the George Square Campus, University of Edinburgh}

In post-war Britain, the University was regarded as ‘a moral and scientific hothouse’ and great financial and legislative support was given toward the expansion of established universities and

\textsuperscript{586} In England, English Heritage and the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) held an exhibition and series of talks entitled Brutal and Beautiful to coincide with the 20 September 2013 listing of four additional modern buildings to the National Heritage List, including a Cold War bunker and a ‘High Tech’ warehouse in Swindon designed by Lord Norman Foster. Conversely, in Scotland, the controversial Red Road Flats in Glasgow were proposed for demolition by dynamite as a sort of fin-de-siècle for the opening ceremony of the Commonwealth Games in July 2014. Former MSP Carolyn Leckie led the petition (signed by over 17,000 people) against the demolition of some 1100 social housing flats, attacking the ceremony organisers for the callous and vulgar “disrespect displayed by blowing up homes for entertainment”. The proposal has since been dropped due to widespread criticism and officially, for health and safety reasons.

\textsuperscript{587} Stefan Muthesius, \textit{The Postwar University: Utopianist Campus and College} (New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2001).

\textsuperscript{588} Architects and LLC, \textit{New York University Campus Preservation Plan}. P 2.

\textsuperscript{589} Prudon, \textit{Preservation of Modern Architecture}. 
the development of completely new universities. Yet, the inner-city expansion of the University of Edinburgh in the 1950s-60s, and the resultant demolition of the historic Georgian buildings, was met with great resistance. Project architect for the on-going refurbishment (or rehabilitation in America) of a number of the post-war university buildings around George Square, Dermot Patterson of LDN Architects LLP, has said that the refurbishment has even proven controversial because many people still regret the day these buildings were built. This enduring guilt has perhaps played too heavily into the conservation of the George Square Campus, leading to compromises and final results that less than glorify the inventive nature of the original designs.

While a formal conservation statement has not been written for the University of Edinburgh, the modern post-war buildings around George Square have been assessed by Historic Scotland and were A-listed as a group in January 2006, with individual buildings of outstanding value - the Sir Basil Spence designed Main Library and the David Hume Tower designed by Robert Matthew – designated in their own right at Category A (Fig. 1 shows David Hume Tower standing tall over the Adam Ferguson Building and extension). The Adam Ferguson Building, now the School of Business and the focus of this study, and its matching partner, the William Robertson Building, were both individually listed at Category B, but are considered significant contributors to the grouping and environment. Work by LDN Architects LLP was guided by the listing statements and recommendations of Historic Scotland’s Senior Inspector of Historic Buildings, Steven Robb, who worked to ensure that the most appropriate solutions were found for structural and functional shortcomings in the building. Despite the high level of supervision and discussion, the refurbishment has led to some unexpected outcomes.

Improving the energy-efficiency and indoor quality of the building were main concerns of the University and the users of the building. Upon inspection, very little insulation was found in the exterior walls and the timber-frame windows were badly weathered and rotted beyond repair. It was decided by Historic Scotland and LDN Architects that the most suitable option to both improve the thermal functioning and retain historic character was to replace the windows in-kind with new double-glazed, timber-framed windows. The rhythm of the window pattern was deemed more significant than the windows themselves, so this was carefully recreated (Fig. 2). To attain the Target Emissions Rating (TER) standard set out by the Scottish Government, the building was tied into one of three University of Edinburgh combined heat and power (CHP) facilities installed around George Square in 2005-06. In the first full year of operation the CHP system cut CO2 emissions by 1,250 tonnes compared to the emissions of the 50-year-old steam boiler system previously in place.

Greater liberties were taken with the interior, even though interiors can be protected with designation in the UK. This does not necessarily demonstrate a more lax systematic approach to the protection of modern buildings, as some would argue, but it does demonstrate the greater flexibility of the refurbishment approach versus the more strict regulations of a preservation project. The plan had originally been laid out with a circulatory movement pattern, with services clustered at the centre and offices at the exterior. This layout let very little natural light pass further than the rooms bordering the exterior and created an unsatisfactory, unnatural interior space. Planning permission was granted to extend the building upward by one floor and to open up the core of the building with a light well, both reducing the reliance on artificial lighting and improving the comfort of the building (Fig. 3). The building was also further opened up and reoriented toward George Square with the addition of a new entrance and additional ground floor glazing where originally there had only been small clerestory windows (Fig. 4). The extensive gutting of the interior was permitted by Historic Scotland on grounds that the interior finishes and

591 Engel, “Interview with Dermot Patterson of Ldn Architects.”
furnishings were deemed of lower quality than those found in the Category A listed David Hume Tower and Main Library.593

Expansion plans to the south side of the Adam Ferguson Building were guided and legitimised by a 1958 archive drawing by architect Robert Matthew that illustrates a small indeterminate (unbuilt) square building in that location. As it turns out, after construction began, an unfinished passageway was uncovered that would have connected the two buildings. An earlier proposal by LDN Architects for a long, low 2-storey building was rejected for a squatter 3-storey building with a smaller footprint, and though the latter hides more of the façade of the Adam Ferguson Building from a street level viewpoint, Historic Scotland felt that the lower building obscured the Acropolis-like ‘plinth’ upon which the university buildings were ceremoniously raised (Fig. 4). Through numerous review meetings with the Edinburgh City Council and Historic Scotland, an extension was agreed upon that satisfied their request for appropriateness in scale and form. Also of note, earlier renderings by LDN Architects depicted the glass box extension with timber fins matching the timber frames of the main building. When and why this design was abandoned for the matte grey metal frame, I cannot say for certain, but in my personal opinion, I feel the timber fins would have been that key element to tie the extension back to the original building in a refined and contemporary way.

In terms of function, the extension seems to satisfy the spatial needs of the users (Fig. 5). However, a personal inspection on a bright, spring day found the interior insufferably warm despite the cool outdoor temperature of 9° C (48° F). The thermal inefficiencies of a glass box seem to continue despite the firm’s great efforts with thermal modelling, frosted thermal glass, high-level operable windows and exterior fins. The addition is unmistakably contemporary and fits the widely accepted mantra of ‘different yet compatible’, but one has to question whether the design was driven more by contemporary fashion than material compatibility and sensitivity. This determination to force the old to accommodate the new is evident in the firm’s RIBA profile: ‘LDN Architects is best known for its award-winning approach to conservation blended with creative contemporary design that recognises that history must be made in the 21st century as well as respected.’594 The refurbishment of the Adam Ferguson Building has greatly improved the programmatic functionality, the energy-efficiency and the beauty of the exterior has been carefully restored for at least the next fifty years, however, the wholesale loss of the interior is disorientating and is an example of the growing systematic acceptance of façadism for modern movement buildings.

In general, facadism has been abandoned as a conservation practice in Britain after witnessing the chronological incongruence the practice gave us in the post-modern period; however, in this case, I have to say I agree with Historic Scotland and, in general, with the work of LDN Architects. And that is the point I want to make – there is no prescriptive measures that we can apply cleanly to all of these buildings. In this particular case, there was very little, if anything, worth saving of the original interior; there weren’t any fine finishings or poetic spaces to maintain. Do I think that the architects could have worked harder to create an interior aesthetic less institutional and more on trend with the era of its construction? Yes, but this is what the client wanted and that is often the bottom line. These new interiors can be replaced in 20-30 years, and in time, the new addition may not look so stylistically incongruent. The important thing in this instance is that the distinct pattern of the original strip windows was painstakingly and expertly replicated, and other faults in the main building exterior were remedied in a sympathetic fashion. So while refurbishment projects are most often driven by the best intentions, the path to respectful conservation is not clear-cut and we must be mindful of current trends encroaching on our interpretation of significant buildings from our recent past. ‘Compromise conservation’ need not be a faulty venture employed as a means to bypass real heritage conservation, but can, if innovatively and knowledgeably executed, reveal the most significant elements of a historic building for a new era of users.

593 "Listing Description: 36 George Square, University of Edinburgh, Arts Faculty, Adam Ferguson Building (Block D)."
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The 13th DOCOMOMO International Conference was held in Seoul, South Korea this October, marking the first international event to be hosted by an Asian chapter. The theme of the conference, ‘Expansion & Conflict’, prompted speakers to address how the demands for new development are affecting the recognised and unrecognised modern heritage of the twentieth century. Conference Chair, Jong Soung Kimm wrote in the Editor’s Note of the astonishingly already published conference proceedings that the march of Modernism on the built landscape in Korea had been ‘…more tortuous’ and was ‘nothing less than a “conflict” because it entailed superseding a whole inventory of architectural styles before Modernism took root’. As one of the first great contrasts to the traditional architecture of Korea, the starkly modern Sewoon Arcade shocked and awed residents of Seoul during its construction in the mid-1960s. The Sewoon Arcade continues to elicit strong opinions from the public and until February of this year, was scheduled for demolition and redevelopment. Capitalising on the wealth of international knowledge and experience descending upon Seoul, the conference organisation committee arranged a design workshop in which students of all levels and backgrounds were given the opportunity to work with esteemed local architects and guest architects from around the world, and after an intense three days, each of the nine teams presented their research and designs to a panel of prominent city planning officials and architects. As a participant of the workshop, I have chosen to use this article as a platform to further disseminate the insights I have gained about how modern movement heritage is perceived differently in South Korea and the Asian countries in general.
The workshop asked participants to address an extraordinary problem city planning officials are facing in Seoul – the future of the Sewoon Arcade. Designed by the famed Korean modernist architect, Kim Swoo-Geun and completed in 1967, the Sewoon Arcade is a mega-structure bisecting the heart of an historic neighbourhood of Seoul, spanning one-kilometre in length and visually connecting the Jongmyo Shrine in the north, a UNESCO World Heritage site, to the Namsan Mountain in the south. This historic neighbourhood within which the Sewoon Arcade sits still retains the same street patterns that were developed around 600 years ago. During WWII, Japanese forces in Seoul created a fire-containment gap by clearing a 50m corridor through this district. After the war, this expansive swath of land became a shantytown for those impoverished and displaced by the war. Embarrassed by the provincial image this development presented to the outside world, President Park Chung-hee ordered their demolition, and this was the land upon which the Sewoon Arcade was built, wiping away the memory of the two successive groups of displaced residents. To facilitate the construction of this enormous project, the building was divided in four blocks and built by four different companies. Rising up to 13 storeys in places, the Sewoon Arcade was one of the first high-rise buildings in Seoul and was a symbol of the country’s progress toward modernity after their emancipation from Japanese rule in 1945.

After completion, the Arcade was a buzzing hive of commercial activity and a great source of pride for the citizens of Seoul. Like many mega-structures of this era (Cumbernauld in particular comes to mind), the Arcade was designed to function as a multi-functional facility with loading docks and one-way roads running along the ground floor of either side of the arcade. Shops filled
the first through third floors, and were accessed by a pedestrian deck running the length of each block. The upper floors had a variety of uses, but were mostly used for housing, office space and storage, and are primarily used in that manner today.

The reputation of the Sewoon Arcade declined as the architectural style fell out of favour and as other districts of Seoul developed with glistening new high-rises and commercial activities. Like the shantytown it replaced, the arcade is now derided as a vile and problematic place, called ‘the Monster’ by locals both for its gigantic form and the supposed seedy activities that it hides in the great depth of its bowels. Upon the first visit with my design team, our guide, a young local architect, insisted that we were not to enter the building, but to only observe it from outside for our own safety, and he warned that women especially should stay well clear of they could be snatched and forced into a sexual slave trade. Of course I heeded these words with caution – the building is rather formidable – but after wandering the length of the pedestrian decks, one could not resist the temptation to explore the narrow hallways lined high with archaic, dust-laden television sets, clock radios, shelves and shelves of nuts, bolts and all the trappings of a traditional hardware store. Opening onto the decks were traditional, no-fuss restaurants where locals could get a cheap meal, fluorescent lighting shops glimmering like jewels, and on one deck, a large flower shop made a rather beautiful contrast to the weathered, unforgiving concrete. From what I could see, the building was not a monster but a protective shell for merchants and small goods producers for whom time had passed by. The dystopian aesthetic has already begun to attract the alternative types, such as the young contemporary performance art group we met who had claimed a vacant space in the building for a one-day pop-up performance.

It was this original concept of the multi-functional, self-supporting community that drove our programmatic redevelopment of the Sewoon Arcade. Our small design team\textsuperscript{595} began by assessing

\textsuperscript{595} Our design team consisted of Ryo Kasahara (4\textsuperscript{th} year architecture student from Japan), Jiseong Kim (architecture graduate from South Korea), Kim Chang Gyun (Principal Architect of UTAA Architects in Seoul), Michel Melenhorst (Professor of Contextual Design at the Academie van Bouwkunst and Principal Architect of fm architecten), and, of course, myself, Caroline Engel (PhD Candidate in Architecture at the University of Edinburgh).
what original aspects of the building remained and of these, which were important to keep. From this, we developed a sort of conservation statement, in which we analysed and defined the significance of the arcade through its physical attributes, the urban context and the community within and around the buildings. In the end, unlike most design teams, we did not propose a specific design solution, but instead a programmatic plan to revitalise the businesses already within the arcade through a greater connection to current markets. Rather than inviting a completely new use for the whole structure, such as a university or student housing, which would require great changes to the fabric, our team proposed to reinvigorate the self-sustaining principle by developing a programme that would encourage new uses based upon the current tenants. The new tenants would ideally benefit from the small welding, lighting and electrical shops, the light manufacturing, and construction industry supply stores already on site, and thus increase the commercial draw to the area.

Given that the building had been slated for demolition until protests from the local architectural community put a halt to these plans in February 2014, the onslaught of questions from esteemed Seoul architects and political figures on the panel and nodding heads throughout the audience gave the encouraging impression that we had helped them see the Sewoon Arcade as something other than a monster, as something that could once again become a source of pride for the city. The city planning officials of Seoul were showered in positive publicity for the unveiling of the Cheonggyecheon River in 2008, which had been covered by a highway for the past four decades. Undoubtedly hoping to further boost the city’s international image, the proposed demolition of the Sewoon Arcade to create a parkway perpendicular to the river would have been at the expense of not only the arcade itself and the great early modernisation ambitions it represents, but also at the expense of the humble low-level community around it and the historic 16th century street patterns. The concept of heritage conservation is different in the East, and I wouldn’t necessarily advocate that they follow the Western model, but I do hope that through our assessment of the heritage significance of the Sewoon Arcade, we have helped the planning officials see that the building is a destination in itself, and through its revitalisation, Seoul could teach us something in the West about how to deal with these concrete mega-structures in a way that both honours their originality and incites new interest, pride and investment from the local community.
Above Left: Contemporary street map of the Sewoon Arcade and surrounding neighbourhood with markings showing where ground level connections could be made through the building based on the historic street pattern to help integrate the Arcade with the community.

Above Right: Conceptual proposal to draw pedestrians back up to the 1st floor deck level and to improve its usefulness by connecting it over the busy roadways between the four blocks of the Sewoon Arcade.

Presentations from the 2014 DOCOMOMO Student Design Workshop can be viewed at:
http://issuu.com/docomomo.international/docs
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**Using Documentation to Inform Decisions**

When using documentation to inform the decisions taken in a conservation project regarding post-war modern heritage, we must first ask what we are intending the documentation to support and often whether our aim is to conserve the original conceptual authenticity or the material authenticity. Perhaps neither can be conserved in their entirety if the building is to suit an unintended use or the incongruent requirements of the client, but regardless, our personal interpretation of the documents at hand must be acknowledged as an outside influence that would never have played into the original design.\(^{596}\) Likewise, the differing personal interpretation of a building by professionals and the public should not under-valued.

Modern architecture has challenged us to question whether material authenticity truly offers a direct connection to the past, and whether this is an aim we should continue to embrace. It is no wonder that the writings of Viollet-le-Duc and the ‘conservative surgery’ methods of Patrick Geddes have once again risen to the fore in conservation theory.

With exceedingly acute pressure for university buildings to suit current study programmes and the image of ‘newness’ to impress the students and their guardians, is it enough to rely on conservation through documentation, as was the leading agenda for Docomomo at its founding, or is it possible to use documentation to support the often unpopular proposal for extensive material conservation, if such a thing is possible? Is it commendable to preserve just fragments of a

---

building, and if so, is it acceptable to restore elements of the design no longer there if solid evidence for such exists in the documentation?\footnote{Jukka Jokilehto, A History of Architectural Conservation, Butterworth-Heinemann Series in Conservation and Museology (Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1999). P 335-338.}

Recent Documentation Programmes in the United States

Architect Jon Buono, a senior associate in historic preservation and design at Einhorn Yaffee Prescott in New York, has said the evolution of modern architecture in American universities has led the current appreciation of the campus as an assemblage of well-designed architecture representative of the passage of time. In the campus setting, Buono explains that historic preservation is ‘more broadly understood as an act of institutional stewardship, a successful tool for strengthening diverse stakeholder relations, and a companion to sustainable development goals.’\footnote{Buono, ”Modern Architecture and the U.S. Campus Heritage Movement.” P 88.} By the beginning of the 21st century, though a framework for campus preservation planning had been suggested by a number of state and federal management organisations, none had successfully demonstrated the benefits of building and landscape conservation over the increased facility demands and other influences on the campus planning process. Since 1976, it has been a requirement laid out by Congress that all properties meeting the eligibility requirements for designation on the National Register for Historic Places must be considered with a greater sensitivity. Despite this federal requirement, academic interests were often at conflict with building preservation and The Getty Foundation Campus Heritage Initiative program ran from 2002 through 2007 to assist the colleges and universities with the management and preservation of its architectural heritage.

The Campus Heritage Preservation Conference held in Chicago in May 2002, was organised collaboratively by the School of Architecture and Allied Arts at the University of Oregon and The Getty Foundation. Papers from this conference have since been published in the April-June 2011 edition of the Planning for Higher Education academic journal, published by the Society for College & University Planning. The conference set out to address four questions:

- How do we define campus heritage resources from the recent past?
- What is the relationship between heritage resources from the recent past and campus planning?
- What are the challenges of community relations, especially as they impact heritage resources from the recent past?
- What are the challenges of institutional leadership, alumni relations, and funding regarding sites from the recent past?

Barbara Christen has described the post-war building era as a ‘freight train coming down the track’ and asked how documentation could be used to establish the value and significance of a place, in relation to original design intent, materials and relation to the surround campus landscape and buildings.\footnote{Barbara S. Christen, ”The Historian’s and the Preservationist’s Dilemma,” Planning for Higher Education 39, no. 3 (2011), http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=71497749&site=ehost-live.} She argues that architecture of the recent past exists in a category of “otherness” with respect to the canonical value system of the U.S. National Register of Historic Places. Thus, this unapproachable nature does not readily render it as ‘national heritage’ in the minds of those whom are unfamiliar with the aesthetics of post-war modernism. Of the vast number of university campus building and expansion programmes of the 1960s, Christen points out that little documentation exists outside of works by the master architects like Gropius, Kahn and Rudolph. The high-style bias of the research and attention paid to the modern movement is beginning to widen to include the lesser-known actors, some as a direct result of the Getty Foundation campus
initiative. Documentation through the personal experiences and memories of alumni, staff and faculty denote how the architecture of the post-war building programmes have less (or a different type) of ‘psychological potency’ as the University Gothic or Richardsonian styles of the late 19th-early 20th century.

The Council of Independent Colleges Historic Campus Architecture Project (CIC HCAP) project was funded by two generous grants from The Getty Foundation Campus Heritage Initiative – one to funded survey data collection and the second to fund the development of the website database. Over the six-year course of the initiative, The Getty Foundation supported 86 campus preservation projects across America with the total grant aid exceeding $13.5 million. The project culminated in November 2011 with a national symposium on campus preservation, organised by the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP), where numerous campus conservation plans funded by the Campus Heritage Initiative were presented. Many of these campus conservation plans are now available online through the Society for College and University Planning. The symposium drew participation from the likes of Pamela Delphenich, Director of Campus Planning & Design at MIT and Joan Weinstein, Deputy Director at The Getty Foundation. Richard Ekman, the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) president, outlined the ongoing development of the first national architecture and landscape database of independent college and university campuses, the Council of Independent Colleges Historic Campus Architecture Project (CIC HCAP). From 2002-2004, the CIC collected survey data of university buildings and landscapes with significant historical interest (in relation to design, educational reform, history, religion, engineering, or culture) to ‘help various constituencies gain an awareness of and appreciation for campus history and also to learn from the architecture and landscape preservation efforts made by institutions.’ Building profiles can be browsed by name, state, type, design, building style, function or time period. The survey covers 724 independent, four-year, B.A.-granting institutions with less than 5,000 students, so it by no means accounts for all architectural heritage to be found in universities across the US, leaving out the larger universities that often commissioned larger projects by eminent architects in the post-war period.

New York University Campus Preservation Plan

In 2006, New York University (NYU) in lower Manhattan was granted $180,000 through The Getty Campus Heritage Initiative to fund a campus preservation plan to survey 96 buildings, two of which are already designated as historic landmarks, and 65 of which are set within locally designated historic districts. The study aimed to not only evaluate and document the architectural heritage within NYU’s possession, but also to develop management guidelines and to ‘develop a rational strategy and schedule for performing necessary preservation work on all of NYU’s buildings.’

The project was subdivided into four phases: Phase I: Building Assessment; Phase II: Treatment Guidelines; Phase III: Implementation Strategy; and Phase IV: Education and Training. Phase I was completed over 6 months, beginning in the autumn of 2006, by Murphy Burnham & Buttrick and Higgins Quasebarth & Partners, wherein the historical significance and visual conditions of each campus building were evaluated. The Phase II Treatment Guidelines were categorised by building type - determined by building function, age and construction materials – and was adapted to work with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. In the preservation report, the Treatment Guidelines are divided into categories of architectural

600 Ibid. P 106.
603 Ibid. Project Background.
604 Architects and LLC, New York University Campus Preservation Plan.
605 Ibid. P 2.
features, wherein the recommendations for preservation/maintenance or restoration/rehabilitation are outlined for each subsequent type of feature, i.e. concrete canopies or exposed-steel canopies. The division by architectural feature rather than construction material or time period is done to emphasise those features that define the character of a building, and to emphasise the need for thoughtful preservation or rehabilitation works.

The Phase III Implementation Strategy prioritizes the necessary maintenance and preservation work for the buildings of historical or architectural significance. Approximately half of the NYU campus buildings are designated as New York City Landmarks or fall within the boundaries of historic districts, so any work to these buildings will require a permit from the Landmarks Preservation Commission before work can begin. The Phase IV Implementation Strategy priorities are as follows:

- Adopt a program of preservation and preventative maintenance for buildings under six stories.
- Expand the scope of the five-year cycle Local Law 11 work to preserve NYU’s buildings six stories or higher.
- Restore a select group of NYU’s buildings that have outstanding architectural qualities or a strong presence in the immediate neighbourhood.

Of interest to this paper, the NYU Campus Preservation Plan evaluated both post-war apartment buildings (building type R4) and late-20th century commercial buildings (type C2). The report briefly outlines the history of the significant buildings, such as I.M. Pei’s 1961 University Village (now Silver Towers), and other apartment buildings that were constructed as part of Robert Moses’ slum clearance measures implicated under the Title I redevelopment plan for the South Village. Following this, the section on common features and conditions lists the common materials and construction methods used, and the common maintenance issues and technical problems now found with a list of typical solutions for each. The section is not technical but is meant to be an overview of typical issues for each period of building types. For late 20th century commercial buildings, NYU has three, including the commercial development on LaGuardia Place, to accompany the Washington Square Village apartment buildings. The development was never fully realised, but the building standing was well designed, faced in blue stone veneer and colour-glazed brick to match the Village apartment buildings. The survey found that the buildings were not in good condition overall, and that inappropriate signage, awnings, light fixtures and storefront infill has compromised the architectural integrity. It is not surprising that, with the exception of the University Village, the report found that all buildings from the 1940s through the 1960s are suffering from poor maintenance. Given that ornamentation is limited in these structures, the greatest conservation threat is the use of improper materials in ad-hoc replacement and renovation works.

In 1964, NYU commissioned Philip Johnson and Richard Foster to design a master plan which would create a cohesive architectural identity for the university incorporating both new and acquired buildings. Three new buildings were constructed as part of the master plan - Tisch Hall (1970-72), Bobst Library (1972) and Meyer Hall (1971) – but since that time, construction has proceeded without coherence to a master plan. The survey found similar inappropriate material repairs to the late-20th century institutional buildings and that the alteration of uniform interior lighting throughout the buildings has had a noticeably detrimental effect on the intended aesthetic quality. The report insists that ‘the unity of the façade is critical to maintaining the buildings’

\[\text{606} \text{ Ibid. P 3.}\]
\[\text{607} \text{ New York City’s Local Law 11 jurisdiction requires façade inspections and resulting repairs in five-year cycles. The Local Law 11 was implemented to ensure the safety of buildings and the public areas around them, it does not require proper conservation practice and therefore does not ensure the integrity of repairs in relation to the aesthetics or original materials of the building.}\]
\[\text{608} \text{ Architects and LLC, New York University Campus Preservation Plan. P 1-18.}\]
integrity’ and that any necessary upgrades or rehabilitation works ‘should always avoid any efforts that compromise the character and defining features of these buildings.’\textsuperscript{609}

The conclusions drawn regarding NYU’s current maintenance and repair efforts were outlined in full as such:

- Smaller buildings not covered by Local Law 11 have been neglected. This is especially the case with areas of deteriorating façades that are not easily accessible and which fall outside of routine maintenance work.

- The annual building inspections are a positive step towards addressing the growing backlog of repair needs of smaller buildings. This program should be expanded to address the maintenance and preservation of these buildings.

- Local Law 11 work has been effective in identifying and addressing deterioration of the larger campus buildings. The program, however, can be enhanced to insure that work is appropriate to the historic integrity of buildings.

- The Office of Construction Management has made significant improvements to NYU’s larger campus buildings through basic preservation measures through its Local Law 11 budget.\textsuperscript{610}

Recently, NYU enacted a policy requiring building managers to make an annual check of all buildings under 6 storeys as well to ensure proper maintenance. The survey found that, in particular, older, lower-storey buildings had a backlog of deferred maintenance that contributed to accelerated decay and disproportional repair costs. At the time the report was published, an implementation plan had been developed for buildings which warranted special consideration for their architectural value. These Initial Restoration and Rehabilitation Projects outlined the scope of work to be done on a select number of buildings. It is worth noting that no buildings after 1945 were included in the initial implementation plan.

\textit{Conclusion}

In the post-war period, the newly developed notion of a university as a ‘microcosm of society’, with planning emphasis on knowledge, politics, values and socialisation, informed new concepts of environments that encouraged a certain ‘experience’, and thus, the university became an equally influential setting for developing the students’ personality as well as their mind.\textsuperscript{611} It was here that architects were able to implement their grander plans for urban environments on a smaller scale. Complexities of urban planning, including industrialised building methods, separation of automobile and pedestrian traffic, and new architectural forms for the expanding variation of building uses all came into practice in the universities where these new problems could be grappled with at a graspable scale. General urban planning concepts like compactness in layout to encourage social mixing, visual coherence and interest were experimented with around newly developed pedestrian precincts and motorcar byways. By the 1960s, the functionalist theory of modern architecture had fallen out of fashion, and though architects were foremost interested with serving the practical needs of the building in an economical manner, they strove to accomplish something more in terms of the aesthetics. The political, social and moral values of a building could be elevated through the artistic treatment of the buildings and campus as a whole.

Unfortunately, the idealist and moral aims of this architecture has been lost in translation over the years. In Britain, The Twentieth Century Society has recently published their eleventh journal in

\textsuperscript{609} Ibid. P 1-32.
\textsuperscript{610} Ibid. P 3-2.
\textsuperscript{611} Muthesius, The Postwar University: Utopianist Campus and College. P 4.
their *Twentieth Century Architecture* series, entitled *Oxford and Cambridge*. Inviting contributions from a number of notable professionals, the journal presents the design ideas behind some of the most loathed modern buildings that have since been seen to disrupt the picturesque cityscapes of Oxford and Cambridge. Alan Berman writes in ‘Modernising Oxford’s C20 Listed Buildings’ about the difficulties of saving these buildings when some college fellows and faculty are viscerally opposed to their continued presence in any form.

When it comes to buildings and architecture some are wonderfully open, enlightened and realistic while others, notwithstanding their enormous collective brainpower, are deeply conservative and suspicious of anything modern: knowledgeable of course, but occasionally narrowly opinionated, unworldly and impractical.

Over 25 years, the architectural firm Berman Geddes Stretton has been commissioned to work on listed buildings of all eras at fourteen of the Oxford colleges and one Cambridge college. He has found that though only the best young architects of the post-war period built at Oxford and Cambridge, these buildings remain largely, but by no means universally, unloved. In the environments dense with significant historic buildings, funds are found for the repair, restoration and retention of the traditional buildings, while the college fellows question whether to allocate funds for work on the 1960s ‘monsters’.

In one particular meeting to discuss potential changes to a listed Killick, Partridge & Amis building, one fellow vehemently remarked, ‘Now get my position on this building clear. Semtex is the only solution.’

It is important to document the difficulties faced when arguing for the conservation or sensitive refurbishment of these buildings for the prosperity of other professionals in the field. Berman found the foremost challenge to be the construction of a convincing case for the expenditure of funds necessary to ensure proper renovation. The ‘patch and repair’ attitudes continue to dominate discussions in many college financial committees in regards to post-war buildings, and in his experience, he says ‘it sometimes seems they have a positive mission to use inadequate maintenance to ensure a building’s demise.’

Though the fate of many modern post-war buildings still remains uncertain and advocacy for sensitive renovations remain an uphill battle, the awareness of modern architecture as national heritage has risen in recent years. The major restoration and rehabilitation projects underway at the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT), Florida Southern College and Yale University are evidence that institutions of higher education are coming to believe that their modern buildings and campuses are not only valuable, but also continue to effectively serve modern educational needs. In August 2001, Mies van der Rohe’s Crown Hall at IIT was listed as a National Historic Landmark, the country’s highest award for national heritage. Despite this progress, Buono argues that most of the country’s modern university heritage remains under threat, both from hasty determinations of obsolescence and insensitive or uninformed surveys and condition assessments. Subjective opinions in opposition to modern movement architecture exist in academic professionals, administrators, users, planning professionals and architects. Competition for the brightest minds and the constant pressure to possess the newest technology and state-of-the-art facilities often paint the post-war modern buildings as outdated dinosaurs. Over the next decade, we shall see that the thorough and informed documentation of these buildings will be necessary to save the best representatives from this era against the detriments of deferred maintenance, prejudice, thoughtless renovations and demolition. Let us hope that more campus
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614 Ibid. P 182.
615 Semtex is a general-purpose plastic explosive often used in commercial blasting and demolition.
administrations begin to see the campus as a collective of architectural history and theory overtime, valuing each age for its unique contribution regardless of style and personal taste.

5.1.4. **ASSOCIATION FOR PRESERVATION TECHNOLOGY 2013 ANNUAL CONFERENCE, ‘PRESERVING THE METROPOLIS’**

*British Post-war Housing: Balancing Heritage Value and Suitability to Modern Needs*

Association for Preservation Technology annual conference  
New York, New York  
11-15 October 2013

**Abstract**

The undeniable evidence of an impending global environmental change has spurred governments and architects to ask more of the world’s urban building stock – new and historic. In terms of heritage protection, some argue that post-war modern movement architecture in Britain have been subject to greater alterations and less protection from both governmental and non-governmental agencies. Poor maintenance and performance, budget-cutting alterations during construction and incongruent interventions after completion have tarnished the image of many post-war modern movement buildings, yet, in recent years, this era of architectural design has steadily gained popularity as the subject of critical reappraisals by academics and conservation professionals. In 2011 alone, Historic Scotland listed 35 post-war buildings, structures and artworks; however, the Historic Environment Amendment (Scotland) Act 2011 enacted a new provision called the Certificate of Intention Not to List, which legally guarantees that a building will not be statutorily listed for five years to allow for redevelopment, which could possibly put undervalued modern architecture at risk. With the risk of loss still high, conservationists must question the appropriateness of post-war structures to their current social and cultural environments and whether the existing conservation practices properly assess and address the suitability of a structure parallel to its importance as heritage. After speaking with leading professionals within such heritage-minded institutions as DOCOMOMO UK, DOCOMOMO Scotland, The Twentieth Century Society, English Heritage, Historic Scotland, and with the architects working with post-war structures, I will present a survey of the challenges presented by the increased heritage valuation of post-war modern movement architecture within Great Britain and how this architecture is being re-evaluated in terms of an increasingly important political agenda of enhanced sustainability.

*Note: This paper was written as a speech and was never published.*

**Introduction:**

First and foremost, I would like to thank the conference organizers and student scholar committee for inviting me to be here. I am honoured to be here.
I have been asked to open the session on sustainability in the historic built environment, which I will do with a look at measures to continue the usefulness and improve the environmental efficiency of post-war modern buildings in Britain through two case studies – the Barbican in London and the Canongate Housing Complex in Edinburgh.

*Heritage Value and Efficiency Upgrades*

The Climate Change Act of 2008 stipulates that by 2050, Britain’s greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced by 80%, using a baseline of emission levels from 1990. By 2020, the Act requires a reduction in emissions of at least 34% and the Scottish Government has set itself a more challenging immediate objective to lower emissions by 42%. In urban areas of the UK, half of all CO₂ emissions can be contributed to the building stock, and one-quarter of this to the older buildings. It is clear that to achieve the task set forth by the Climate Change Act, we must address the energy efficiency of the ageing buildings in Britain.

The two case studies I present today are leading examples of how the energy performance of post-war housing complexes can be improved through measures sensitive to the significant heritage aspects of the design.

*England: Energy Saving study at the Barbican*

The Barbican is an impressive estate in central London, designed by architects Chamber, Powell and Bon and was built between 1962-1988. The estate covers 35 acres and houses 18 residential towers, two schools, an arts centre, theatres, restaurants, offices and more.

This past July, to my knowledge, the 1st study of its kind was published on the energy-saving interventions that could be implemented at the Grade II* listed Barbican. This study was based on findings from a residents’ survey conducted by Carrie Behar of the University College London Energy Institute.

The residents’ survey included questions that tried to determine the energy-use behaviours of residents at the Barbican, which could then be compared to those behaviours of residents at two new low-energy UK housing developments. If the behaviours at the Barbican compared favourably, then it is believed that the residents may be open to sustainable interventions, which can be difficult to implement in such a large and complex listed building where the 2,000 flats are mostly individually owned.

Like many post-war structures, the solid concrete walls of the Barbican are poorly insulated which leaves them inefficient to prevent heat loss. The floor-to-ceiling single-paned windows and doors afford fantastic views of London, but also do little to retain heat. Heat loss is not the only temperature-related problem at the estate though.

In an attempt to eliminate all clutter of radiators, pipes, boilers and mechanical equipment, Chamber, Powell and Bon designed an in-floor heating system, which is controlled centrally by a timer set to deliver heat during off-peak electricity hours in the morning and evening. This central system is set to deliver background heat to 16 C/60 F during the winter months between 1 October – 30 April. Each unit has its own circuit, however, residents do not have thermostats by which to regulate the temperature individually. Instead, residents must contact the maintenance engineer to adjust the settings for their flat via a system of trimmers. Residents can also request to have fuses removed for certain rooms to cut off the in-floor heating altogether.

---

Through the residents’ survey, Behar found that many residents were completely unaware of these measures to regulate the temperature. Instead, they resorted to active or passive heating and cooling methods, active being freestanding electric heaters or air conditioners, and passive being window or door ventilation, which unnecessarily wastes heat.

Behar found that 89% of people resorted to opening windows in the winter to regulate the overheating of their flat. Of the residents who use the central trimmers to increase or decrease the amount of electrical charge entering their flat circuit, this percentage dropped to 81%. Although a difference of 8% seems miniscule, in a population of over 4,000 residents, this difference could mean significant energy savings if more residents were made aware of the alternative options for heating control.

For a building complex that was designed in the 1950s, Behar found that in terms of energy consumption, the Barbican actually does not function too poorly. Without any sort of sustainability measures in place, the average heating energy consumption across the residential towers was found to be 194 kWh/m$^2$/year over a 6-year period starting the winter of 2002/2003. In comparison, a new residential structure built to comply with the 2006 UK Building Regulations averages around 100 kWh/m$^2$/year. You can see the average building from the 1960s and 1970s performs much worse.

The study also found that half of the Barbican residents would be interested in the installation of household energy use monitors. The Barbican Association Sustainability Group has since used these findings to recommend that the Barbican Estates Office installs a monitor for any resident who requests one. Residents could then see the benefit of trimming the amount of energy entering their underfloor heating system. The overall annual cost of heating is divided between residents of a tower, so while immediate financial benefits may not be apparent, great energy savings could be seen if the measures were implemented throughout the building.

The Sustainability Group was also able to use these findings to persuade the Estates Office to undertake a pilot study in one of the residential towers, wherein all residents were made aware of the alternative ways to regulate their heating. The energy savings from this pilot programme have not yet been calculated, but it will be interesting to see if this very site-specific alteration can make a significant difference in the energy consumption of the whole estate.

Scotland: Canongate Housing Complex, Edinburgh

The Sustainable Urban Environments Research Group (SUE-RG) within the School of Engineering and the Built Environment at Glasgow Caledonian University has conducted a similar sustainability study of the B-listed Canongate Housing Complex in Edinburgh. Historic Scotland asked the research group to assess the energy efficiency and sustainable upgrade options available for the residential blocks. The study aimed to provide practical guidance for owners and residents on measures that can provide a significant decrease in energy consumption and improve comfort, while preserving the historic value of the existing building.

The Canongate Housing Complex consists of 3 individual blocks, constructed with heavy masonry external cavity walls, which support the concrete slab floors that run through to the exterior of the buildings, and in some instances, continue outward to create individual balconies. On the whole, the buildings are sorely under-insulated, with reference to insulation being made only twice in the original drawings – the provision of 1” of insulation below floating floors over the through-building walkways (presumably fibreglass) and a small amount of insulation in the timber roofs. These two instances make no impressionable impact on the energy efficiency of the buildings, since the concrete slabs and exterior walls are uninsulated. The sustainability study corresponded with a conservation statement prepared by Simpson & Brown Architects on behalf of the Edinburgh World Heritage Trust. The drawings here show the architectural elements that Simpson & Brown found to be most significant in terms of heritage.
The residents’ main concerns are dampness and condensation within the flat and extensive heat loss due to drafts and poor insulation.

Figure 4 shows the average CO$_2$ emissions and average annual energy heating requirements for the Canongate Housing in 2 scenarios: 1$^{st}$ - as originally built, and 2$^{nd}$ - with replacement double-glazed windows and combination boilers. The bottom two rows of the graph provide a comparison with the current energy efficient requirements of new buildings. Though it is unlikely that any of the flats remain completely unaltered, this calculation is useful as it underlines the original lack of regard for energy performance in buildings, and it also shows how great an improvement small upgrades like double-glazed windows can make to the performance of the building.

From the results of the residents’ surveys, the research group devised two general packages for energy-saving improvements. The first assumed that works would be undertaken as a communal approach in a block-by-block basis, which is required to conduct any external fabric repairs. The second package assumes that improvements would be done on an individual basis wherein flat owners would make internal improvements to their own flat.

Through different variations of the two packages, using both external and internal improvement measures, the research group has calculated a 79%-84% reduction in CO$_2$ emissions in each individual flat. These improvements would put the buildings on par with the targets set out by the Scottish Government in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act of 2009. When 50% of all CO$_2$ emissions can be contributed to the building stock, and 25% of that to older buildings, results like this are a positive reassurance that the objectives of the Climate Change Act can be achieved.

These two studies show that by using residents’ feedback, energy-saving strategies can be identified in a structure that, due to its historic and architectural value, cannot be treated with the conventional fabric interventions, but can yield promising results.
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Introduction

About a month ago, I was asked to describe my research through a sketch on a post-it note. The conservation of post-war social housing has proven more controversial and complicated than any era before it. Today I will present a brief history, the current thoughts and approaches held by conservationists and architects in England, and a case study to illustrate my points.
For its size, England has probably identified more buildings of architectural or historic interest than any other country, as most buildings constructed before 1840 are designated. The same is true for post-1945 buildings, but designation has not kept pace with alterations and demolition. To date, post-war modern movement buildings account for only .11% of all listed buildings in England (only 424 of the estimated 372,000 total listings). The controversy of listing these buildings is possibly due in part to the relative late arrival of modern architecture to Britain as compared to Europe, and most definitely due to the widespread unpopularity of the Welfare State public housing. The public has been slow to recognize the more mundane works of the modern movement as heritage, however, the re-veneration of the design intent of the Barbican estate and the popular remodelling of Keeling House show a growing public interest in the architecture of the modern movement in England.

The first move to list modern 20th century buildings came in the 1967, when the Minister asked architectural historian Nikolaus Pevsner to draw up a ‘top 50’ list of buildings from 1922-1939. Most of these were listed at the lowest grade, Grade II, where 92% of buildings in England are listed.

**Background**

In 1987, Minister Lord Elton issued a statutory instrument extending the listing legislation to all buildings at least 30 years old, and in special circumstances, to buildings under threat only 10 years old or older. A competition was held with the Sunday Times and English Heritage wherein the public was asked to nominate candidates for listing built from 1941-1957. Of the 70 post-war buildings English Heritage put forward from the public suggestions, the successive Minister, Lord Caithness, only accepted 18. The decision whether or not to list a building ultimately falls on the Minister and his or her personal tastes and political stance.

The term of the Minister of Culture, Communication & Creative Industries is five years, but Ministers in this position rarely ever stay the full length of their term. It is a relatively junior post, and ambitious politicians often move up. The current Minister of Culture, Ed Vaizey, is said to be sympathetic to modern heritage and he understands buildings. His mum is also a retired art critic and a member of the 20th Century Society, which might sway his vote in favour of listing more post-war modern buildings in England.

Because the final say in listing comes down to one person, this rapid shuffling of Ministers has been difficult for English Heritage and the 20th Century Society who rely heavily on developing a relationship with the Minister in order to have their concerns heard. The ministry covers an incredibly broad portfolio, and as, Catherine Croft, Director of the 20th Century Society, explained that the chance the Minister knows about her society is actually pretty limited.

**Current**

In the early 1990s, English Heritage began assessing post-war modern architecture through thematic surveys, the most controversial of which was public housing. Controversially, in 1993, Minister Peter Brooke approved Keeling House for listing, making it the first tower block to be listed at Grade II*. Being fully aware of the technical and financial problems, he defended his decision, asserting that the legislation required him to look at buildings without regard to the cost of repairs or other consequences of listing, and to base his decision solely on the special architectural or historic interest of the building. He admitted that listing clearly creates a presumption in favour of a building’s preservation, but that the main purpose of listing is to ensure that care is taken over decisions affecting the building’s future.

---

His statement sets the tone for the treatment of listed post-war modern movement buildings in England. Heritage value is taken into consideration, but even Grade I listed post-war buildings are often altered to a questionable extent, and not only that, it seems to be a given that post-war buildings must be altered in order to find a future use.

Further recommendations by English Heritage in 1996 were accompanied by exhibitions, short informational films, seminars, and meetings with local authorities and residents, and by the end of 1998, the largest batch of modern movement public housing was listed, including the Roehampton Estates of Alton East and West; Trellick Tower in North Kensington; and Park Hill estates in Sheffield. Of these, Park Hill was the only estate where the responses from residents were not overwhelmingly in favour of listing. The acceptance of large modern movement social housing estates has not, however, been all inclusive by any means. The Robin Hood Gardens estate by The Smithsons is currently under threat of demolition, and though it is recognized internationally as an important body of work for the wealth of ideas it embodies, English Heritage has rejected it for listing on that grounds that it has proven unsuitable for housing. Ironically, the site it sits on, encircled by busy motorways, has plans to be redeveloped with high-rise housing.

The alterations allowed at the Grade I listed Royal Festival Hall appal many I spoke with. Architect and Docomomo UK member, James Dunnett, stressed that Grade I is Grade I and all buildings should be treated the same. He said, if he were to be cynical of the government, he would say that the government agreed to list post-war buildings because it is politically easier to say ‘Yes, we’ll list them’, but then not enforce the standards of listing to the same degree because that is more difficult to pinpoint. So what happens is that these buildings are listed and then works of alteration are allowed to them that in no way would be allowed to a comparably listed building from an earlier period.

Case Study

John Pendlebury argues that value is not an intrinsic characteristic, but that value is a culturally or historically constructed concept that we assert onto buildings or objects. For buildings to be valued and accepted as heritage, they must go through a process of identification, or ‘heritage creation’ as he calls it. This, essentially, is the purpose of the listing programme in England. The act of conservation itself grants a building cultural, economic, political and social value. The hierarchy of this differentiation then signifies the level of importance or value within the whole.

If each generation reinterprets heritage according to its own expectations and values whose foundation is not independent of previous reception, will the process of transforming modern architecture into heritage contribute to its acceptance by the general public as a new traditional architecture? Such may be the case, as I will suggest with the case study of Denys Lasdun’s Keeling House.

The Keeling House tower block and estate has been radically redeveloped from its beginning as council housing to its current use as luxury privately-owned flats. In this case, though the interiors have been completely remodelled, Catherine Croft feels that Keeling House should not be downgraded or delisted because its significance is heavily based on its sculptural form and the extraordinary layout of the flats which fit together like a jigsaw puzzle.

Croft agreed that, in most instances, buildings all have to find an on-going use or they will not survive. She said, ‘Certainly, keeping the kitchens and bathrooms is probably not on, and keeping the original services is probably not on,’ but she does think a lot of the historic fabric can be kept,

---
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and that restoration projects that stripped right back to just the concrete frame, have lost something.  

In assessing the fabric of a building, she asks what specifically makes the building significant, how the building’s use may make it significant, and if there are things one may do in terms of usage that may make this significance unreadable.

In England, it is likely that a number of tower blocks will be wholly converted into private flats. The infamous ‘Right to Buy’ scheme, granted by the Thatcher administration, allowed council flat dwellers to buy their flats at a very low purchase price. Architect James Dunnett explained that one was unwise to buy a flat in a mixed-ownership building like that, because it is impossible to know what liability one may be incurring for major renovation expenses and it is very difficult to have a building like that surveyed for hidden concrete decay, carbonization, etc. At the time of purchase, flat owners were either unaware or not well informed of the extent of these maintenance costs, and thus, many were unable to pay their share as issues arose. Dunnett said it is a shame that a mixed social housing context could not continue, but that it is a better framework to divide maintenance costs between a whole block of owner-occupiers who can afford the payments, as is the case now at Keeling House.

Though Keeling House has found a second life, Croft laments the loss of the two low-rise blocks of maisonettes which were demolished and replaced by new low-rise walk up council tenements. One would hardly know the replacements were council housing, which seems to be the way forward. The 21st century’s emphasis on sustainability in the building industry has placed greater pressure on post-war structures to meet the new set of criteria for efficiency.

Architect John Allan, of Avanti Architects, maintains that we are still in a Darwinian struggle with modern buildings and only the fittest will survive. Allan believes change is an essential precondition of real conservation. Many I spoke with applauded the success of his modern conservation projects, but some felt uncomfortable with the extent of his alterations. Naturally, the refurbishment and upgrading of modern movement buildings incites a struggle for custody—the rights of the property owner versus the asserted cultural ownership of the interested public. A conservation architect’s job is to balance the interests of associated parties, but from Allan’s perspective, in the end, “…conservation is about vitality, and serving life as it is lived is the oxygen of building survival.”

Conclusion

Balancing the pressures from political figures, conservation groups, the media and the public is by no means an easy task. Elain Harwood, Post-War Specialist for English Heritage, half-jokingly said, ‘If you’re offending as many people as you’re pleasing, you’re probably somewhere about right, but it’s like you’ve got to be ahead of opinion, but not completely off your head.’ Yet, on the whole, Harwood feels that on occasions where English Heritage took a stand ahead of general opinion, by and large, the public has come around. It was thought to be ludicrous to list the expansive central-London Barbican estate in 1989, yet now: it is attracting a whole new group of people who want to live there expressly for its history and heritage value.

As for the future of post-war modern movement architecture in England, Harwood said she did feel quite pessimistic. Different buildings are surviving in different ways, some phases better than others. New Towns, schools and public housing are particularly under threat, while private buildings and houses are holding their value better. Universities are finding a new appreciation among the younger audiences, who she says are the most appreciative of post-war buildings, aside from the very elderly who built them. The problem is, she said, that an awful lot of those working

---
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in conservation or local authorities are those people who started out in the 1970s and 80s, in that era of the reaction against modernism.

In all of this, Docomomo states that its role is not to deliver ‘the answer’ as such, but to be a facilitator, assembling the growing toolkit of knowledge and experience with which those engaged in conservation can better formulate their own programme and priorities.  

For architect John Allan, it comes as a comfort that this question of selective conservation may never be settled. In regards to the modern movement, it is accepted that each case must be freshly assessed with this expanding toolkit of knowledge, and no conservation or adaption project is ever free of complications. In the coming years, we will see if English Heritage continues to support this method of ‘constructive conservation’ and how demands for change will weigh against the preservation of the original intent of Welfare State modern architecture of England.

628 Ibid. P. 21.
5.2. **UK INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTIONS**

5.2.1. **DERMOT PATTERSON, LDN ARCHITECTS - ADAM FERGUSON BUILDING REFURBISHMENT**

Edinburgh, Scotland

30 September 2013

D: We're working on a number of projects at the university. Not just this one. One of the projects we've got, I guess we're working on stage E if I mentioned that in the detail design at McEwan Hall in Bristo Square. So the idea is to, well it’s a Grade B listed building and it was obviously built for graduations and exams but it's being used for other events. Its not terribly good at supporting other events because the kind of accommodation it has is pretty basic, so what we're going to do is extend it underground and give it foyer accommodation so that when people visit that building, say as a graduate, you can come in, get your robe on, much more easily than you can at the moment. [etc] So really to give that building a continuing relevance for the university. It needs investment, it needs to work a little harder for the university. That's probably true for a lot of the buildings around George Square, but interesting for the university, they now have two problems - in the one sense the have a stock of buildings which are Georgian and are valued in a conservation sense, but they also inherited a stock of buildings from the 1960s which are getting toward the need for a generational level of investment. But it's quite an ironic thing for the university because they're still criticised for ever having allowed Georgian buildings to be removed in the first place and now they're defending these 1960s buildings and making the case for change, and of course those buildings are loved by other groups of people, the 20th Century Society based in London who promotes the conservation of post-war buildings. So they've got sort of two conservation camps to keep happy.

3:25

C: And correct me if I'm wrong, most of the buildings around George Square - the 1960s ones - are B listed?

D: Most of them are, yes. David Hume is A listed, so the grouping, the building that we worked on - Adam Ferguson - is B listed. William Robertson is also B listed, but the grouping is A listed.

C: So how has that affected what you've been able to do with them?

D: Well, it affected pretty dramatically what we were able to do, since we had to demonstrate sensitivity to the qualities of 1960s architecture. [presentation to the Edinburgh Architecture Association]

05:50

C: When you say you had to demonstrate sensitivity, was that to Historic Scotland?

D: Yes, exactly.

C: I spoke to Carsten Hermann, and he didn't think that Historic Scotland was directly involved.
D: They were. Stephen Robb.

C: There wasn't a conservation statement made up was there?

D: Yeah, there was.

C: And that was by Steve?

D: Well, Steve would have made a report to the City of Edinburgh and that might still be available on the planning portal. If you were to look up the application on the City of Edinburgh website, you can search for planning applications, and we will have it somewhere.

C: I had a look through the City of Edinburgh website and I couldn't find it...

D: You couldn't? Right, ok.

10:00

[walking through project document]

C: Who is working on Appleton Tower?

D: We're working with Burell Happel, the engineering firm we share this office with. So we're working together on that project, which again is similar in a way to this but its mostly concerned with the external cladding, to take off and replace cladding which is failing, the curtain walling isn't very good, no insulation properties really in that building at all. And its like many of these modern buildings, lots of people hate them. They really regret them ever having been built here, but the context of these buildings has changed a lot even over the last 10-12 years, what with the Informatics Building going up. Suddenly this building doesn't look so out of scale in comparison to how it used to be. [describing layout of the square]

[sketch found in the RMJM archives]

12:30

C: That little building in the back was never built, was it?

D: No, so this became quite an important drawing for us when we wanted to justify extending the building the way that we did. We were able to point to this sketch and say 'there was an intention to build here originally'. And in fact, subsequently, when we started building we found an underground service way that was intended to link into a future building in that location. So, it became a really important part of the argument that we made to allow change to that area.

13:35

D: But when we first became involved with the project, it was pretty obvious the building was suffering neglect. The external fabric was not in very good condition.

C: What is that?

D: These are the window frames. All the window frames are timber. Water was getting in. It was single-glazed, so there was no sort of insulation properties.

C: Was that a struggle with Historic Scotland, getting double-glazed?

D: Ultimately, no. We did look to a number of different ways to treat the windows because we wanted to improve their thermal properties without changing the character of the building, so we
looked at a number of different ways of doing that, possibly with fixed shading externally, but we thought that would have too great of a detrimental impact on the character of the building. Its a really straightforward building in lots of ways, but one of the things it does display a degree of sophistication in the visual texture of the windows, and you can see there's a mixture of opening and fixed panels, and there are two layers - there are thin bays that are recessed about 300 mm back from the face. So there is quite an interesting texture and rhythm to all that, which requires a bit of sophistication. But of all the things that we found that were strange about the building was this elevation that faces George Square had these tall walls. In fact, behind them, that wall, was a ramp leading down to the basement of the David Hume Tower, and on this side, these were toilets with high-level windows. So you've got this public face of the building, completely introverted, offering nothing back to the square, so our very first reaction was to reverse that and engage the public realm in a much more positive way. And that was true in our very first impression and we followed that through in the design. The other thing that was really unsuccessful about the building was that it had this internal circulation pattern, so there's a corridor, which ran in a circle with the rooms on either side. So there was core accommodation in the middle, with toilets, vents, IT rooms, that kind of stuff, down the middle of the plan and then a circular corridor around the edge. No windows from the circulation to the outside, so no means of orientation, and then offices all around the edge, and no natural daylight to speak of. We said, 'This is something we've got to change. It's a really unattractive quality.' And in terms of way finding, it’s very difficult to find your way around. When you came in the front door of the building before, that's [when the face left?], there was a janitors office to meet and great people, or probably more often than not ignore people, [laughs] and so that way, when you went to go visit your professor or whatever, it was a leap of faith more or less when you set off on that journey. So there were some really poor qualities, but the work that we did was preceded by some work by RMJM and they looked through a feasibility study they had done for the University into whether it would be possible to extend it in some way. So the principle of extending it had been explored certainly by the University before we came along. So when we got the job, the first thing we needed to do was to develop an attitude really as to how far it would be appropriate to extend the building and in what way could we extend it. How could we maximise the value of bit of real estate without undermining the qualities of the building. So, you know, how high could a rooftop extension be and close to the building could a pavilion be, and should we have it in a clearing, should we build it new, and how high could that be relative to the podium again without undermining the [?] building. And also would there be a way of introducing building physics of a sort that would allow it to operate much more naturally, so introducing natural ventilation and daylight. How could we let daylight penetrate the depth of the plan? And so these were some of the very first thoughts that we had about the vestibule of the building. And of course we needed to layer into that the programme, and so, you know, what's the best way to [the various types?] [18:22] of accommodation, and I think it's pretty obvious that obviously teaching and social space should be at the lowest level where you've got the greatest population of people moving in and out, with academic offices on the upper levels, and then social space at the top where they can take advantage of the views into the square and beyond. And interesting for us, one of the battles we had at the very outset was the need for so many individual academic offices, but it quickly became apparent that most of them simply weren't going to budge, that they were absolutely clear that every academic needed their own office, that's the way they work. That's the way they've always worked and that's they way they will continue to work. Maybe you're becoming that kind of person yourself? [laughs] And of course, as you'd expect, we looked into other examples of other recent business school refurbishments, some new, some working with existing buildings, and we developed a scheme, which we moved away from, but this is the first scheme we had, and rather like that section I showed you in the programme, the building over-laid on the section, these individual floor plans relate to that. You've got a lecture theatre, arrival space, reception space at the lowest level on Bueccleugh Place, and the idea was that this would become the new front door of the building in a sense, because you can get parking right up close to it. A lot of people who come to this building are coming from Pollock Halls or in housing from that direction, so this is quite an important front door for the building, but recognising that George Square is also important to people who are going to be approaching from that side, so we wanted to make it double fronted.

20:08
And then moving up through that plan, more lecture theatre, office accommodation and student office accommodation as well, but we do have a section like that to show how a pavilion here with a front door and student facing reception might work, and how it might connect to the existing building at a higher level. And then we began to develop the thinking about how natural ventilation could work. If we introduced a [?] [20:45] along the roof, could that get natural daylight into the plan as well, whilst letting old air out and could you encourage a stack effect to start [stop??] operating by having a connection between the office accommodation and a central light well? As well as beginning to look at other means of improving the energy efficiency of the building. The University has a CHP plant, you know, combined heat and power, which runs around the whole square, so the plan was to link this building into that system for the first time so that it could get free, effectively free heating medium, cooling medium and electricity. [21:28] It's all centrally supplied and generated in a very efficient way. And I think about the upper levels of the building, one of the things we were very keen to do was to create offices for PhD students in a way that they would feel part of the academic community. So the idea was to put academic offices toward the ends, but in the centre and associated with a new light well, an opened up stairway, have classrooms and offices, shared offices so that PhD students can work with each other and have a connection to daylight but also feel part of the academic community. At the ends of the buildings, whereas previously there were offices in these positions, we thought no we'll take those out and ensure there's a connection to the daylight in the end. And in doing so, we made a little informal meeting space where people can come out of their offices and see each other. We want people to come out of their offices and encounter each other. And also, and what was going on here as well as behind the light well, it also meant that the floor plates in the middle of the building were visible to one another, so again it helps the overall imagibility of the interior.

22:50

D: And then these are the offices, and there are very particular requirements with these. As you know, there is a standard amount of sq meters per academic and they've got so much shelf space and storage space, so we had to plan each of these offices out in an optimal way so that each person could have a degree of choice in how they arranged their office, but also in a way that related to the existing window pattern and didn't disturb it. And then on the top floor, we've got a new structure, and what became apparent to the structural engineer was that we couldn't take any load down the centre of the building, any additional load. The existing foundations couldn't take any more load. So the new frame spans from side to side across the full width of the building and the weight goes down a series of columns that [sit on the column positions?? 23:52]. But it being a free-spanning piece of structure, that meant we could do what we liked with the accommodation. So we've got open plan spaces up here limited by the positions of the stairs in the middle of the building, because what we're doing here was extending existing stairs up to create a new level and we had to think very carefully about how people could go from here, because we were loading existing stairs with more population, and so the fire design became quite complicated and we finished up making a completely separate fire compartment on this top storey, so the light well at this storey has fire-rated glazing around it so that it's visually connected but physically separated.

24:43

And then of course we had to start developing an attitude toward the pavilion - What should it do? What formal language is going to be appropriate in such proximity to the existing building? And that sketch, we started to think about what it's shape and form should be, where is the entrance... And that I think is the first time that we began to think about, well given that the existing building is a building 'in the round' - it doesn't have a front and a back - and these spandrels and windows run right way around as a ribbon, so we thought well that's probably the right thing to do with this pavilion. It shouldn't be directional. It shouldn't have sides or a front, unlike that sketch which I think is quite a strange sort of relationship. But it's very obvious that we thought it should be this kind of object... and so we started to develop an approach to the facade that was really to do with...transparency at ground floor level so there's a direct an obvious connection between [the temperature on the street] and the inside of the building, but then recognising that we needed to shade a building, which was going to be predominantly made of glass, we what sort of interesting patterns for that. And we looked at the original fenestration here and then sort of extruded that
pattern across the brise-soleil on the new pavilion and took a direct key from the fenestration. So it's a bit of a trope in a way, but what we wanted to do was make something that's quite elegant. It finished as a 2 storey building, so you have this... with vertically emphasised proportion unlike the Adam Ferguson with horizontal banding, but there is a key there and even if you don't know that's where its from, I think that it helps the new and old sit reasonably comfortably with each other.

26:52

[discussing models] So that was the first scheme - a long, low pavilion, only two storeys high at this point, and that matches the section that I showed you, but taking its key from that rhythm. The floor at the top storey was a little bit trickier to sort of impose the same idea on. And we did have versions of this scheme, which again took that rhythm and repeated it, but it began to really compete with the lower stories visually, so I thought, 'No, I think the approach to that should be very, very straight forward, very simple.' Yeah and this is going back to that Robert Matthew sketch, that's where we ended up with at the first planning application. Plans at that point needed to [inform?] Historic Scotland and we were concerned about the way in which a long, low building here was obscuring an understanding of the building as an inhabited plinth with a building on top. We were kind of completely obscuring that. And so we thought again about it, and thought well if we were to make it instead of a long, low 2-storey building, if we make it a squat 3-storey building, then we can reveal the life of the building around and within the podium there, and at the same time, create a space here that's associated with the point of entrance into that new pavilion. And so I think that process we went through with the planners and Historic Scotland was really positive in the end. It's kind of frustrating. You know, when you're trying to do something one time only, but I think it was better as a result of that, of that dialogue that we had. And so, it went toward that kind of idea and against the early visualisation. A 3-storey pavilion and a garden... and like I said, revealing what's happening inside the fabric of the building. And because we had gone from a long, low building to a plan, which was much more squished, it meant that the volume had to work quite hard to get everything inside, working as it needed to do. And we always wanted to make any new spaces we were creating have a sense of connection to each other, so one of the aspects of the brief was this 150 seat lecture theatre, so we thought, well if we stick it up at this level and have an entry concourse associated with George Square at that level, then it can have a connection to the level below it. So all these spaces can be read and understood as one volume. So by overlapping these functions, as I said, the envelope is working pretty hard. But its resulted in quite an interesting form, or an interesting sequence of spaces internally.

29:55

So these were some of the planning drawings, very very straightforward drawings, but showing the key moves about taking that wall down on this side and introducing the lighting, so that the building could connect to its context. A very simple, straightforward [route?] to the top storey, not competing with that visual texture. And then the pavilion on this side, it taking its key from that texture that's separated with a sort of very played-down glazing linking the two things together. So in a way, I suppose the visual components are straightforward glazing, straightforward glazing, and then slightly more complex glazed building with a quite rich visual texture. And because of that volume is doing a number of different things inside - a lecture theatre, concourse, cafe - we wanted to develop an approach to the facade that would allow it to do what it needed to do along its length, so in other words, bits of it we wanted it to be opaque, bits of it we wanted it to be transparent, some bits need to be quite well insulated, and other bits needed to be operable to get fresh air. But that strong pattern we made allowed different things to happen in each of those spaces without it becoming visually incoherent. So we began to look at different types of facades, we've got just a clear opening, we've got fitted glass to limit the amount of heat getting into the building, and we've got solar panels as well. But doing all those different things within this visual framework was possible because it was strong enough in itself to cope with this. So with that approach in mind, we got to work with Burrel Happel thinking about how much this facade needs to be operable, how much of it can be transparent, what degree of fitting do we need on the facade to limit heat build up, and they constructed a thermal model to help us understand the technical challenges. It also helped us understand how much open-able area you need at high levels to encourage stack effect ventilation to get going, and how to [?] inter-visibility from one floor to the
next, also then, we're creating air paths, so ventilation from storey to the next. There was a downside to that when the building first opened, the smell of paninis and things like that on the grill getting everywhere. So we had to increase the ventilation into the plant room so the smells went that way. But that was the drawing that began to put together these various technical requirements, as well as... and it helped with how we organised the division. And again, the fitting pattern that we developed for the glass was a further abstraction of the window pattern, so its taken that motif and using it at different scales visually to help us organise something technically. We developed 3D models of the facade to help us integrate the louver area that was needed for natural ventilation...

33:40

Going back to the main block, this was a couple of studies that we did, Burrel Happel did a thermal model and this showed external blinds in front of existing windows and this showed vertical fins. And each of these would have worked to help us reduce heat gain inside the building, but we felt ultimately that they had too great an impact on the visual character, so we went back and started looking at the glass specification. I think, I hope, that we got a balance between the need to control the environment and the desire to have as much transparency as possible, because the higher the [silver?] insulation properties of the glass, the more tinted it becomes, and we didn't want to create a building that was going to have heavily tinted or god forbid, mirrored glass. So worked very carefully through the glass specification to achieve a balance between technical performance and what we wanted visually. So we finished that with high-performance double-glazed units, set in completely new timber frames. It isn't timber frames we've taken out.

C: Right, they were just unusable I'm assuming.

D: Most of it was, but we did salvage... you see on these little recessed bits here, on the glass. Well each of the mullions at that point was a pretty chunky piece of timber, so we took those out and reused those in the new insulation. So it's a mixture. It all went to this firm up in Aberdeen who salvaged all those bits of timber, and then built them into the new assembly. So it's good. And we were using as much existing fabric as we possibly could. Overall, the frames on the face of that building are new and they obviously have a greater depth to accommodate the double-glazed units, but the face width is exactly the same as it was originally. So visually, there is no difference, but it's completely changed its performance.

36:00

C: Have any tests been done on the improved energy efficiency of the building?

D: Since it’s opened? I don't know? But we did get an energy performance certificate for the building, so I can let you know what that is. That was when it opened, and I don't know if the university has gone back and done any post-occupancy evaluation, but they are starting to do that across the estate so they might. As you can expect, one of the things we did was to put insulation on the inside of the building where previously there had been none. I guess the only bits of the building that remained in place after we had stripped everything off was the concrete frame and the stone cladding on the spandrels. Those walls were existing as well. New windows, new insulation, completely new services throughout, so we initially stripped it right back to the shell. The building was full of asbestos. You remember those first images of the corridors? All those partitions were made of asbestos. So it all had to come out.

C: So the additional insulation went just on the interior face?

D: Yeah

C: Was that insulated wallboard or what would that be?
D: We didn't put insulation in the cavity. I think we felt it would be better to have a bridge at that point to avoid any points of damp penetration. We couldn't be certain what that construction was like; we couldn't take the stone off. And of course, all the new bits – the rooftop extension, that roof section is hugely insulated, and so is the roof of the pavilion.

C: And this was never insulated before?

D: No, well, minimal. Minimal. There's at least a foot of insulation up there now. If you're interested in how this works, the rooftop extension, again, we wanted to, one of the objectives was to have as little mechanical ventilation as possible so that the building is, I'd say, 70% naturally ventilated. The only spaces that aren't are the internal lecture theatres, where you've got large volumes of people in close proximity, and so we do have some mechanical ventilation. And then the little horseshoe shaped lecture theatres have [chill beams?], so they're getting their cooling medium from the CHP plant. But then, at the top level of the building, obviously we're putting a new level here, which is mostly glass and its mostly glass for reasons of not wanting to compete visually with the rest of the building, but then also to take advantage of the lovely views up at that level, so there's good reason to use glass, but that brings with it heat build up, which is another challenge. But the approach here was to introduce opening windows at that level to beget cooling air in, and then a [attenuated] vent at high level. So the idea is if people are warm in the space, they can open the windows; if the temperature continues to climb, then there's an attenuation here that opens and is connected to a thermostat, and that allows cross-flow ventilation. That section is the only one that showed this assembly quite close to the edge. We actually then moved it right [?] following this exercise we went through with Burrel Happel, thinking about how much useable space we really needed and what temperatures we were trying to achieve throughout the year... there's a model... So this allowed us to move that assembly to here so that you get the proper crossflow ventilation through the space. And then having made a little upstand here for the louver, it also meant that we created a barrier, so there's a safe zone for people to walk around, and all the drainage outlets flow back from the outer edge to a drainage point here, so there's no reason for anyone to go on that part of the roof, so they can get out there and safely maintain it. So its doing a couple of different things. And that upstand runs all the way around, like a racetrack way.
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D: So that's just a picture of how the building finished up... And we took a cue from the colouration of this building [?], the grey stones there... a neutral palette. So on the plans, lowest level: cafe here, a corridor running all the way along here, which at this point obviously is on the external wall, so lots of natural daylight, and then the rest of these are the teaching spaces, these are social spaces. And one of the things the business school wanted was different types of teaching accommodation, so these are intended to promote discussion so people are sitting facing each other instead of facing the instructor, this is a more traditional layout, and then these are syndicate rooms, these are computer labs here, and then all the core accommodation - toilets, IT is on the back edge here where they don't need natural daylight. So the little tradition lecture theatre in the horseshoe shape with [chill beams] at high level. And that's one of the social spaces, and there's the cafe, so the corridor continues down here and that's where the courtyard is. And you can see the concourse out the back. And then that is concourse, and it links front to back, so you can stand here and look both ways through the building. Where we needed a partition for reasons of security, we've got a glass partition so again people can see who is coming in, you can see where you want to go... So its all about making it leisureable and friendly. And then the concourse, this space, was a space that the school never had before - a space where the whole school could gather for events. As a business school, they're fairly outward looking, they have sort of corporations coming in and doing events with them, so they need a social hub and so it gives them that for the first time. So its flexible space. This upper gallery is a secondary means of escape through the lecture theatre... but it also means that someone can stand on this stair and make a speech to a group of people down here, so it's quite flexible. ... This is first floor: more teaching accommodation, there's an undergrad reception here, although its mainly postgrads in this building, there is some undergraduate teaching, and there's a big computer lab there. And there's an undergraduate reception space here and an essay drop-off point, more lecture theatres and syndicate rooms. So there's the central lightwell, and again, we wanted to take every opportunity to make connections
right through the building. That's that space there, so you can see right through from one side to the other, orientate yourself, and know where you are. And that's one of the first floor lecture rooms, typical syndicate room. Again this is pattern that ultimately goes back to the window pattern, that's that motif kind of repeating itself throughout. [45:00] Up a level is the PhD level, and these are the PhD rooms right on side of the light well.

C: It's nicer than my office!

D: ... And this is the end of the corridors, so little informal meeting spaces. Top floor: staff room, meeting rooms, board rooms, and linked together with a glazed partition so that they can be used together or separately. Looking out over Beucleuch Place, and that's it.

C: Let me just look through my questions... One of them was: What measures were implemented to improve the energy efficiency?

D: Natural ventilation, high levels of insulation, connection to CHP, rain water recycling - so all the rain water is gathered and reused in the toilet, so there is a spectacular basin holding all the rainwater and that's recycled, but that's probably it.

C: And then the windows.

D: Yep.

C: So the colouring on the windows, that was because of the certain properties...

D: Yeah, what we tried to do... where these panels are windows, that is like a ceramic that is baked onto the glass, and it stops a certain amount of heat transference through the glass, and then what we chose to do there at that end of the pavilion, you see on that picture, was to increase the density of the pattern, and there is actually a solid panel behind there, so it looks like its glass but it's actually got a solid insulated panel because that's the lecture theatre. We only wanted a certain amount of natural daylight in there, so the fitting was quite useful devise to either have transparent windows with less heat build up or opaque panels.

C: And the changing of the colour of the windows on the main building, was that a problem with Historic Scotland?

D: Changing colour?

C: Because I imagine the original windows wouldn't have had that teal tint?

D: The actual glass? Well, it is a little bit different to what was there, but not massively so. I mean we got samples of the glass from the building, and then, there is this useful facility that one of the big glass manufacturers have, its this big truck with all their glass panels and sections, and they bring it to your office and park it on the street, and you stand there comparing all the samples. So it is pretty transparent. There is a slight tint to it, but not overly so. But yeah, Historic Scotland was interested in that, but what was more important to them was the frames really. As I said, I think if would have been heavily tinted, it would have been a major issue.

C: I think that the colours compliment each other quite nicely... Were any of the measures that you had suggested rejected?

D: On the energy conservation side? No, not really. The planner, and certainly Historic Scotland, were more interested in if it was going to, I suppose, undermine its visual character. So if we're proposing things to them, it was helpful I suppose to say that we're doing this in a way that is going to make this building relevant to future generations, and part of that relevance is that its functions are sustainable, and that means being energy efficient. So I suppose philosophically it
kind of gives you the authority, if you like, to make change which you can demonstrate is going to be sustainable.

C: Economically and energy-wise... And just generally, which issues did you run into during the project? Were there any major conflicts with the University or Historic Scotland?

D: Um, well I think with the University, what was really important was that, you know this was quite a big project and there were hundreds of people who were going to be working in this building, so they needed to feel that they had some buy-in into the project, and so inevitably, we were, our client was the University Estates Department and their client, if you like, was the people who use the building, so we had two clients - the Estates people who have their objectives for a wider estate, and then you've got the Business School people who want to operate this building in a particular way and they needed to sell the scheme to their colleagues, so we really had to work very closely with them to develop the brief, and as we'd develop proposals, we'd go talk to them, we'd go talk to the faculty, make presentations to them, half of them aren't interested and some of them are really interested. They want to know where they'll be working, so we needed to make sure we communicated well with the faculty as well as with the head clients. And there were differences in opinion in the faculty. Some people just didn't want to know at all. They thought this would be a disaster. This was a horrible old 1960s building, thinking 'bah, its never going to work'. But having got there, they're quite happy. I think there was literally only one person who stubbornly refused to be made happy by it, and I think they were trying to manage him out anyway, so they simply kind of ignored him. ... It's been pretty successful. The feedback has been good, and I think the variety of teaching accommodation has worked pretty well. So, no mention of conflicts from the client side. I described to you the change we went through with the pavilion, which was modified quite considerably. And so that was an interesting point in the project to try and manage, to come to terms with, and also, as you do with any client, make a proposal to them, you do your best and you think you're doing the right thing until you come along to something which is better, and you have to be able to explain why there is a reason for doing it differently. But again, you have to be big enough to accept if something obviously is better, that is right to change.
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C: Did that set back the programme?

D: Not in overall terms, I mean, it did for a time, but we met the end date that was established in the beginning. So it opened for teaching at the beginning of the semester when it was meant to, in line with the original programme, so it didn't suffer in overall terms. It meant a lot of hard work, maybe unanticipated hard work for a period, but we got through it, managed it.

C: And when was it fully completed?

D: Goodness me, I think it's been open 3 years now? Actually I think it was September 2010. It's been three full academic years now, and this is the fourth.

C: Have you had to go back and change anything since then?

D: No we haven't. We've also stayed in touch with the Business School and we did a little project that spun out of that and we converted one of the townhouses for more accommodation for them. No, I mean, they have made adaptations themselves, because it has been very successful in a business sense. There are more students coming into the business school than they had anticipated, so some of the spaces which we had made into syndicate rooms have subsequently been converted into offices for more academics, because with more students comes more teaching staff. So they've maybe grown slightly more than they even anticipated. Which is great! Yeah, so they're doing little adaptations by themselves. You know, the University has their own small works department, so they can do that kind of stuff.
C: And just generally, do you feel that the renovations have impacted the integrity of the original building at all?

D: Um, I don't think it's harmed it. No, I don't. I mean, I would say that, but no I don't. In a way, I think that the mass of the building is slightly improved. One of the studies we did, was to show that whatever happens to this building should really happen to the building opposite it, and that is now happening. Those two together, and looking at those in comparison to the Georgian townhouses, these buildings I think now have a scale which is more sympathetic to those, and the top storey we put on is in a way sort of analogous to the slated roof, top storey of the Georgian buildings. So the tops of our buildings now match the tops of those buildings, so I think that's probably better. It makes more of the real estate, there's more floor space here, and it certainly engages its context in a much more positive way. So I think we've reversed a lot of the things, which in the 1960s weren't important. When the building was designed, it was designed absolutely on the edge of the building codes of that time - the beams are absolutely designed to be no bigger than they absolutely need to be, so there's little latitude for change. But unlike a Georgian building, a traditional 200-year-old Georgian building, one of the reasons that they have survived so well in Edinburgh is because they have been incredibly adaptable. These massively thick walls and robust timber structures have allowed them to serve a number of purposes across their 200 years. It started off as houses for the wealthy, they became shops and offices, and now they're going back to houses again, so they've come full circle. Offices are moving out to Quarter Mile and Fountainbridge where they need open floor plates. And we're the same, as an office, we were in a Georgian townhouse, and as you can see we now have an open office, and this is much better for the way we want to be culturally. But as I say, those buildings have that inherent robustness. This building doesn't. It was very fragile and the kind of accommodation that we think of as important now, you know a sense of generosity, the point of arrival, light, legibility - they just weren't on the agenda then, so pretty often, these 1960s buildings are pretty unpleasant to be in. So I think we have reversed a lot of that and brought it up to match current expectations.

C: So you could say, like the Georgian buildings, the 1950s - 1960s buildings are just getting to that stage, that second phase, and a lot of people are resistant to that change in function, but I'm not sure that that necessarily hurts the integrity of the building. ...I was wondering, could you tell me anything about Appleton Tower or is it too early to say?

D: It is in the very early stages, but again, its a building which has similar issues to this one I suppose - not well insulated, very very efficiently built at the time, so everything is very thin. And the problem there is that the facades have literally moved, you know the curtain walling, in the high force, gale force winds, they were actually moving and they were becoming unsafe. So the University had to very quickly address that with ad-hoc measures to make sure that their facades aren't going to be dangerous. So they've done that, but the facades are still, they're not designed in a way that is going to make for the long-term sustainability of that building. So in other words, they've got operable windows, but of course its quite a tall building, so people will open the windows and papers will fly around, they get lots of drafts, so they sealed the facades up and put in mechanical ventilation which is not sustainable long term because it relies on energy to function. So what we want to do is reverse those sort of things, and put a facade on that is going to operate thermally and will allow the building to be naturally ventilated, so we're putting in louvers with [baffles?] behind them so that when they're open you get fresh air, but you don't get drafts coming through the building. So again, it's a very similar ambition to this, but its more to do with the skin of the building than how the building is operating internally. Incidentally, it's not bad and it has been refurbished a number of times throughout its lifetime, and some of that is better than others. So the focus isn't the interiors, its more the skin. But we're also hoping to do a top storey like that again. Some people don't like the building because its a sort of classic, modern point block on a podium, but its been covered in rubbish, and telecommunications dishes and aerials, so again, we want to strip all that stuff off and get it back to something which is close to the original design, which was very clear, and hopefully, once we've done that and its well insulated, and crisp and pristine, people will begin to like it again. Formally, I think it's quite good. It's not bad. One of the silly things about that building is that it was cladded in mosaic tiles which in southern France, you can imagine is pretty nice, but in Scotland, you know, the water gets in behind, there's no point in fixing that... No, we're getting rid of that, but we are going to put back on a material, like a
composite stone material, which will be quite pristine, quite white, but which will last in the long-term - won't stain and its not going to fall off, but it has some visual texture as well.

C: So the little mosaic pieces, were those originally painted white?

D: No, they were ceramic.

C: White ceramic?

D: Yes, but because they started to fall off in patches, the University just painted it all white.

C: So when is the end date on that project?

D: Oh its about 3 years away. We're just at the point of putting in a planning application now. It's not listed.

C: Has it been proposed for listing?

D: I think they're having conversations about it. I think it will be listed at some point, but it’s not at the moment, and hopefully, once we've done the work to it, it will be listed. It deserves to be listed. I think it’s as good a building as David Hume Tower, and people tend to like it because it uses local materials, its got sandstone and its trying to be of its place, whereas Appleton Tower is a bit more uncompromising. It’s more classic, white modernism.

C: Could I have permission to talk about this in New York?

D: Of course. Everything I've told you about that project, that's all in the public domain.

C: And are there any files I could get from you?

D: What would be best? I could give you that presentation, and I've got a copy of the planning report, which I could give you.

C: Is there a reason why one went to LDN and one went to Page & Park?

D: Yeah. Competition. We were too expensive.

C: But it looks like they're doing everything to match your work.

D: Yeah, it’s a sore spot. We compete for this work. It's publicly funded, so it goes through the European Procurement Process, and we have to tender for it. And we knew what this would cost us, having done the Adam Ferguson Building, so we didn't feel that we could tender any less than what we had charged on the Adam Ferguson project, however, another firm came along and they put in a lower fee bid, so they won it. Which we were really sore about at the time, but its competition. It's slightly different. They're roof top extension is slightly different. Superficially, it looks the same, but I think the way that they treated it [1:07:50] [describes changes]

C: But were they required to make their alterations suitable to yours?

D: Yeah, absolutely. I think that if they had gone to the planning department wanting to do something different, the planners would have said 'No. The principles were established with Adam Ferguson. You need to do something which is going to be ostensibly the same as that.' So yeah, I would have liked to have done it. I think we would have done it very efficiently, having done it once, but we didn’t get that job. But, we're doing lots of other things for the University, so in the broader sense, I can't complain. We've got our hands full; we're as busy as we want to be.

C: So would you mind if I used any of the images, properly sourced of course?
D: Yep, go ahead. No problem at all. And are you looking at other buildings?

C: In Edinburgh? I was looking at the Basil Spence Cannongate Complex and studying the ways that the different ways that the energy efficiency could be improved...

D: We did a little project, a modernist church in Edinburgh, Craigsbank Church, which is in Corstorphine. ... This must have been 4-5 years ago, you can see what kind of condition it was in... this was kind of a Corbusian ... continues talking about renovation works.

5.2.2. James Dunnett, DOCOMOMO UK - The Barbican Arts Centre

London, England

18 March 2013

0:30

J: National US Docomomo council a bit aggrieved that the US only has 1 seat on the international council, while Canada has 3 because they managed to get individual membership for the French-speaking east coast, English-speaking east coast, and the west coast. Each have a seat on the international council. US argue that membership should represent nation states and not subdivisions within nations.

1:30

J: UK is a similar example. Docomomo UK was set up to be the only British branch. Without any reference to Docomomo UK, Miles Glendinning applied to the Dutch Secretariat to set up a Docomomo Scotland. Not a joint decision at all and without any consultation. ‘It set this pattern of disintegration, if you like’. Similarly, Iberia only has 1 Docomomo branch for Spain and Portugal. ‘So then this anomaly then exists of there being a separate Docomomo Scotland from Docomomo UK.’ ‘I mean, I don’t particularly mind...as I say, I’m not an officer of Docomomo UK, and if they’re active and do things up there, that’s fine.’ The US seems to operate on the basis of having groups in different states, but... there is still A Docomomo US. Docomomo Scotland and Docomomo UK both have votes on the international council. Docomomo Scotland is effectively a separate entity entirely.

3:38

J: ‘I do remember, nevertheless, that Docomomo Scotland refused to support the retention of probably the most significant example of modern architecture in Scotland, which was Basil Spence’s flats in Glasgow. And we tried to defend them. And they actively wrote to the press, and spoke on local radio and so on, opposing our efforts.’

4:28

J: ‘I know that Docomomo Scotland said that some of them had made efforts five years previous or whenever the threat to the building first emerged, without getting anywhere. When in my opinion, they should have, you know, that is no reason for not pursuing those efforts, but Miles Glendinning, whom I have known incidentally from long before the establishment of Docomomo, ...had this thing about not wanting to be a part of a conservation group that was unpopular with the public for defending things that nobody wanted. And so he thought that, since they had made their
stand through official channels five years previously, nothing more should be done, for fear of incurring public enmity. Well if that’s the case, then we might as well all pack up and go home, because the whole point of these bodies is to fight for things that otherwise may not be defended.’

6:10

Historic Scotland and the listing of the Gorbals

J: ‘I’m sure that local politics had a lot to do with it. A certain group in Glasgow was determined to impose their vision of the Gorbals, i.e. recreate if at all possible, the kind of five-storey walkup pattern of the previous Gorbals. And the Spence flats stood in the way of that.’ J Dunnett called the man in charge of the Queen Street Area Regeneration Project [check title], and he sort of said ‘come up here sonny, and I’ll show you what’s what’ in a threatening, rude and crass manner. And that’s what Docomomo Scotland should have opposed. ’Instead, and I’ve got no reason to tirade against DOCOMOMO Scotland, they do a load of work, but instead they fixated on Cumbernauld New Town Shopping Centre – which is terrible, and always was. It was never popular and was never nice. I saw it fairly soon after it was built, and I didn’t like it then and its now in really terrible condition after assorted changes.’

7:50

C: And is that when you were working with Erno Goldfinger?

J: It was, when I went to see it, but it has nothing to do with that. Goldfinger was a totally different kind of… I mean, I was quite interested in what Cumbernauld New Town was trying to do, but mainly to do really with the housing rather than the shopping centre. It just doesn't work. I mean, you've got to go right up on the top of this thing. It was trying to do what Hook New Town was trying to do, but in a terrain where the ground went down so that you could go onto the deck without having to climb up this enormous distance, and Cumbernauld Town Centre was trying to do that but on a hilltop site, so you've got to go up even higher, and you're even more exposed. ...The Barbican works better than many places in that respect, but of course, it all illustrates the fact that somebody like Corbusier sort of tired with the brush of people who do the opposite of what he said. I mean, Corbusier was always against, although he was in favour of vehicle-pedestrian separation, he was adamant that this should not take the form of pedestrians being above the traffic. The traffic should be above the pedestrians. That was his view. The ground should be retained for the use of pedestrians. I mean, to go up to a higher level for traffic is nothing, but for pedestrians it is. But people think that two-level separation with the pedestrians at a higher level is something that Corbusier liked and its the opposite.

10:20

J: “What I would say about the Barbican is that it works better because the spaces...you're not on a narrow, you know where the rest of the city has this upper level walkways, well not the rest of it, but where there are vestiges of this upper level walkway system, tends to have rather narrow spaces, narrow bridges, which is bad, but the Barbican tries to have large upper levels. But the trouble with that is that, the biggest upper level space created is actually over the road... It is only achieved at the cost of creating this terrible tunnel, which is a horrible environment, which people, nevertheless, have to walk through. So that’s fine – it creates a nice green, planted space on the top, but only at the cost of creating a hellhole underneath, and I don’t think that’s a satisfactory design solution.”

11:40

C: It is described as a public space but I questioned whether it is actually treated this way.

J: Feels Barbican people do use it and enjoy the open space, despite the design faults and peculiar and confusing junctions
James objected strongly to the alterations planned for the Barbican Art Centre, and pointed out in his article that it would be disastrous for what qualities there were.

"It emerged that Allford Hall Monaghan Morris, the architects, had sent a very preliminary enquiry or referred their intentions or their ideas to the Twentieth Century Society, three years previously, and apparently they hadn’t made much comment about it at the time. …Allford Hall etc felt they had been given the green light, and it was only when their detailed plans had been presented – and I happened to be on the [Twentieth Century Society] committee at the time – [I don’t think Docomomo got particularly involved in this thing, because I mean, Docomomo is just a few people, it hasn’t any funding; Twentieth Century Society is the government-funded amenity Society. It gets government money to look at applications involving listed twentieth century buildings. That’s why its got 4 paid officers and it has a statutory duty to look at these things.

Is this something that rolled over from the Victorian Society?

Yes, they assumed, I mean, they were at first an off-shoot of the Victorian Society and got some of the money forwarded by the Victorian Society to handle post-1914 applications but they campaigned for and eventually won their own independent accreditation and funding from the government. So they have the means to learn about... the local authorities are under statutory obligation to refer applications affecting post-1914 listed buildings to the C20 Society. That’s not to say that all of them do it, but they are actually obliged to do it, so C20 Society should get, for comment, information about all applications affecting post 1914 listed buildings. And they have funding, not a huge amount of funding, but funding from the government to hire casework officers to handle that and report to the committee and so on. So they should not only have an information stream, ie. what is planned, but also the means to deal with it.

Docomomo is a few people who are interested in the topic and there is no reason why they should be consulted or know about any applications until they are made in the public domain. We don't have paid offices. The Twentieth Century Society is the statutory amenity Society not only for England, but also for Scotland and Wales, so they deal with listed applications in Scotland as well.

Reference to murals in the Barbican that were referenced in the listing b/c of Catherine Cooke of Docomomo. Planned to be removed for revamp, but halted by the listing.

James invited to be on the committee for the Twentieth Century Society (still called Thirties Society at the time) in 1990 (when Docomomo was funded), he thinks because the C20 Society "didn't fancy the idea of being, as it were, outflanked by another organization taking over postwar modernism, although they themselves were not very keen on postwar modernism to say the least, since Gavin Stamp was Chair, etc."

"His entire reputation is based on his vitriolic attacks or campaign on modern architecture. So that's one reason why Docomomo UK got set up because it wasn't felt that the Thirties Society was really behind protecting modern. It was set up by a group of people who felt that the modern movement had presented itself as the uniquely legitimate style of the thirties, where in fact, there
was a whole lot of people doing late arts and crafts, late classical, all kinds of things, which were of equal or probably greater value from their point of view. So it was set up by a lot of people who were really ideologically far from committing to the modern movement in fact, and on the whole, the opposite. But nevertheless, Gavin Stamp, again I've known him for a very long time and we've collaborated on a book about Goldfinger. But that was a sort of unique aberration which caused some of his anti-modernist friends to kind of question his sanity really, but it so happened that he quite liked Goldfinger personally... They were both physically large, pugnacious people, so they seemed to get on quite well.

22:20

Allford Hall's drawings were very difficult to understand, even as an architect, so that's why JD thinks they went through 3-4 years previously without any comment, probably because no one understood them. JD did understand them, set a meeting with the City Planners, Allford Hall, Catherine Croft and pointed out that they were actually planning to destroy the principle space in the foyer. JD: Instead of trying to make the Silk St entrance, they should have tried to make the original main entrance facing the water work. Make a bridge across the water to the main facade.

25:11

"The whole design is flawed, there's no question, but a better way of making it work would have been to try and make it work the way it was designed to be made to work. So that became the C20 Society view, but by that stage... my article is a complaint in every case about the fact that English Heritage are a pushover when it comes to C20 buildings. They’re so anxious to appear flexible, but they're not willing to stand up for any key architectural values, as far as I can see."

26:41

"I think that the foyer space of the Barbican as now construed by Allford Hall Monahan and Morris is claustrophobic and therefore isn't functional. They've destroyed it architecturally and functionally. It was a difficult problem before, you came in the Silk St entrance at the back, and you had to go down steps and then up steps again at the other side, and that was the annoying thing... But whatever the problem was, the solution they're adopted wasn't the right one, because it just cuts up the main spaces and destroys the architecture. And I showed them at the meeting the Piranesi drawings from which had evidently inspired Chamber, Powell & Bonn... which showed these great piers with flights of steps going up, and it’s quite evident... but this was news to AHMM, these whiz kids... I don't think they bothered themselves to wonder [where the influence came from].

29:10

"People are blind to modern architecture still, and the fact is, it’s all just one architecture we don't like, and that's why it should be the task of a statutory Society to make them look again."

30:08

C: If this were a Grade I listed building of an earlier era, would this have been allowed?

J: Clearly not. I'll draw an exact comparison. You look at the Richmond Theatre, 18th c theatre which is Grade I listed, which was recently restored with the most careful possible exactitude to get the exact colour of shade of paint and so on, well if you're going to do that, on that basis, the Festival Hall... to allow its complete re-figuration at the stage end, is obviously not treating it in the same way. The trouble is of course that the Festival Hall is a 3000 seat theatre in the centre of London, whereas the Richmond theatre is a 300 seat gem in the provinces. That is an issue, but nevertheless, Grade I is Grade I, and there were solutions to the perceived acoustic problems that wouldn’t have involved that change. Again, it’s one of these things that had been set on track years in advance, and then I have to say, that the C20 Society screwed up the business of appealing, of
having that decision called in. I, at the time, had just gone through the business of getting the planning decision on the Royal College of Art called in by the central government, and it’s not an easy process, but you have to claim that a building is of national importance and that the local authority is not going to give it due consideration, and that was evidently what was going to happen at the Royal College of Art. So, I, and in that case, Docomomo, took on the full process of fighting the case, on behalf of the C20 Society, because they had the statutory duty.... They didn't approve what was proposed at the time for the Grimshaw Building, but they weren't that bothered, if you see what I mean, but I was bothered. They agreed that it wasn't good, so I might as well fight the case. So we got it called in by the central government, but that is a very difficult thing to do. And that means that there will then be a public enquiry about it, and at that point, the Royal College...This is despite the fact that English Heritage approved the scheme. It’s just incredible to me, and Westminster council too approved it, and the director of the Royal College of Art was chairman of the arts council and chairman of the design council, so the dice were pretty heavily loaded, but we were still able to put in a claim with the support of the Royal Albert Hall, who had previously registered and objection to what was planned but not really felt able to take a strong position because they didn’t want to be isolated, but when they realized that there were some others that felt strongly too...

Friend of JD collected signatures from about 1000 people cuing for theatre or concert tickets, saying do you want this to happen. Able to submit to government, saying that they should call this in, and they did. Had to submit proof of evidence that they were going to submit to a public enquiry. All in JD's spare time. Fortunately, RC of A, were advised by legal council that their case in a public enquiry would be difficult to sustain, so they withdrew. Immediately after, the Royal Festival Hall thing cropped up.

This time, the C20 Society said they would take it on, and again, it was evident that Lambeth Council were about to approve this, and English Heritage were about to approve it, etc, but they crassly they did not realize that you have to submit the request for it to be called in before the permission has been granted, not after, once the permission has been granted it’s too late.

C: was it inexperience?

J: Well, I think not. Well of course they have a great many cases to look after... a lack of sufficient eye on the ball or whatever. Why? I don't know. Especially since it was the lawyer they had put me in touch with originally on the RCA, who explained the procedure to me, which we got right on the RCA. Why they couldn't do the same, I don't know. So the result was that Lambeth and EH approved this change and so it went ahead. I do regret that still, because I think, what is the value of a Grade I listing unless it prevents that sort of thing happening.

C: different criteria for post-1914 or post-war Grade I listed buildings?

J: That's absolutely my point, that, being cynical, you can say that the government agreed to list post-war buildings because it’s more difficult to say 'Oo we shouldn't list post-war buildings'. It’s politically easier to say 'we'll list them', then not enforce the standards of listing to the same degree because that’s more difficult to pinpoint; there are shades there. So what happens is that these buildings are listed and then works of alteration are allowed to them that, there would be no question that they would be allowed in a comparably listed building from an earlier period.

C: Is this the greatest challenge to conservators in regards to conserving post-war modern architecture in Britain? Or is it working with the local authorities and their lack of interest or knowledge about the period?
J: talks about changing windows on modern buildings and local school by architect Cadbury Brown

44:40

appeal hasn't been rejected yet, but JD expects it will be

44:50

Case where Docomomo is acting on behalf of C20 and Docomomo

"C20 Society had informal discussions with English Heritage who said 'don't bother putting it in for listing again. We'll reject it again'. They've got to allocate their time, their paid officers, to where they think they can make the most use, so spending a lot of time putting together another case that's going to be rejected anyway, from their point of view, wasn't a good use of officer time. But for people who actually care about the outcome, we felt it was worth it. But I'm not at all surprised that it was rejected yet again, especially since the inspector [Emily Jean] who made the original assessment in 2005 is now the head of listing. So it didn't stand much chance of getting a fresh look. So that's why we've appealed, because we felt that it didn't get a fresh look, to the DCMS. Now who the DCMS refer it to, I have no idea because EH is supposedly their advisors. Since we're appealing against EH's view, I don't know to whom they turn. We'll see. They haven't rejected it yet.

-given open ended time to make their decision

54:00

Docomomo UK Honorary Secretary from 1990, when it was set up

Christopher Dean, coordinator set it up and did all the work

John Allan, Chair

55:30

Issue with Docomomo from the start, 'was the modern movement intrinsically against conservation, and therefore to set up a conservation group for the modern movement was a sort of paradoxical thing to do. But Hilde Heynen, who has written extensively on that and gave a paper on it I think at the very beginning, saying that there is no evidence that the modern movement as a whole was against the conservation of its architectural values, and sort of dismissing the argument really. But people are sensitive to it, and that's why the title of Docomomo is Documentation first, and then Conservation, in the theory that you could photograph the buildings and that would be enough.'

56:40

C: With the way that mod buildings are altered now so much, even when listed, do you think that that idea is changing? That it’s not enough to just document it?

J: Well I don't think anybody was ever really convinced by the argument that it was enough to document it, because there's nothing like the experience of a building in its simple existence. From my point of view, well not only do I value works of modern architectural art in itself, just as one values modern art, so its legitimate to retain modern architectural art in the same way that its legitimate to retain works of 18c architectural art. But it’s also very important from the point of view of there being a model, an example. I defended especially the work of Erno Goldfinger, who I worked for, but who I went to work for because I thought he was the only person building Modern architecture in this country, what I thought was modern architecture, and that embodied
certain ideas of value, so I wanted his buildings preserved in a way that could inspire future people with these ideas, so they could go and look at Trellick Tower or Balfron Tower and recognize the architectural drama the architectural quality, and realize that all the sort of naysayers, of whom there were umpteen million, were actually failing to see something altogether, or determined not to see something.

59:00

JD went to work for Camden Council under Neave Brown after working for Goldfinger: people working there were extremely proud of their modern movement affiliations, but they didn't recognize Goldfinger. 'Their whole attitude was, in my opinion, anti-modern. ...Insofar as the modern movement envisaged the green city, the idea of freestanding blocks in green space and the idea of going taller in order to get that green space, and to create what was called a three dimensional city, that was all anathema to them. They wanted to revert to the idea of the low-rise, high-density. That was their philosophy. And that's what they built. And all that's listed and admired. So the fact is, Goldfinger was a completely ignored or ridiculed figure until very recently. That hadn't been the case in the early 60s or late 50s, where sort of extreme modern or modern movement views were acceptable, but by the end of the 60s, that was no longer true. So as far as people like Neave Brown was concerned, Corbusier was their hero, except they ignored most of what he taught. They focused on many narrow aspects of what he did as a justification for what they were doing, but I think they missed the point about space basically. But this is not to say that they were not extremely dedicated people, they were, but they were not ready to recognize that we in Britain had produced, in the work of Goldfinger, work of international level, the highest level comparable, in my opinion, to the work of Mies van der Rohe and so on in terms of architectural value.'

1:01:45

C: Do you feel that it’s recognized at that level yet?

J: Probably not quite fully, but it is in that league, in my opinion. So I want it to remain so that people can see that, and all those people who think that modern architecture can only happen abroad, which is more or less the view of people like Neave Brown...

1:02:00

JD worked for Camden from 1975-83, period of gradual reduction of funding and building

Alexander Road under construction at the time

The whole Social housing program was being run down, whole idea of local authority architects offices were being attacked, particularly after M. Thatcher came into office in 1979, they were going to have to compete in terms of fees with private practices.

1:04:01

'Margaret Thatcher totally destroyed the basis on which the architectural profession had existed for 100-150 years really. The Right to Buy meant that local authorities became less interested in building new Social housing if the tenants could then buy them shortly after. You don't suddenly announce, 'We're stopping Social housing. That's it.', so what you do is you undermine it bit by bit, and then it grinds to a halt. And that's more or less what happened.

1:05:00

Right to Buy didn't take away funding for maintenance, but as soon as the more desirable units are bought, then its no longer available for Social purposes. The funding became more and more restricted, so local authorities couldn't build more Social housing. Conservatives did their best to
encourage anything other than local authorities, housing associations or whatever, to build housing instead, as well as allowing the right to buy.

1:06:00

J: I thought at the time, that allowing the right to buy would turn managing local housing estates from being difficult to being impossible, because how are you going to maintain an estate where random units belong to other people and you have to go through an elaborate procedure to get the work done, and then you find that there's people who actually don't have the means... They bought the flats without fully understanding that this exposes them to demands to contribute to really major building works, and then they don't have the funds, because they're taxi drivers or whatever they may be. And so then the local authority is faced with an invidious position of effectively having to evict people from their flats that they've sold them, and then they're open to accusations that they sold them without making it plain the extent to which future renovation may be needed. Just absolute hell and chaos. But, I have to say that it had one positive effect, which is that you then got owner-occupiers in some of these flats and because they had a stake in it, the maintenance and care of the estate became something they cared about, because their capital was tied up in it. So they then became a source of agitation for getting things done, and became an effective pressure, or group in some cases, for things being done. So there were good sides to it, and I don't know quite what the overall situation is now. I think local authorities have managed to learn to cope a bit better with the fact that there are random individual flats that belong to other people, but still, it is still very contentious and difficult.

1:08:20

JD's work for Tower Hamlets on the Balfron Tower:

'That was partly motivated by the few people who had bought their flats in Balfron Tower, who then resented having to pay their share toward the concierge, because the council had decided there should be a concierge. And the concierge sat in a converted building outside and effectively was useless. People simply went past, but these residents were expected to pay £500/year or something for that... So they agitated and said this is not value for money, so as a result, the Tower Hamlet's council had to concede and started looking into how to make the concierge service more effective.

Balfron Tower still mainly local authority social housing.

'You are unwise to buy a flat in building like that, because it’s impossible for you to know what liability you may be incurring for major renovation expenses. You can't have a building like that surveyed to give you an idea... there may be all kinds of hidden concrete decay, carbonization, all kinds of more or less secret, hidden things, which was then a part owner of the building, you then become liable to contribute to. And they are expensive to maintain. There's no question.'

1:10:45

Probably a better framework to have a whole block of owner-occupiers who are well off enough to own their flat and have a share in the building, than a sort of mixture. 'Balfron is likely to go that way in due time. But it’s a shame. I don't really have political stance on it, but it’s not what they were designed for. But I'm in favour of any system that allows the buildings to be looked after and maintained.'

1:13:15

J: 'I don't think Docomomo ever aspired to become a statutory Society like the C20 Society.'

1:30:00
Reaction from government officials and public:

J: 'Incredulity is the answer. As far as they were concerned, this was just a heap of rusting concrete and Goldfinger was virtually unknown, or if known, the prototype for the James Bond villain. And I think the fact that I campaigned for it, and we got letters of support for it from John Summerson, Berthold Lubetkin, Denys Lasdun, Richard Rogers, and suddenly the government thought, 'Cripes. These are big names!', and also from Phillip Johnson. Phillip Johnson wrote the best letter in support of it. I knew that he knew Goldfinger. Arthur Drexler and quite a few people from America. So suddenly the government was confronted with what they regarded as a crumbling heap of concrete that unfortunately they had a few years left to run on their lease, was being promoted and people were writing in its defense from the highest possible quarters, so it led to them feeling that English Heritage needed to - and it took English Heritage completely by surprise too - ...do sort of thematic surveys where they looked at particular building types over a particular period, and got a handle on the corpus, on might be worth preserving...'

But, the fact is that, it was not only rejected for listing, but a certificate of immunity from listing was issued and reissued on two subsequent occasions. Rejected for listing twice since then, and currently in for listing again, but it’s now in far worse condition than it was when originally proposed. Cinema destroyed, badly converted for housing, painted white and blue, block built on it which totally upsets composition. Absolute mess. Would be remarkable if it were listed and could only be listed because Goldfinger regarded it as his best work.

1:17:40

Faults or limitations in C20 or Docomomo?

J: 'They all have very limited means and they can only do as much as there are people to do.'

Docomomo doesn’t have any funding outside memberships - 110 members or so

Sponsorship for lecture series from Brick Development Association or whatever

Interviewed by Radio Scotland (or something) on Basil Spence Gorbals:

Guy said: 'Do you think you're organization has done as much as it should to arouse public interest or appreciation of modern architecture?'

J: 'It’s done just as much as a small group of volunteers can do in their spare time.'

1:19:28

J: 'My interest is in preserving these things in order to enable people to understand an idea. It’s important that the fabric should be preserved, but it’s more important that that example should be there so that they can understand an idea.'

1:20:00

J: In 1988, when Docomomo was first jelling as an idea, that was the height of postmodernism and I think there was a desire by Hubert Jan Henket to... not only to preserve Zonnestraal... but also to try to influence the Russians. That's why it needed to be an international organization. And also to convince the Dutch government to fund more restorations like Zonnestraal.

1:21:00

J: proposing at the moment to rephrase or restore clause 6 of Eindhoven statement to Henket's original plan, in that it should say, 'explore and develop the ideas of the modern movement', which implies that the idea of the modern movement would be promoted and gives an agenda for
ongoing development. There was a group in Eindhoven who thought the organization should be historical, that it should look at this as the past and not promote the ideas for the future, and that's why there were a compromise and the phrase was altered to 'explore and develop the knowledge of the modern movement'. That doesn't mean anything. You can’t explore the knowledge of something. Henket is unsympathetic. 'That is one thing Docomomo has not done at any stage. It has been really entirely concerned with identifying and conserving existing examples, which is valuable because it helps people to look at those buildings, but it doesn’t in itself develop the ideas any further.'

1:23:10

Robert Loader, honourary secretary of Docomomo UK, working with English Heritage to develop better relations with English Heritage

EH just produced draft report on office buildings 1964-94, which they sent to Docomomo for opinion

1:23:40

Age of consensus?

J: I shouldn't think so.

Greatest challenge?

J: There's no doubt that modern architecture or the architectural characteristics that modern architecture sought to develop, are hard to reconcile with the very strong energy conservation agenda'

Modern arch minimized structure and opened space to outside, whereas the whole emphasis of the energy conservation is to shut it all in again, so there's a direct conflict there, and of course the modern movement wasn't conscious of the energy conservation as a factor. Jury's still out on how this will go.

1:26:00

John Allan restorations

Personally thinks that sometimes he goes further in direction of alterations to satisfy clients than stricter doctrine of architectural conservation would warrant.

1:27:30

Conservation has been associated with left wing attitudes, but hasn't stopped major US corporations from being concerned

1:28:00

'Prince of Wales doesn't understand what Modern architecture is about. He thinks modern architecture is antithetical to nature, whereas it isn’t; it’s based on the desire to make appreciation of nature available to everybody. So in theory, it ought to be on the same side, if you like, but he's been indoctrinated with ... he has a rose tinted view of the past, and I suppose, as a monarch, it is rather difficult to embrace a modernist kind of approach because your whole position is to do with tradition and heritage, and there's no such thing as a modern image of a monarch. As a concept, it is antithetical, so I think it would be difficult to do much else, but some of the things he does are quite valuable. He is caught in his position as we are all.'
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1:50

C: What's going on with Cumbernauld?

R: I haven't been there recently. It's just my opinion. They've made such a mess of it by trying to bring it up today. It's made it worse.

2:25

C: In the time that you've been at Historic Scotland, have you seen attitudes toward post-war architecture change at all?

R: Interests of the organisation haven't changed, but attitudes certainly have changed. I think that, you know, when we started talking about preservation or listing of post-war buildings, I think the more discerning people within the organisation could understand that that might happen, but there was a lot of resistance. I was in this thing, Docomomo, along with Miles, and we produced this thing - Docomomo International demanded that all the national agencies, or national chapters if you like, would produce a fiche - 50 of the top buildings. If you're writing about the old days, if you're interested in that, there is a meaningful chapter in the movement of conservation. Whether people were quite ready for listing modern buildings, I don't know. There was kind of some shock tactics involved here, like putting the Red Road Flats and Hutchesontown C. Hutchesontown C was an issue - a big issue. I just think that people gradually got used to the idea that it wouldn't stop at Victorian or 1930s buildings. That things would move on, and that we might list the best of the post-war architecture. That process began I think in the late 80s - early 90s. We started to produce documents. You know English Heritage has the 'Change of Heart' document? Have you ever seen that? They started to produce a lot of stuff, but I think the big difference between what they were doing and what we were doing was that they were kind of promoting I guess what a lot of people would call soft modernism at the time or the acceptable face of modernism - new towns and things like that, Festival of Britain modernism... We were more interested or as interested in Brutalism because that was taken up so avidly in Scotland, and hence Cumbernauld being the canonical megastructure as its described by Reyner Banham. The idea of big, concrete interventions like that, which were the lowest point of their popularity, maybe in 1980, but that we were kind of espousing their interests I guess. There is a website of sorts that was put up - ScotBrut - so obviously people are interested. I think possibly with buildings like that, we've still got some way to go to convince anyone that these are of any interest at all.

6:30

C: I'm thinking of the St James Centre. That's not listed?

R: No.

C: And it won't be listed because there is planning, extensive planning, in progress?

R: There is.
C: And it is scheduled to be demolished?

R: It is. The very interesting thing is, when you've got something like that, the owner, as it were... well you could say, 'I'm going to get rid of this eyesore.' But there's a kind of demand that whatever you rebuild occupies that same space, so have you really demolished the building or not? It's quite interesting. You've rebuilt it. The other example of that is Robert Matthews building on George IV Bridge, Edinburgh. It was the Midlothian County building. It's not there anymore, but it was only recently demolished and they've replaced the building on exactly the same footprint with the Missoni Hotel. Do look at that, because that is an interesting conservation side issue. I know some towns in the Netherlands that if you take a 1960s block, a big slab, knock it down and rebuild it with the same footprint, but you pretend that it is a row of houses...

C: A divided facade. So they didn't actually divide up the plot?

R: No. There's quite a lot of literature on that. Yeah, and they were doing that as kind of a townscape notion. It's the same building with a different facade. That is quite a difficult concept.

C: And the St James Centre - that's basically gone? There's no saving that at this point?

R: No, I would doubt it. The one thing I would say is the sustainability argument. That has saved quite a few modern buildings. There's a company in England called Beetham [?]. They bought a lot of tower blocks basically and give them a makeover. So the basic philosophy there was, take a big tower block in the city centre - if you take it down, you don't get to build a new tower block, so if you keep it, and reclad it, you can have... That's just building economics.

C: Would they have done Keeling House?

R: Yes. Is that Manchester? Oh sorry. They did a famous one in Manchester as well. That's quite an interesting notion isn't it? Is that a conservation problem or is it not? Is it only conservation if you say, 'No I regret to conserve this building', but if you just actually conserve it, repair it, reuse it...?

C: Keeling House... at least, Catherine Croft at C20, she seemed happy enough with that, because with that particular building, its the way it fits together, the sculptural value of the building that was kept, and that's the value of the building.

R: That's the significance argument. ...They are restoring Balfron Tower, they restored Trellick Tower, and again, the kind of equivalent one here is Anniesland Court. I don't know if Dawn mentioned that one. It was renovated, but they've altered the panels to some extent. If you look at it, it looks like a version of Balfron Tower or Trellick Tower, you know with the detached service tower. It's a good example. It was listed in 1996.

12:20

C: So that was originally council housing?

R: Yes, well it is still council housing and its now, there is a thing called Glasgow Housing Association, and technically that's not council housing anymore, but in reality I think it is.

C: Is it subsidised?

R: Oh yes, yeah, very much so. Affordable housing, you could say, public housing. But in that case, they started to argue about the doors, windows, and what you got involved in there was kind of a political thing, where the tenants said, 'We want new doors', and the housing association said, 'Ok. We'll give you these doors', and they said, 'No we want better doors than that. We want the original doors because its a listed building!', and we said, 'Look, it doesn't really matter about the doors. That's not the important thing about this building. You're treating it as if it's a Georgian

365
building.' So then we get drawn into the whole argument about it. Do you see what I'm saying? Listing gets used for all sorts of political devices to get what you want. You don't want your school to get torn down so you say 'well list it and that will [save it]. Any local school, post office, church etc. You can imagine... [14:00] that there is a political dimension, both in the larger sense and in the smaller community politics.

C: So what happened with Anniesland? Did they get the original doors?

R: No, i think they got a door that eventually everyone was... we're talking about 500 of these, so the price of the unit was very very important, where as if it was just one unit, well you could spend another £100. Anyway, they came to some sort of compromise but it rumbled on for years. Then the people that live there start to make listing a problem, then if that happens, that can have an effect on whether we might list another modern building.

C: And councils may be opposed to the listing...

R: They might be, because it might create a problem where they'd have to spend more money than they otherwise would have spent. The Lanark county building was initially sort of in that area but an incredible thing happened though. They sort of embraced the idea of this thing and have continued to look after that building, they've kind of restored it, reglazed it and it looks great. A very interesting thing happened there, in that they were looking to create more space, [starts drawing] slab and then there’s the plaza and the fountains. Its very United Nations. And then out here, there’s a debating chamber, council chamber, so they needed more space. I've still got the illustration, which you could use. What they said was 'We'll create another one of these [tower block], a matching one, and that'll suit you. That's what you wanted; that's what you like in conservation.' So it’s interesting because you kind of try and get over, I suppose you call this conservation, but then you see it misapplied in a situation like this. They didn't do that. Obviously we advised them against that. There's a brilliant artists impression, which would be worth illustrating because it makes a point.

C: And you have a copy of this?

R: I think so... I think its great. I used to have it on the wall... I guess maybe you could track that down. It was a council applying for consent.

C: So it was listed?

R: Oh yes it was already listed.

C: But they have renovated it in a sensible and sensitive way?

R: They have done. And every so often there’s a new issue that comes up. I think there was new ventilation and there was a lot of discussion with us about how they might do that, which they absolutely accept. It didn't look, they thought at first 'this is an absurdity. Why would you list this building?' so we had to do a lot of explaining around that. But having got the idea, they've absolutely gone with it; they haven't continued to grumble about the fact that it’s listed. I think they're rather proud of it. The same is true of Anniesland Court.

C: The management? The council?

R: Well more the tenants. I've met them a couple of times, and they came along to a book launch we did - did you see that? We did a wee book on post-war

C: Was it rebuilding Scotland?
R: Yeah, Rebuilding Scotland. Well when they launched that, they [Anniesland residents] came along to that. So again, they'd embraced the idea, which is quite an amazing step forward from 1980 and 1996, I would say.

C: So it was listed in 1996?

R: Yes

C: I got a strong impression from professionals in England that post-war buildings are granted listed status but then they're granted listed building consent, because that is less in the public eye, except for the Southbank Centre, which is in the media right now. But that post-war buildings are allowed to be altered in ways that earlier listed buildings listed at the same level would not. Do you find that in Scotland at all?

R: I know why you're saying that, but I wouldn't say so. I think it goes back to the significance and that it is possible that you are able to make bigger interventions without affecting the significance to the same extent as you would be to a 17th c building or something. I mean that seems quite obvious to me that a Jacobean priory or something, that you couldn't add a great glass wing to it without destroying it. Whereas the same, well a university building - of which many were designed to allow for an extension, which imagined an extension taking place - there isn't a controversy around that. But I could see why you would form that impression if you were a practicing architect and your one job had been a Jacobean priory and the next was a 20c school, well you might think, 'Well I couldn't touch a hair on the head of that building, but this one I can have a go at it.' I don't think it comes from a lack of... I don't think its because people value them less, I wouldn't say - although they may do, they may value them less.

C: The general public, yes they may value them less. But in Historic Scotland, would you say that listed building consent is granted more for post-war buildings than for earlier buildings, or is it not such a controversy here?

R: I mean I really would say not. Something like the Lanark County building that was reglazed, or Anniesland Court, you see where they've taken much greater liberties with these buildings, but on the other hand, there were technical reasons for doing that with Lanark county buildings. You had terrible heat gain, so they reglazed with solar glass, as far as I remember, and in doing so, have not altered the character of the building. So that's really what its about. I don't think it’s about laxity of approach or valuing these buildings less; I think it’s in the nature of the buildings that you are able to do that without affecting the character to the same extent.

[23:15]

C: I'm trying to think of any case study in Scotland that would be kind of on par with the Southbank Centre - anything as controversial?

R: There hasn't been. Possibly if we had listed Cumbernauld town centre, and then they began to do these things to it, then there would have been an issue there. No we haven't had a... we haven't got a complex the size of the Southbank Centre or any cases really... I'll keep thinking about that though.

C: It's interesting. I wonder if that feeling comes from being that extra step away and not always having the ear of their minister or their agreement

R: The big difference is, now this is an important thing, English Heritage are able to criticise government policy. Historic Scotland, well that would be ridiculous because it is in government. It can't criticise itself. When it's an NDPB, it might do that. I hope not. To me that would not be a good light to go down, to think 'Great. Now we can criticise the government'. I'm going to have to think there aren't many grounds for criticism... to set up this conflict type of relationship. Well I guess I could go further, that in a way is the way that Westminster politics is, and obviously we're
hoping for something better in Scotland, where you've got more consensus. And you don't see something like SNH bashing the government, which they could do. Sometimes they might disagree with a decision, but at the end of the day, it's the government and... is a government organisation.

25:50

C: I think that you were involved in Docomomo from the very beginning?

R: Yes

C: Were you involved when it broke off from Docomomo UK?

R: Oh yes, that was great fun because it was never a part of Docomomo UK. We absolutely refused to accept that. Well there is a Docomomo UK and it has continued to call itself that now that there is a Docomomo Scotland. The two are equal parts.

C: Scotland never considered itself a part of it but Docomomo UK was set up first and it wasn't so much that Docomomo Scotland split from it, but just developed its own chapter?

R: Yep, it didn't split. There was kind of a turf war there with the guy that started... I forget what his name is - an awfully nice guy... but he started the UK thing, and he said, well lets all join together, and we said, by all means lets cooperate, but you have Docomomo England and Wales, we'll have Docomomo Scotland, but he wasn't happy with that. He carried, or they have carried on Docomomo UK. We fought each other, not to put it too strongly.

C: Was it very long afterward that Docomomo Scotland was started?

R: I think it must have been early 90s, because we had a nice conference in 1992 called Visions Revisited, where we were looking at Cumbernauld and all of this stuff, so I think all of this stuff is 1991. I don't know when the UK... it started just a number of months after the UK started. When you talk about these organisations, you're only talking about 2 or 3 people. Both sides... Docomomo UK is not a huge big London tower block, its one bloke with a typewriter, as they used to say, and we were the same. We were 2 blokes with a typewriter.

C: I should ask Miles about it

R: Yeah, if he can be bothered to think about it.

C: I think it is part of the story.

R: I do, I do. Otherwise I wouldn't talk about it generally, but it is part of the story that you might be telling. Yeah, I don't know if there is any other equivalent sort of national pride wars - I don't know if there was a Docomomo Catalonia or Docomomo Quebec, that would be the kind of equivalent, do you know what I mean? Any time there is a kind of international organisation, there is a potential for argument about countries like Scotland that...would want better representation.

C: Well each state in the US is, well not everyone has one, but each state is allowed to have one, and then there is also Docomomo US

30:25

C: And then also about the same time is when the Gorbals came down and Docomomo didn't seem to stand up for that?

R: Well, no they did, yeah. There was, I remember there was an article in the paper, well Paul Stirton, he's now at the Bard graduate school in NY... He was involved with Docomomo, was that
later on or maybe it was about the same time as Miles and I, and... but laterally it's been Clive Fenton who's done all the work. Anyway, so you were asking about the Gorbals. There was to some extent. There was a question about whether they would be listed, these buildings, I raised that within my office, we did a list description, it was thought about and we decided not to list it. And I don't think that was because we thought they're not interesting enough. It was felt to be too controversial because of their condition, what they symbolised at the time. That Paul, I remember, wrote an article and we referred to them as 'designer' blocks and that would be in The Times, just about when they were going to be demolished. The London Times I'm pretty sure. He might have a copy of it.

[33:45]

R: I think any of his [Paul Stirton] recollections of it - you know that book Rebuilding Scotland, a book that Historic Scotland produced about post-war architecture in Scotland. Post-war Scotland is a series of essays. Rebuilding Scotland talks about a conference in 1992 and there's a photograph of the speakers. Paul is the one immediately on the left. I can give you his email address.

[35:50]

C: Yeah, I just got the impression while I was down in London that Docomomo Scotland didn't stand up for the Gorbals but that doesn't seem to be the case.

R: Oh this is what they said? [laughs] That sounds familiar. That would be the way that organisations there would think that they were to operate. This kind of goes back to an earlier answer I gave you about how things might operate, you said about campaigning organisations, but we didn't want to do that frankly. We didn't feel that was the thing to do. The idea was to get as much research out there as we could, and then simply the attitude towards these buildings would come out of that, rather than hectoring the [??]

C: So it's more of working with Historic Scotland...

R: Yeah I'd be wanting to work with everyone I think. And this is why, I think, if you would read that... you'll see the idea that, well, we say 'These things are very important, and these things showed how they thought people might live in the future, and it was very civilised and urbane, but if they're beyond repair, they're beyond repair.' That's not a matter of campaigning. It was turned into a big event, like 'This is the end of all this stuff, this arrogant attitude to how you might house people. Its the end of all that and we're going to blow it up.'

C: So it was a celebration?

R: Yeah, a kind of celebration which was, I think, distasteful really. You just needed to have a more thoughtful approach, but it’s difficult to be thoughtful in a big scale like that.

C: Was Basil Spence there for the demolition?

R: Oh no, he had died by then.

C: I feel like that would have been very heart-breaking for him.

R: Yeah, I think so. I don't know. That is an odd question, what that means to people to see their... You think of Gillespie, Kidd & Coia. They've seen quite a few of their buildings demolished and they're attitude to that...

C: I don't know if anyone else has gone through that sort of celebration and glorification, and then, 10 years later, the backlash and wholesale public rejection... You don't see that so much with postmodern architecture. People maybe don't like the style of it, but they don't say 'blow it up', its 'ok, let's maybe change the colour'
R: That's true. It's not symbolic of a way of thinking, which these buildings I guess tended to be, they tended to become symbols of something. And there was complete lack of sympathy toward the aspirations of the builders, the planners, architects, until relatively recently. What I find very interesting in recent years is the inspiration for the younger artists in modern architecture, Martin Boyce is a painter, Toby Patterson, a Scottish artist, were both very inspired by modern architecture. If you're interested in that theme, you could speak to them. But there are other people you could speak to. Martin has written a wee bit about modern architecture. You'll see how important modern architecture is for his work. That's a strange thing. I think there is kind of a hankering after community, because it was, it just seemed that during the Thatcher period, all of that seemed like an embarrassment that you might have a community, that you might live in the same place happily together, and so it was vilified. Now that we're hankering after that again, of course we're interested in the period. Is that why you're interested in the period?

C: I don't know... Do you think that the maintenance of tower blocks and modern buildings is improving at all now? Are they being better maintained now or is it only after a renovation that the maintenance efforts improve?

[42:00]

R: Yeah, well what do you mean by 'these tower blocks'?

C: Um well, I guess the one's in Glasgow are all going now...

R: I think they would like to demolish all of them because I don't think they were ever maintained properly, although there are exceptions in Glasgow, but they are very much exceptions. Well, there's some at Broomhill, there's some at Winford which is SSHA - Scottish Special Housing Association - not a city council scheme, but you know, that's Glasgow. A lot of them were quite well looked after, for example, Lanark county, you know the prestige offices. That was an important part of their image, was the high rise, and image is a big part of it isn't it. It looks glamorous and international and caring for your people and giving them something international and modern. There's a story that's occasionally told about Ardross, and this was a wee town wanting a high rise just for the sake of saying 'we've got a high rise now. We have arrived as a proper town.'

C: Did they get it?

R: I think so! [laughs] So you've got to sort of situate yourself back in that period where that was something to be desired, not vilified. It's very difficult, very difficult. Anyway, we've got Aberdeen, who of course, have famously looked after their high rise buildings very well, but they have a 'look after your buildings' culture very strongly embedded. It wouldn't occur to most people in Aberdeen not to do that, in my experience. So there's much less of that...

C: Have you been up there to see them?

R: Oh yes, and I've worked up there, I'm going there today there actually.

C: And people still enjoy living there?

R: I couldn't say. I couldn't say whether you could get someone to say that, to admit that. That's a whole lot of a question isn't it? What happens when you say to someone, 'Do you like living here?' You don't really know what you're asking, do you? I would rather live in a house with a front garden and a back garden. It's irrelevant. I've got a friend in Architecture & Design Scotland, she's just done a big housing survey because, in Scotland, every so often the politicians say, 'Why are we building all this terrible spec housing? We need to raise the standard.' But then when you look at the question as to how that happens, it’s incredibly complicated, and it’s about consumer preference, building construction, the size of house building companies, the way in which we've experimented in architecture through social housing. It's all sorts of issues; it’s not simple at all.
And I think the same would be true about user preferences. You will get, I think, in Scotland, that people who will happily tell you that they would rather live on the 14th floor in or near the town centre rather than somewhere out in the suburbs in townhouse where you can't get anywhere. That sort of thing. You know, that's what's happened in England. There's more of a preference for flat living. This is the other issue. Flat living is ingrained in Scottish culture at all levels, whereas in England, it was never part of an acceptable way of living really. So that was imposing something that was new to quite a lot of people, whereas in Scotland, you've been removed from your tenement and put in another tenement that just happens to be 18 storeys. So that's how most people would have thought about it.

C: But the Red Road flats, the maintenance was just never up to what it needed to be and so, is that why you think it failed?

[47:25]

R: I don't know. Again, it's complicated, towns have moved on and people think... There's a whole issue about living in social housing at all. Whereas I might have been, is that the way to live? Is it stigmatised now? People think, 'well this stuff is not good enough.' Is it just for people who cannot afford a proper house? I've got friends who grew up in Red Road. They had a great time. They thought it was fantastic, but I noticed a few blogs around Red Road recently, people saying 'Yeah I loved it as well. I lived there til I was 14'. So, the idea that it was kind of high-rise hell is nonsense. It slowly became that.

C: [referenced article by man living in tower block in Leith]

R: That's the cycle isn't it? It's really problematic in a high-rise because it can sour the whole block.

[49:30]

R: Sustainable adaptations, absolutely, we want to show that this is perfectly possible with all these buildings. They can be retrofitted without loss of character. In a way its more difficult with [Victorian or Georgian buildings] than it is with modernist buildings. It’s assumed that they can't be brought up to standard, but it can be done.

R: Do you think we are reaching an age of consensus? [laughs] As I said, I did say that, and I don't think that it was met with particular resistance in Scotland. It’s met with some resistance, but not especially in Scotland.

C: It doesn't seem that it's on the level that it was in England, and Dawn didn't feel that it was either. I didn't expect to find that, especially with the Gorbals. But yeah, I guess I just didn't expect it to be different between England and Scotland.

R: There was a great thing on telly a few years ago about the demolition of high rise buildings at Westerhailes in Edinburgh, and Edinburgh was out for a party as they used to have. I mean that whole thing is very interesting - why would you do that? And they blew up this thing, and this woman they had been talking to burst out crying she was so upset. She said, 'That's my home! Why are you celebrating?' So, I think the celebration thing is odd. I went to one there Townhead [?] ... in Glasgow they blew something up. Must have been an old tower. My son was only a wee boy. We went up there to have a look at that, and [draws map of area] there was a block sitting like that and a row of tenements here and another block there, and these people were all out and they'd got a street party with tables, and this thing came down and there was an enormous cloud of dust that immediately enveloped these people. It was ridiculous that it hadn't been worked out that that was what was going to happen.

C: Did anyone get injured?
R: I don't think so. They just came running out of the cloud coughing. And I was, there's a hill here, I was watching from the hill, and I thought, 'Oh dear, this was meant to be a celebration and no one is really happy.' We were just walking away from it and there was an old man trudging up the hill, and my son, he started crying. He was upset about the whole event; I don't know why I thought it would be alright. And he said, 'Look at that old man...’ ... Oh I know why, he thought the people were in it. Can you believe that? He thought when they blew it up... it never occurred to him that they wouldn't... Isn't that terrible. Anyway, he said, 'Look at him. He's so sad. His house has been blown up.' So, it would be quite interesting to talk at least... to have described them as celebratory events and to have issued invitations. They did, yes. I don't think that was the right thing to do, but I don't think they do that anymore. Sighthill, they demolished one, or they're continuing to demolish them. There's one over here that they're clawing away at. I don't know what the technical reasons are that some get blown up, but mostly nowadays they get torn down. These two there are sitting in Ballahouston park, and they're always, they're very proper, they're sitting in a nice area. I think that's possibly the key to the whole thing. Miles has incredible knowledge of these things. He knows all of them.

C: And the other one you were talking about was Town Head?

R: Town Head is just over there, if you look at Townhead, they referred to these things as 'blow downs'. I think it might have been demolished in 1993 - 1995. So I think it was quite brave of us to list that building at Anniesland Court at a time when they were still blowing up tower blocks.

C: Was that the first one listed?

R: It was the first housing block

C: The only one?

R: Yeah, you're the right. It is the only one. The reason they're quite interesting is they're designed by Jack Holmes, who was a very talented architect. We've listed other buildings by him, so it was a kind of tower block design by an architect. So in a way it was in the same category as the Spence flats. The original idea was, the idea of providing housing on that scale designed by the top international architects, that was the important thing. Most of the other stuff was package deals. But the one at Anniesland was designed by Jack Holmes, so a one off much like the Trellick or Balfron Tower designed by Gollfinger. If you look at them, they're very similar. You could say well, 'This was Historic Scotland responding to the architectural rather than the social', so you would say we go around listing things by talented men - the art historical approach - and we haven't really dealt with the social approach.

C: Do you see any other tower blocks being listed? Are there any left that were really creative or...

R: Well it's interesting because you're using that term, creative, and using an art historical approach, well you might say, should we continue to use that approach because it was designed by an architect? I mean, we've obviously listed at the University of Edinburgh the David Hume tower. It's not a residential tower but that's a good question. I don't think now there are any residential towers probably that we might list. Miles' thing was not taking an art historical approach and in fact, something like Sighthill, which was a package deal designed by Crudens (?) or their company architect, was more interesting and more modernist and was designed in Corbusian lines. So if you look at that, an aerial shot of that, you'll see what I mean. His point is, that's more interesting in response, more interesting to world trends in architecture and this thing at Anniesland is just some version of an architect. I don't know what the answer to that is. That's how we've been criticised - well no, or how we might criticise ourselves. And with the English Heritage debate, well you've listed the stuff that was easy to list... and the really important stuff, by the Smithsons and people like that, you're frightened to list that because there will be a public reaction.

C: But there aren't any tower blocks worth listing?
R: I don't think so. No, no. Whether you would look at these two [Bellahouston Park] and think, 'We need to list that', I doubt it. I doubt it. I think we would record that as not interesting enough.

C: I think that's about it. I'm going to go through my scatchings and email you for the things you've mentioned.

R: Please do.

C: So they were more about preserving the general character, not necessarily saving all the windows

R: No they'd replace all the windows, they'd make big changes to it. There are these buildings... these buildings, the Hook of Holland in Rotterdam and the Van Nelle Factory, so a lot of big interventions, and to some extent, at the time, that seemed quite shocking that you would list a building as it were and then make such big interventions to it, such big changes to it, but really, later on, I think this is really what we've evolved into. Do you see what I mean?

5.2.4. ELAIN HARWOOD, POST-WAR SPECIALIST FOR HISTORIC ENGLAND

London, England

19 March 2013

E: 60s, started looking at Victorian

Pevsner suggested they look at modern movement, 1920s, 30s, gave a top 50, most of which were listed in 1970-71

Art Deco buildings demolished in 1980-81 got English History looking at that period

1987, pressure from and requests from public finally persuaded the government to issue a statutory instrument of legislation, any building over 30 years old could be listed and any building over 10 years old - outstanding and under threat - could be listed.

Competition held with Sunday Times, group of experts assembled - architects, engineers - put together a list of 70, only 17 of those listed,

3:00

C: How much do these decisions come down to the Minister?

E: A lot. He is the final stop, and they change very rapidly, so at the moment we've got a very sympathetic one who understands buildings, whose mum is a member of the Twentieth Century Society and retired arts critic, so she's seeing her boy does good.

C: term?

E: [The Ministers] do get shuffled at the junior level quite regularly, as upper posts becomes vacant or somebody has to resign, or is ill, they get shuffled about. The government has a term of up to five years, but within that time, Ministers very rarely stay the full term, and particularly for the lower ones, when it is probably good for their careers to swap about.
Organization of the DCMS:

Minister of the DCMS, Secretary of State at top - tends to do sports, another person to do TV regulation, and another person to do arts. Minister of the Arts: Ed Vaizey at the moment

C: Does the system work? Too much to cover?

E: 'I think English Heritage does try to second guess the politics as to what's going to be controversial, and usually so gets it wrong that it’s not really worth trying. But, essentially our role is to be dispassionate and professional and give the expertise as to what's good and what's not. And then, it’s for the Minister to take out. Now they can consult whoever else he or she may like, and they used to consult CABE, but that's been cut [because of budget cuts]...

E: [Upton red car?] was turned down for listing against English Heritage's advice, and I don't know but you do sort of wonder, if there was a great somebody who was actually celebrating modernism the way CABE used to, would that sort of building got through? You know what you notice now is a great range of buildings being listed, not just the modern buildings like the Lloyds Building, but more quirkier, lots of memorials, lots more Festival of Britain inspired things, ballrooms...a bit festival a bit art deco, buildings associated with the Beatles being listed, buildings with murals. So the variety is much greater.

C: When CABE was consulted, do you think buildings were judged more on their commercial value for redevelopment?

E: No, you're not allowed to. I think they were judging buildings by the name of the architect. ...I don't know what they would have made of the Smithsons, but that sort of architects approach, the value of the names, buildings that were published in the architectural press at the time; they were the ones they would go for.

C: Did the thematic studies help move listing away from the glorification of the architects?

E: I think so, well certainly CABE were mystified by what they got charged to deal with, because some building that was done neo-classical - the values are different, and so the building types studies were great because it helped you understand what the brief was and what the architects were trying to do in building schools that had windowsills down here for five year olds, or new universities that looked at new subjects like social sciences so linking those departments together on those great long spines, so you could [knock through?] with different faculties as needed or different groupings of subjects... they were sort of interested in what happened at the intercesses between such subject types and borders... And I think doing surveys by building type helps you sort that out a bit more.

C: [references Adrian While: Control and uniformity in the planning system and over designation in the UK?] Has too much been listed?
E: 'No I don't, because I can see all the ones that got away. I don't think we designate enough, because so much has been given away the local authority who's planning officers often don't know what they're getting, you get schools listed where the planning authority is also the education authority, so are being demolished. Listing doesn't save a building, only marks it out, so an awful lot are going or have gone. And we're almost too late; there's not a lot else you could add to the list of the great buildings of the 60s. I think more buildings should be listed. If it meets that standard, it should be listed... Because we have a system where every building or terrace, say, is individually listed, whereas in France, they sort of list a great one, and then everything around it becomes caught up in a group. They don't have so many listed buildings but their actual controls are much more strict. ...Here, everything on this street (RIBA library) is listed... but say this [building] were listed and nothing else, the rest of the terrace would be protected because it affects the setting of this one. Whereas in England, [the legislation just applies to the one building].'

14:50

C: Conservation areas: Do they work similar to the French model?

E: 'Less teeth. They stop demolition but they don't stop alteration.'

15:15

Local authorities not realizing what they have:

E: 'It's still very hard to convince members... It would be lovely if they all did your course, but how many people in Bradford are going to be able to do a course? And it's how conservation officers aren't necessarily trained in this period, and not all local authorities have a conservation officer. And there's an awful lot of authorities that will only have one post-war listed building, and they called in English Heritage, but English Heritage will still try to give away a post-war building or give away key features such as windows or even whole elevations because it feels that they should be allowed to change in a way that it wouldn't with a Georgian building. I mean, look at Park Hill in Sheffield, for example.

16:50

C: Do you disagree with the way that they allow these alterations to post-war buildings?

E: 'I look here, and look how many Georgian buildings there are along here, and the number of 20th century buildings is very few, and so, to me, they're more unique and they've had to go through more hoops in order to be listed, and they have to near on perfect to be listed. But then, this double standard appears that they are allowed to be more altered than the Georgian buildings and that just seems puzzling, utterly ludicrous and wrong.

17:40

C: Do you think that this will change? 10 years from now?

E: 'If there's anything left. I do feel quite pessimistic, for some fields. Different building types are surviving in different ways, some phases surviving better than others. It's bad for schools and new towns and a lot of public housing, whereas I think private buildings, private houses are holding up their value better so they're more desirable and sought after. Office buildings, Universities - Universities are pretty appreciated because of younger audiences who are most appreciative of post-war buildings, apart from the very elderly who were building it. And the problem is, an awful lot of conservation people are those people who started out in the 70s and 80s in that era of the reaction against modernism.'
C: Will the listing of PoMo illicit the same sort of backlash as the listing of modern buildings?

E: Possibly. I don't know because, at the time the legislation came in, those were buildings that were fashionable and classical buildings were on the out. Now, anything that sort of suggests postmodern, they're going. They're disappearing quite quickly. I don't think there would be any controversy over people like John Outram, you know something that was selected for its flamboyance. The real sorts of extreme postmodernism like Marco Polo House, down near Battersea Bridge, and it was built by a developer, and it's sort of white marble with this broken pediment on top. It was very, very silly but quite, sort of, strong. And it's already starting to split, divide opinion because it's supposed to be under threat and it's not quite 30 years old yet. I don't know it's actually come in as a case, but that kind of commercial architecture is going to be controversial the way that listing Centre Point was controversial. Maybe the general public would accept the NatWest Tower now if it came in now, I don't know. It'll be interesting to see.

22:40

C: How do you balance pressures from political figures, conservation groups, the media and the general public?

E: 'You have to try to stand in the middle really. If you're offending as many people as you're pleasing, you're probably somewhere about right, but it's like you've got to be ahead of opinion, but not completely off your head.'

23:20

C: In most cases where you stood ahead of general opinion, has the public generally come around to it?

E: 'I think so, because I think people have come around to Centre Point now, by and large, and that's one that still divides people. The Barbican, when I first looked at that in 1989, it seemed outrageous to be listing it and now, it's got a whole new population who are moving in because they like it. Robin Hood Gardens is interesting, isn't it, because English Heritage wouldn't list it. The powers above me were not going to go for that one. They argued that it hadn't worked as housing. [set for demolition? could happen fairly soon, but has only not happened because of the economy]

25:00

Description of situation at Robin Hood Gardens

28:08

English Heritage said No to Robin Hood Gardens,

E: 'but internationally, architects, conservation people from around the world, historians all think it should be because of the wealth of ideas it embodies.'

28:30

English Heritage and the C20 Soc:

E: 'All the amenity societies, same as the Georgian Group or the Victorian Society, they get a small grant from English Heritage toward their casework and they can provide the specific expertise in cases where English Heritage and local authorities don't have so much information on twentieth century buildings, and they can lobby and call for buildings to be listed, and when it comes to thematic programmes, English Heritage are increasingly consulting them, and they've [EH] helped sponsor some of the society's publications, so there is encouragement to work
together, because when they end up on opposite sides, like Robin Hood Gardens, it starts to be a bit more difficult. And you would expect the C20 Society to be this sort of radical, cutting edge [group].'

C: Whereas with EH, there are many different views on heritage within it and they look at all of them?

E: Yes, it’s always balanced.

30:30

C: C20's grant from English Heritage: yearly?

E: Yes. It pays for about half of their casework and the rest has to be made up from membership fees, charges for events, magazines.

31:30

C20's publication for Robin Hood Gardens

32:00

C: Docomomo UK: Volunteer group, no funding. How does it function differently? Is there a benefit in having both groups? Would it be better if they joined?

E: 'In many ways, yes, but it’s this culture that likes lots and lots of groups, and they've always appealed to architects and they're even more maverick and radical, so it’s great that they're there when it comes to saving the important buildings. And they had some money years ago and they did used to be able to pay for a caseworker, so they did have a lot more impact in the 1990s than they do now. And of course, I think Docomomo Scotland is much more of a pressure group because C20 doesn't get that far north very much.

33:00

C: With Docomomo UK and Docomomo Scotland, is there a need for Docomomo NI or Wales?

E: No we need somebody to set one up. There was a group here that called themselves Docomomo UK, and then Miles and his chums decided that that wasn't right, and Scotland [should] have its own voice with modern architecture, which it does. [There was] not enough focus on the modernism of Scotland, and Scotland, with its different housing policies seemed to have different issues, and it had that radical group of people led by Miles who wanted to do more campaigning about more ordinary architecture and not just the big names, and do something more about Scottish, specifically Scottish, types of architecture.

33:30

Gorbals and Docomomo Scotland:

E: ‘...They weren't really interested in that [the Gorbals], because [Basil] Spence was really a housing architect.

37:00

C: Difference between English and Scottish listing system?

- Spot listing and immunity from listing in both. Check names.
E: The difference is that English Heritage is a quango whereas Historic Scotland is still part of the civil service. They report much more closely to the Minister, whereas we are legally completely separate.

EH = non-governmental org; HS = governmental

38:00

E: 'It’s a splitting of hairs that makes civil service in England look smaller, and it means that people can leave us money, we can raise money separately for our properties, and we can operate as a charity for Stonehenge and all that kind.

'On that side, it works out better, on the preservation side, we are one step removed where Historic Scotland are much closer to the decision maker - their Ministers within the Scottish Parliament.'

C: Do you think this makes them a little more timid in what they put forth for listing?

E: 'No, I don't. Traditionally they've been a lot bolder than us, with a few exceptions in Edinburgh, they don't have the same political pressures and property values to deal with, and so Historic Scotland have listed proportionately more modern buildings and more recent buildings, and they've had a couple of cases in Edinburgh where Ministers have rejected their advice and the buildings have been demolished, but it looks like they've taken the position... [incomprehensible bit]... site near Edinburgh Airport, 'handsome' office building(s) by Robert Matthews, Johnson, Marshall, late 70s - early 80s, 'which would be a radical thing for English Heritage to list, but Historic Scotland was going to go for it.

40:30

E: 'Where they are different, is that they're more timid - I think they can't list if there's a current - their spot-listing is more tied to planning applications than ours, and we are more timid if a planning permission has been given, and if there's a current planning application in that's not been decided, then Historic Scotland won't look at it; they'll wait until the decision has been made, which to me seems very strange. [check details]

E: 'If a planning application is in, but undecided, we will try and make the decision ahead

For contacts at Historic Scotland: Andrew Martindale:
andrew.martindale@historicscotland.gov.co.uk?

-Check for Historic Scotland publications

46:25

C: Is EH invited to sit on city planning board meetings?

E: 'We sit on things like [Diocletian] advisory boards, we'll have a rep, but that's about it. Churches exempt from listed building and planning controls, and their applications for alterations are dealt with by advisory boards under the diocese. Each bishop has an advisory board, so English Heritage has representatives on those. And perhaps on specific issues of regeneration, but that’s about it.

47:45

Southbank:
E: 'Again, it’s not a listed building because it’s been turned down by the Minister, but there's a Grade I building next door to it, so English Heritage have been involved. Different section, I have no idea what English Heritage will think.'

C: But EH granted the Immunity from Listing?

E: NO, we recommended listing. The government (i.e. Minister) granted immunity. We have consistently recommended the listing of that one.

49:00

C: Do you think the alterations planned for the Southbank Centre set precedence for future alterations of listed postwar buildings?

E: 'Look at Park Hill. ....I don't know. But it’s a dangerous precedence, isn't it.

50:00

E: 'The Southbank isn't protected and because it’s not got the city's support, there's probably more commercial pressure on it.'

C: Because they've listed part of it, do you feel they think that's enough?

E: 'Look what they did to the Festival Hall! They've allowed all that chopping with listed building consent, and that's Grade I. ...they allowed the stage area to be transformed, taking out canopies from the auditorium, made acoustic changes, major changes to the bar and foyer areas and big changes to the external envelope, most of which, I think have been ok in making it function better so that's quite good, but that [paved the road?]... So you can expect an alteration to be made to an unlisted building.

E: It’s been listed since 1988, and there was no money or will to make alterations at that time, and it’s because the decade of the 80s was a decade of neglect, that there's more pressure on these buildings now for alteration. Nothing was done to any of these buildings of this period between their construction and the 90s, and that's really why they're coming for having all this money spent on [alterations].

52:15

C: Because of the alterations, should Festival Hall be downgraded in listing?

E: 'No. In Park Hill - yes, definitely. But the Royal Festival Hall is still the Royal Festival Hall, and its slight palimpsest, it's certainly odd anyway because alterations were made to it in the 60s, and what they've tended to do is alter the 60s bits more than the 50s bits, so I think it’s still worthy of its listing. And because there is so little of that era, I mean, it’s one building that’s sort of in its own, internationally at that time.’ [Internationally known]

5.2.5. CATHERINE CROFT, DIRECTOR OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY SOCIETY

18 March 2013

London, England
CC: And to you know about the Getty's thing? The Getty has got this massive program on the restoration of 20th c heritage - a sort of worldwide comparative thing. I was out there in December with Hubert Jan Henket, who set up Docomomo, and someone who set up MAAS[?], which is a sort of panation twentieth century architecture conservation. They've just did a great big colloquium and that's where I was at, of which they're going to write up, I think. As well as them, there's a group, Mandruseo[?] in Switzerland, who are doing an encyclopaedia of 20th c architecture conservation. They're very nice. Mario Botta...

Me: How long have you been with the 20th C Society?

CC: I've been director for about 10 years and before that, I was a trustee... for probably about 4 or 5 years. I don't remember.

Me: In the time that you've been involved, have you seen the aims of the 20th C Society shift in any way?

CC: Yes, they've shifted enormously. I mean, obviously, we started out being called the Thirties Society. I mean, we were never that prescriptive about just doing thirties buildings, but it was very much a focus on not modernism or... so it was a lot of Deco and a lot of traditional revival, classical revival stuff. And we have evolved.

Me: It's quite a swing. Was early modernism included in the scope of the Thirties Society? Were people interested in it?

CC: I suppose they were, but I think that some of those... I think that maybe they were thought to be less vulnerable because the early listings concentrated exclusively, mostly, on the early modern stuff, so I think that it was felt that they were probably going to be looked after, and going to be looked after by the architectural profession, and I think a lot of the people who were involved with us early on were architectural historians who sort of saw themselves as fighting the case for the neglected bits.

Me: So when you switch to being the 20th Century Society, were people angry about that? Was it a point of contention? Or was it seen as necessary to expand?

CC: It was definitely seen as necessary to expand. It was increasing thought that the Thirties Society didn't work as a name, but I think people felt quite uncomfortable with the Twentieth Century Society as a title for a long time, and now, we're forever being asked what we're going to do about the 21st century, and you know, is it worth going through the same pains all over again, really? I tried to introduce C20 with a little 'plus (+)' sign about five years ago, and that went down badly, but it is an issue.

Me: Looking at the later 20th century, the postmodernism that so many people who appreciate modern architecture don't appreciate postmoden architecture, is that a new contention within the society?
CC: I think we've always been absolutely adamant that we were wanting to assess buildings without any regard to their style so that... but I don't think that has been a huge thing to swallow. I mean, it hasn't in theory, been a huge thing to swallow, I think the actual buildings have been quite problematic for some members, but we put in Broadgate for listing, and I was actually surprised how positively that was supported by my trustees and by English Heritage actually, when we put it forward, they were really up for it in a way I wasn't really anticipating. So, I mean, it was turned down by the Minister, but…

Me: Is Margaret Hodge still the Minister?

CC: No, we've had a huge slew of different Ministers, and you probably need to track them. The current Minister is Ed Vasey. Broadgate was turned down by the previous Minister.

Me: And what is his view toward modern architecture?

CC: I think we should ask him that question. He seems more sympathetic than many of the Ministers we've had for a long time. I think he's genuinely interested, and really quite well informed. On the whole, I think he's a good thing. Because the Department of Culture, Media and Sport is very much the least prestigious, certainly about the least prestigious ministry in government, we tend to get a high turnover of Ministers because we get ambitious (young) people on the way up, or who are thought to be a good thing but they don't really want them in any mega important position on the way down. And we have had a very large turnover, which has been difficult... and it's an incredibly broad portfolio as well. I mean its culture, media and sport. And obviously, the chances they know about us is pretty limited. At the moment, the big obsession with the department is broadband provision and digital media, and for the last 4 or 5 years, it's been the Olympics. It was impossible to have any conversations with anyone at the DCMS basically for the whole of last summer, because they were just totally tied up the Olympic stuff.

Me: Do you think that works to have just one department covering such a broad range or do they need to break it down?

CC: I don't know. In some ways it works, in some ways it doesn't. The bigger question is whether... there is another department that deals with planning, so we're not in the same department as the town planning. That's a much debated question. Whether if were in that, we'd be lost in an even bigger department? I don't know. In some ways, I think it would have advantages.

Me: What chance do you have to work with the planning departments?

CC: They all have to consult us; there is a statutory obligation to consult us. Once [a building] is listed, if there is an application for listed building consent that involves demolition, then they have to come to us.

Me: But, say if there is a building that you have been trying to get listed but it has been rejected, they have no obligation to consult you then?

CC: They have no obligation but, that's the situation on the Southbank Centre, for instance, at the moment. And they have been involving us in early discussions because they're interested in what we might say to the press.

Me: The press does seem to come to you quite a bit, especially on Southbank.
CC: Yeah, I've worked hard on developing press contacts. I feel that's... and I have worked as an architectural journalists - freelance, I briefly worked for Building Design but I've written for lots of different people. And I've done that, because I'm still part time here, so I've done that alongside working here. So that's been very good for building up contacts.

Me: Southbank design being put to public review?

CC: They've put it up in the Festival Hall as an exhibition.

Me: And when they say they're putting it up for public review or public enquiry, how much of that do they take into account?

CC: I have no idea.

CC: We put a statement on the website about 2 weeks ago [C20 News section]. We're taking it to our casework committee this evening, so you're probably asking me on the wrong day. I think we want to see scheme that revitalises those buildings and gives them a long future, and for a long time, it looked as though they might seriously be coming with an application to demolish. So we've come a very long way in the right direction. There are narrow aspects of the scheme that we're still consulting upon. ...They're putting it in for planning permission in May I think. If that's approved then ...they've got to raise the money to do it because they haven't got it all in place yet. But they're wanting to start, I think, by the end of the year, which is very fast-track for such a big scheme.

15:15

Me: Do you think the interests of the members have changed along with what you've felt was necessary?

CC: Do you know, I've just done an online survey of the membership, and that's my next job, to actually collect the results. You could ask me in about a month. I don't know whether we'll go public with them, but I don't see why we shouldn't. [check website and write to Catherine if not posted]

Me: Do you keep track of the age of members?

CC: No. [We are asking them how old they are in the inquiry (survey)]

16:15

Me: Back from Utopia. The way it seemed with the articles in there is that the modern movement is done and something of the past, but then I have also read articles where the view is taken that even by conserving the modern movement architecture keeping the principles and ideas alive.

CC: I think that's Docomomo's raison d'etre and I think that we just don't really engage in that debate at all. I think we think that we look at each building and try and work out why it's significant and what we want to keep, and this whole question of the great project of modernism is not something I want to get... I don't really feel it’s relevant to what we do and there are lots of ways I think in which we have a... certainly a different approach to how Docomomo was initially set up by Hubert Jan Henket. I think in fact many of the chapters of Docomomo have been broadening their scope in recent years, and are much less doctrinaire about modernism than they would have been ten years ago.

Me: With the 20th Century Society, from what I see, it seems more practical in looking at a building and how it can remain useful.
CC: I think I would start by saying, 'What is important about it? Why is it significant? What bits of its physical fabric make it significant? What aspects of how it’s used actually make it significant? And are there things you would do in terms of usage that would make it unreadable?' But then, basically, yes, in most instances, the buildings all have to find the on-going use or they won't survive, so you do have to be pragmatic.

Me: On projects like the Zonnestraal Sanatorium, what is your opinion of turning buildings into museums of the modern movement?

CC: I think it could very very rarely be done and it’s incredibly expensive, and I've still not worked out where the money came from for some of this stuff. It looks incredibly beautiful, but actually, it’s largely a reproduction of the original building. I think that's sort of a niche market in the conservation world.

Me: Yet conserving the welfare architecture of late modernism, as-is, seems unrealistic.

CC: Depends what you mean by as-is. Certainly, keeping the kitchens and bathrooms is probably not on, and keeping the original services is probably not on, but I think a lot of the historic fabric can be kept, and a lot of the issues are to do with management and maintenance, and I do think that schemes like Park Hill, where they stripped right back to just a concrete frame, have lost something that was...

Me: What about Keeling House conversion into private flats? Does that ruin what it was?

CC: I think it is still valuable... Keeling is important because of its sculptural form and the extraordinary layout of those flats, and how they all fit together is a great big 3 dimensional jigsaw puzzle, and that's all still there. The saddest thing, I think, about Keeling House is that they only kept the point block and the two low rise blocks, which I think were blocks of maisonettes at 90 degrees to each other at the base of it have been demolished, so you only here see part of the story. [replaced by the new low rise housing in the area]

21:10

Me: With 20th c architecture, do you think we're reaching an age of consensus and that people are recognizing it as heritage now, making listing it less of a battle than it used to be?

CC: I think we've reach an age of consensus on some of it, but not all of it. So, I certainly think that a lot of the interwar stuff, people are quite comfortable with it being heritage and some of those post-war modern movement developments, even though people may not like them, I think they know that they are historic. The postmodern stuff is still up for grabs, the 70s stuff is not appreciated at all.

Me: Do you think the Barbican is different than the rest of the late modern developments?

CC: The Barbican goes back quite a long way. Yeah, I think people think the Barbican is pretty [ok]... Someone actually had a go at me about how ugly and horrible the Barbican was and how I could possibly be an advocate for it over the weekend! [laughs] Whether the sort of rolling front is moving faster or slower than time goes forward, I think is really hard to chart, but I think, probably, we're getting to a point where we can accept more and more recent heritage as being significant, and hence the fact that the proposal to put forward Broadgate for listing was taken seriously.

Me: Would that have been a different case 10 years ago?

CC: Well, my gut feeling is yes, but then 10 years ago, then one would look at buildings 10 years earlier. It’s really hard to say and would be quite interesting to see if one could find any way of analysing or statistical analysis of tracking that. And spot listings are all so random and... you
know, that's what happens to be threatened on the whole. I think it's really hard to say because I don't think there is a big enough pool of evidence really.

Me: Spot listing - Is that typically only used when a building is under threat?

CC: Yes, certainly now it is.

Me: Reuse and adaptations?

CC: Yeah, well I think, pragmatically, that has to be the way forward for almost all structures that we're talking about, because no one's going to pay for it otherwise.

Me: Relationship with English Heritage?

CC: 'Critical Friend' I think is the phrase we like. We see ourselves as their critical friend. Sometimes I think they are very conscious that as the government statutory advisors, they have to be quite circumspect in what they say, whereas we can be more outspoken. A lot of us have personal links and connections, I mean, I was an English Heritage Historic Buildings Inspector for a long time before I came here, and a lot of us... they had something called a Postwar Steering Group, which over saw all those thematic studies, and I was on that, as was Allan Powers, who was my chairman, and Gavin Stamp, who was my chairman before Allan, and Elain who is a trustee still and works for English Heritage and was very much involved, so there is all sorts of overlap. ...But obviously English Heritage has to cover the whole gamut of conservation, and we are always pushing for them to target resources towards twentieth century projects. And I think, I've certainly felt that looking at 20th c buildings is actually a really good way to hone how you might approach other buildings. It’s a good way of giving yourself rigor by looking at buildings where there perhaps aren't immediate assumptions about what you should do with it.

Me: The Postwar Steering Group disbanded 10 years ago?

CC: I think so. Bridget Cherry, who chaired that, then became my vice chair... She was obviously incredibly knowledgeable having gone through that.

Me: So in a way, when the Group was disbanded, the C20 Society kind of took up where they left off?

CC: No, they were very different. I mean, they were a funny group. They were a mixture of historians and people who had been practitioners, you know, architects and engineers who had worked on some of the buildings that we were talking about, and English Heritage had staff or consultants who did thematic surveys of different types of buildings, and then the Postwar Steering Group, which was always constitutionally out on a wing with English Heritage and sort of not ever really properly, very formally adopted into its structure, would review them and then make recommendations that went back through the English Heritage commission, and thence to the Minister.

[and that's how a substantial tranche of post-war buildings were listed]
Some of the thematic study work that was done under theegis of that group has still not been listed. It all sort of ground to a halt in the system, in part because English Heritage felt that Ministers were so unsympathetic it wasn't going to get through.

Me: When it was disbanded, was it felt that the job was done?

CC: From our point of view, no. I think it was felt that it was just becoming too politically awkward a topic. You would need to ask English Heritage what their view on that was. Yeah... they did some very good work and I think it’s still very much an on-going project.

Me: So after a few post-war buildings were listed, the government thought it was enough and wanted to dust their hands of it?

CC: I think they were more, 'These twentieth century buildings are proving really really difficult, they're making our relationship with the department very very difficult, and they're taking up a vast amount of our time and energy as a result, and maybe we want to do this in a more discreet way... Or d (Engel, 2013a) o less of it.'

Me: Speaking with James Dunnett, he said in some ways it's easier to list a building and then give listed building consent for a lot of the changes, ie changes made to the Grade I listed Royal Festival Hall.

CC: The listing process and the granting of listed building consent are handled very very separately by English Heritage, and probably in the past, even more so than they are now. ...Whether something should be listed is purely, we'll it's supposed to be purely, a matter of architectural and historic interest, and fitness for purpose and viability and potential for reuse are not supposed to come into the equation at all.

Me: So these can be considered when granting consent for alterations?

CC: When some of the criteria for... certainly under the guidance as it was until the most recent guidance came in, were about, you know, 'you can justify changes to listed buildings on grounds of wider social or economic benefit to the community'. So that can be very loosely and broadly interpreted with the post-war building listing. Now the guidance is less detailed.

Me: Is C20 or any other planning group invited to any town planning meetings?

CC: No is probably the short answer. We wouldn't have the resources to go visiting planning meetings. We quite often liaise with local pressure groups - local amenity groups: Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Group, different groups who I know do have regular meetings, and often meetings on conservation area issues, which we unfortunately haven't gotten directly involved with. Sometimes we'll write letters to bolster their efforts.

Me: Any collaboration with likeminded groups in other countries - outside conferences, etc?

CC: I guess its all pretty informal. I used to go very regularly to the Docomomo International conferences, and there was a couple of conferences about preserving the recent past in America, which were very influential, but we don't have sort of formal constitutional links in any way. It's me going and talking to people.
I think there are issues around the role of Docomomo internationally. There is also the ICOMOS working group on twentieth century buildings, which we have a casework committee member who is on, and in theory, I keep meaning to join it, but I haven't got the time to do any more committees. Some of the Art Deco groups are members of the 20th Century Society as groups, and obviously, we have quite a big foreign events programme and when we go somewhere, we look up the local people and try and tap into their expertise. In a way, that's what the Getty thing I have been involved with is looking at doing, whether there is need for that international networking. And to what extent people do want to be doing the same thing or whether actually we don't want to be doing the same thing as everybody else.

36:30

Me: What do you see as the limitations of the 20th Century Society, where would you like it to go?

CC: I would love to see it gain a broader membership and really tap into the enthusiasm for post-war and mid-century modern design; to increase its core membership really. I think probably we are looking increasingly at how we use new media and how we might evolve from being a traditional member society where, you know, you pay your annual subscription, to being more of a web linked protest group that we can call on individuals to lobby.

37:35

Me: With Docomomo UK, do you think there is a need for the two groups. Is it helpful to have two groups to follow up on things and lobby for things?

CC: Docomomo, in fact, isn't really doing much casework at all and it doesn't have the statutory role. And most of their energy goes into organising their events programme. I'd love to see them working more closely with us. I don't really feel there is a need for two separate organizations and I think, sometimes, it makes us appear to be splitting hairs, really.

Me: So more collaboration may be in the future?

CC: I'm always up for it.
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0:00

D: [discussing Saarinen's MIT Kresge Chapel] So here you have just a cylinder, a wall of brick connected by a simple steel glass bridge. Now as with many of the buildings of that period, and I'm sure you've been hearing from Henry all day, there is a certain amount of naïveté, of elegance but naïveté, in the detailing, and that is what we are dealing with more than anything else in these buildings. Certainly, the curtain wall here, which you'll see, which we are actually going to have to replace, as is often the case with these windows.

H: No surprise to me.

D: No surprise. And this one, we're still debating. We're about to enter a series of mock-ups to decided whether or not we need to replace it, although here again, there is a very good chance. It should, if all goes well, not look any different, once its done, but these were experiments. They were kind of making this stuff up as they went along. And its very interesting to me, I happened to be at the University of Pennsylvania archives yesterday, looking at details of Kahn buildings from exactly this period, which is the AF of L Medical Building and the Yale Art Gallery, the first Yale Art Gallery, which is a few years older. And there we profiles that look almost identical to Kresge (chapel or auditorium??), done differently with different shapes, but the net affect, what they were trying to achieve was very much the same. And its interesting to compare the evolution of glazing details by Saarinen, I may turn this into a paper at some point, because I'm really fascinated by it, about how the curtain wall evolved, not the sort of standard what became the curtain wall that we know so familiarly - the typical sort of aluminum and glass - but the sort of one-off, bespoke efforts to try to get something elegant, thin and simple, but in a very unique and quirky way. And they're really doing this in parallel (Kahn and Saarinen).

H: Have you ever seen anything to explain why he didn't make that glass wall disappear? Why is it white aluminum? Why isn't it black steel? (Kresge Auditorium)
D: You know, I have never found any correspondence or evidence to that effect, because you're right, it is very different from what he did at GM [General Motors] Maybe he decided he didn't like it, maybe he wanted it to stand out. And the fact that he painted the steel light here, I think there was something about the expression of that he felt gave it scale.

DT: Did Poulson [?] touch the curtain wall at Yale?

D: Oh he did. He replaced the steel sash with aluminum, and did a pretty good job but changed it slightly, but there is an article in a Swiss/French journal that came out a few years ago. The journal is called Place I believe, or Places, from Geneva, that excoriated him. I don't think it ever made it into English, but somebody pointed it out to me because I know someone who teaches there, but it just really tore him apart for doing that. Because generally that renovation has been highly praised, but they were not able to salvage the steel sash. The aluminum that went in, again, you're arguing over an 1/8th or a 1/4 inch, on a whole grid of a curtain wall, it is going to make a difference.

H: I know how devoted you are to Skanska, but we've lost the quality in our window replacements to their value engineering, their LATE value engineering, and their LATE review...

D: That really hurts. That really hurts. That's terrible. Well it looks like... the campus is really crowded, there are thousands of kids in and out, its great, its a very lively place... Why don't we come up and see this (MIT Chapel). We are the first architects besides the original architects and their successors to work on these buildings. It has all been done by Roeschtinckle [??] up until now, which is not to excuse what they did to this ramp here, which nobody likes, nobody has the money to tear it out and do it better, but this is how the building was made accessible. It could be worse, it could be a lot worse, but it's not wonderful. And actually this morning, I just fired off a memo that goes to Charlie Sullivan, the City and the NAAB about why we can't make this building compliant, why we can't make the restrooms [handicap] accessible, why we can't make the alter [handicap] accessible. It's very difficult. These doors are not original. We are going to put back doors that look more like the original doors. But there again, they were stave doors, like a barrel, and there was not sufficient lateral compressive structure there, so they did this [hand gesture], and sort of waved and Eric Ward, my colleague who is doing all the detailing for this and who is a nut about this stuff, he's been arguing with Gary Trondorfte, you can imagine what that's like, about how to build these doors. They're locking horns, but I think we've won Gary over, because basically we've found a way to make shallow staves on a solid core, which is heavily reinforced to keep it dimensionally stable that way. Because as you see, there's no head flashing, there's no protection on these things, and we're not going to change that, we're just going to accept it. We'll treat the top of the door somehow to keep the water off of it, but that's one of the sacrifices you just have to make. Ok, lets go in.
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D: So you can see that the basic idea of the moat, and you notice the way that the piers sort of sit on these granite plinths and the brick which Aalto discovered for Baker House is really a wonderful, old New England water stroke [?] brick, which is another one of my fascinations. I did a talk when we did one of our technology in conservation conferences some years back on brick, I talked about this brick because it goes back to the 17th century, and Aalto was absolutely in love with it. He said he had never found a brick anywhere in the world that was this hard, and I believe it. It's an incredible brick and of course this sort of cragginess really appealed to them. So let me show you some of the things we're dealing with here.

H: And Caroline, you're fortunate to see the moat with water in it.

D: Yes, and one of the things we're doing too is that we're dividing the system for the water so that it circulates to keep it from getting stagnant, and it has a skimmer, but it's not going to appear after, its still going to appear placid. We've got a special fountain designer who's doing that.

H: Do you have to make it potable or sterilise it? We had a lot of trouble with that...
D: It may turn out that its easier that way just to keep the quality where it needs to be to keep that algae from growing. So this is a very interesting story what we're doing here. You can see that there is major failure along the base and this is true all the way along. This is just all mild carbon steel [?], engine carbon steel [?], and this single light, water condenses here in cold weather, drips down and rots it out. And it is very very delicate. So they also have a problem with people knocking into this and breaking them. They're extremely fragile, so the two things we're doing here is one: that we're going to replace the frames in kind but with painted stainless steel, it's going to be stainless instead of carbon steel, and the other is that we have found a way working with a stained-glass expert named Lyn Hubby [?], who I've done a lot of work with over the years, including the lay light over the main entrance to MIT, the lobby 7 here. He's found a way to laminate a clear sheet of glass which will also have this kind of texture with a kind of almost fluid interlayer so that its well bonded so that you don't get any gaps. It looks exactly the same only it goes from being an 1/8th inch thick to about, not even 3/8ths, but 1/4 or 5/16ths.

H: I thought Lyn moved to Guatemala?

D: No, no, he's still here. He came up to the Exeter Tour this past year because that was his work that was his work that they did at the chapel up there. He's in fine form. We have again been labouring over a 1/16th to 1/8th inch tolerances in the details, getting the H-shaped lead so that you have exactly the same sightline against the steel that you have here, and the same dimension of the steel members.

C: And you'll have the same sort of bubble effect in the glass?

D: Exactly, we're actually going to use this glass, and they actually have some attic stock of it, so we're going to take this glass and laminate this other sheet to it. And we've done the visual comparisons, we're about to do a full-scale mock-up, but we've done the visual comparisons and you really can't see the difference. And it will make it much safer, a little bit more energy efficient. That's not a huge deal here, but you know, every little bit helps. The other things we're doing is that we're taking these, which were required by code, the door operators, and countersinking them up into the ceiling (speaking about the automatic door levers attached to the top of the doors). We're actually having to channel the slab and pushing them up, but we're able to do that.

C: And they'd still be able to get at it for repairs and whatnot?

D: Right. So there will be some kind of plate here that allows them to get at it. One of the things we had an interesting dialogue with the MIT faculty, who were our peer review committee, about what to do with... this is a very poor lit area, and we're recommending putting a few little pin spots up and down the sides.

H: That's a nice idea.

D: I think, in the end, that's going to win out. Nobody has come up with anything better. We can leave these essentially the way they are. Re-lamp them with something with a little more oomph, but the fact is, where they need the light at night is on the sides because they set up tables here, and these people have nothing, and there's no place to plug anything in, for a lamp, so it gives them light there. And the pin spots, there's an aperture like that [makes small hole diameter with hand]. I don't think its anything anyone is going to not notice.

C: One of those little Gropius lights?

D: Another thing, dealing with access, as I mentioned before, the only bathrooms are in the basement and the basement, even when you get down there, does this [hand sign]. It's not even accessible from one end to the other. It's torturous, and very very tiny.

C: So these are the stairs down? [stairs at opposite end of hall to the chapel]
D: These are one of the stairs and then there is another set behind the altar. And there really is, this is what I have just finished writing off to the various boards saying there really is no way to get a chairlift into this and have it work around these corners at this radii.

C: Could you argue that there are so many other buildings in the vicinity that are accessible?

D: That's exactly what we are doing. People use the bathroom next door, but you know, they are very particular, as I know they are in Britain too, about universal design, universal access, so that everybody is treated equally. That's really the issue. Other than that, what we're doing here is restoration. We're restoring the wood; we've got a good woodworker who is going to put a lot of this back together. Only a small amount of that really is going to have to be replaced. He's got a way of restoring that.

H: Who is that?

D: Oh I knew you'd ask me that. I can't remember his name. I'll send it to you. ...
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D: Alright, we'll come into the sanctuary. That's Bertoia (the golden screen hanging down from the skylight). Harry Bertoia. That actually, we're going to leave in place to protect it, and just lightly clean it, very very lightly. The scope of work in here is very minimal. It's really just pure restoration. We're going to deal with that grate. That's going to come down and be scrubbed, and above that, there is a plaster ceiling, which is going to be... The other thing we have to do is get a variance to the fact that the altar is not accessible, that you can't get a wheelchair on to the altar.

C: Does the congregation go up to the altar?

D: Very rarely, but what if you have a disable Pastor, Priest or Rabbi? They all use this place. One change we are going to have to do is to make a little modification to the railing up there to make it guard rail height (balcony railing). I think we've got two options: one is to take what's there and just raise it up, but you're still violating the required minimum width between the bars, the other option is to leave that exactly as it is and put a piece of non-glare glass behind it that just a few inches taller, as a clear addition, as clearly something that's completely different but fairly subtle. It would just sit behind that.

H: Is it worth explaining how the reflected light from the moat works?

D: Yes, come to the edge. You get a very subtle lighting effect here, especially when the sun hits it, the light reflecting off the moat, you get these shimmering reflections against the brick wall. And here, what he's done, because remember on the outside it's a pure cylinder, so you have these voids in here which are both air distribution and provide acoustic damping for the space, and some visual interest.

H: I never appreciated the continuity of the glazing in this space before.

DT: Is this how they built it? Right here?

H: is that a 2x4 spacer?

DT: They hinged 2x4s to... (get the right curvature of the wall)

H: They probably did.

D: I never noticed this before! Wow. This lectern was designed by Saarinen, actually I think they both were, but we're not sure why they're different. And here again the issue of accessibility, but there is not a whole lot we can do about it. Eric and I tried, because for the sake of due diligence,
we actually met with [??] to see if he could put a lift on this. But it doesn't quite work. You can't make the turn down below. That's the main problem. But also, look how narrow [the stairway] is. It would require a fairly heavy railing to be attached that would be out to about here.
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D: We are re-lamping the fixtures, but otherwise we are not changing them.

H: But those are consistent with your point sources that would be in the link.

C: So there aren't any requirements to make the building any more energy efficient?

D: In this case, whatever we can do for the systems, the mechanical systems will be more energy efficient, but no, this is so small, it uses relatively very little energy, and the important thing here is really conservation. This is probably the most pure restoration project I've ever been involved with, with the exception a house sort of thing, but certainly with an institution.

H: I've never appreciated the quality of that glazing as much as today. Was it German pebbled glass?

D: Lyn know exactly where to get it and how to make it all work. You've see what they did at Exeter didn't you? Well it was the same pair: Lyn and Michelle Schwartz. They did the window at Exeter. Well this is pretty much it.

C: What is the budget for this project, comparatively?

D: The budget for the whole thing is about $20-23 million. This building alone we're going to spend about $450,000 [??].

C: So that's the budget for the campus?

D: We're doing this building and Kresge Auditorium. They have a lot of events here. I've been to two weddings and two memorial services. That's one of the main things we're facing is when they can shut it down to do the work. The guy, Mike Foley... I mean I've been working for MIT under various different regimes, including the 90s, and generally found them to be a very good client. Even with vast changes in philosophy at the top, the way that the people work in the management and technical level...
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D: Now this was all originally planned to be paved. Saarinen has this wonderful model with these huge triangles, a very very stunning visual triangular pattern that he had put out here, and this was done... value engineering. They just couldn't afford to do it. And it’s kind of nice, this is a very popular frisbee spot. One of the really interesting discussions we've been having, and I think we finally just solved, is how do we... the bell tower there. There's a problem there. It leaks. Basically, the way its set into the roof, its set into these pitch pots, which go down, and water accumulates, and it also filters into the hollow tube and weeps out at the bottom and just creates havoc.

H: That never occurred to me. I always assumed it was up on dunnage of some kind.

D: That's what we're doing. So what we're doing is we're going to lift it and put plates in, lift it up about 6-8 inches, but the question is to how to move it. The rigging question has been a major one, and we've had all kinds of people from fine art movers, from the List [?] Center, their conservators, all these people. What we finally agreed to yesterday were O'Shaughnessy [?]. We're going to pick this thing up, carry it over, put some dunnage here on the lawn, drop it down. SGH has designed these inserts, which will then be put it... We should be able to do the whole thing within a day. Worst-case scenario it stays here one night, and then goes back up. It will be
something to see when it happens. If you go to the MIT facilities office, they have a whole wall of sketches for alternates for that, of different designs for what that could be, by Rosack. And the bell's got a crack in it. We're taking it away to have it restored. But the bell comes down with the tower. We were originally going to take the bell down first and [O'Shaughnessy] said 'Nope. Take it all down together and remove it on the ground. That'll be much better.' We're also trying to waterproof the moat, which has never been waterproofed. Water just seeps through there. And there have been lengthy conversations between us, and SGH and Gary and Lee Kennedy, the contractor. We had to have a very good contractor brought on to all this about how to do this economically, because SGH of course will do it for a fortune, but the question of course is how to do it economically. So this is the auditorium. It's a wonderful space inside. We have is issues with... this is now just set is a soft sand base, and this is all going to be redone. One of the major things we're addressing is this whole perimeter drain. You see the gratings here and these cascades... because water, when it rains, all the water funnels to these three corners here and it comes down like a waterfall, sprays all over the place and just wreaks havoc over time. So we're trying to improve the collection there, but also actually trying to find a way to break the flow, to do something on this so that it slows down the flow somehow.

H: I'm glad they brought all this into your scope.

D: The full scope of this is still questionable. We're doing the whole site as unaltered outside of the immediate drain, but we are looking at it.

H: I thought they'd give you the whole thing.

D: We did too. It's certainly what they'd like to do. One other interesting thing to point out about the roof is... the roof material, people always say, you know, that originally the roof was white and is it ok to have this copper roof you see here? Well, in fact, the original roof was supposed to be copper shingles, so it was always going to be that colour, but it wasn't going to be that composition. They couldn't get the shingles to work. So they gave up in a fit and just put the hybola [??] on it. And of course, they fussed with that on and off, for 20-30 years until Bill Dixon finally put his fist down, did a little sketch, and said, 'Put that on!' This was the Vice President of MIT for many years, and he was so sick of dealing with this building. He said, 'This kind of roof will work. Figure it out and put it on.' And it has held. And frankly, it has become part of the image of the building. I don't think anybody would insist on it coming off at this point, and its in good shape.

H: And I think he was prouder of that than any other thing he did.

D: That's right. I think you're right. Ok, well lets go look at the curtain wall.
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D: So here you kind of see the chewing gum aspect of how we deal with these things. When you look at it closely, you realise- that's a piece of steel; these are aluminum, and they just kind of come in like this and then there are these gooey joints holding all of that together. It actually doesn't really leak. It's fairly intact, at least from a water standpoint, from an energy standpoint it is a disaster and nobody really knows how much longer this will last. It's on its last legs in any case.

C: Is this toxic in any way?

D: Yeah, some of it is.

H: So you have to comply with new lateral load requirements, do you not?

D: We've got a way around that. Pedro [?] is very clever about this. He's a structural engineer with SGH. We actually have figured out that the load is transferred to these, and we've figured out that there is actually sufficient capacity in this to take... Very likely what we're going to do here, we're
looking at several different glazing options in the interest of due diligence, but what we are probably going to end up with something very much like what I am doing at Richard's or even similar to that, where we use a high performance laminated glass with an interlayer that's virtually invisible, but gooses the performance up so that you get better resistance essentially to heat gain.

C: But it's still single paned?

D: Yeah, it is still monolithic. It's actually two panes of glass but they're fused together. It's not an IGU. Its not an insulated glass unit, so it doesn't have two problem that an IGU has: one, the IGU's are not absolutely flat, and the second is that over time, the seals will go, and you have to replace them.

H: How hard of time have you had of convincing MIT of that?

D: Not very.

H: Interesting. We're having a lot of trouble with Fiona Cousins and Arup, making them even imagine that this is a sustainable outcome.

D: Oh at BU?

H: No, at Harvard.

D: Oh, at the Smith Center? Yeah. Well you know, it’s um...

H: They're dead wrong.

D: For the sake of due diligence, we're mocking up an IGU, but it's heavier, its deeper...

H: A complete failure

D: The other thing we're looking at Gary Tomdofte's behest is vacuum glass. Vacuum glass is a Japanese technology, which is two sheets of glass with instead of being filled with gas in between - it is a vacuum. And there are these tiny little spacers, so you actually see a grid of these tiny little dots, but the difference is, rather than just being fused or sealed together with some sort of sealant at the edge, they're welded. So it absolutely will not leak, because it is basically solid with a void inside. The issue with that is you do have this little grid of dots. And right now, the Japanese make it and the cost is up there somewhere. But we are mocking it up, so stay tuned. We're going to do mock-ups on that wall right over there. We're going to have five different alternatives eventually.

H: We should do something together on seal failures, because people are not aware of how lenient the European leakage requirements are - five years after installation and so on. So the sustainability community never seems to have got this.

D: Well, you know who actually gives a very good talk on this is Carl LaFonte. Have you ever seen him do it? In Washington, the city is rife with this. People reglazing... because there is so much demand for office space, people are taking these office buildings built in the 1950s, 60s and 70s and reglazing them with new aluminum curtain walls and throwing away the old ones and saying this is the sustainable solution. And Carl is pointing out that the seals will fail, and when they fail, you aren't just throwing the glass away, you're throwing the whole thing away, the whole system, the aluminum, everything, because its all one thing and you can't decouple it and put it back together. So in fact, it’s horribly wasteful. And so 20-30 at the outside, it's all going into a landfill. So I am really hoping, and I've been hoping for decades frankly, that somebody really comes up with some very very high performance, some kind of ceramic frick or something that makes the laminated glass a really viable alternative. We have convinced Penn that that's a good way to go. I mean, what we're doing at Richard's [Lab Building], we're actually getting about 60% better energy performance with the chilled beam system and the glass we had and they had before.
With an IGU, it goes up to about 65-68%, so its not that big a difference. Most of the improvement, you've got to remind them, is coming from the systems themselves, and the glass, yes it matters, but not on that kind of level.

H: The difficulty we've had at Harvard is they've said, 'We're not touching the systems', partly because they don't know what they are.

D: So, we're going to try different things, but as you can imagine... this is only 1/8th inch glass, so as soon as you start to make that thicker, this come in (frame edge), and a little bit is fine, but if you make it a full IGU, you're bringing it in to about that point and you are although the structure can take it, the analysis - we've proved that you actually can... there are some little tweaks you can do with some of the connections that make this all work...

H: So what's Pedro done?

D: I think what he's really done is just analyse it in such a way to prove that it’s pretty much ok the way it is.

H: It’s ok now?

D: Pretty much, yeah.

H: This is one of the instances where I think that diminution would matter.

D: Oh yeah, I think it would, because the fin-like effect of this is very strong, and if it gets too pudgy, it isn't going to work right. Now one of the things we're trying to get added to our scope is to redo the finishes in here. One thing we are going to do is take this horrible glossy coating off the bricks. We don't know why that was ever.. Somebody put it in at some point and its just been redone over the years.

H: Is it epoxy or polyurethane?

D: I'd say its some kind of polyurethane. It's not going to be hard to get off, but they really don't need to do this. You can do a matte sealer if you need to. So that's going to happen.

H: Presumably he was interesting in a sense of continuity.

D: Yes, absolutely. And if you look at the early photographs of the building, its right there. We have Balthazar Korab photos and you can see it just sort of running straight through to the outside. This was all originally acoustic plaster on the ceiling and we're still researching what the walls were, but we think there may have been some tiles there, and we think they probably put this up because it was too lively a space. But why they did what they did up here, we're not really sure. But that was all done in 1997 when Roeschtinkle did the inside.

H: Why don't we go into the auditorium?

C: Are the walls covered in sound panels?

D: Yeah, they're just fabric acoustic panels essentially.

H: David, do you think that this surface might have been tile?

D: I don't know... just those… Oh my god, there are no lights on in here...
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D: I have never experienced this. I have come into this building at all hours day and night and never found the lights off.

H: It's never looked better [laughs]

D: Well, I'm sorry Caroline... We're doing very little in here actually. The main issue in here is whether we need to have any hand rails along here, um trying to make the stage accessible from here rather than having to go around to the back stage to get to the stage, we're doing something similar in a little theatre. Yeah, it's pretty hard. Accessibility is a huge issue in both of these buildings, but we know Charlie is going to defend our [views].

H: You deserve it particularly in the chapel I think.

C: Is there no sort of ramp to get into this building at all?

D: Oh no no, you can... there are accessible seats in here, but you have to go around to the outside to get in. They're not going to make us put anything in here (main entrance), but there is talk of putting something much more invasive just outside the wall and to take some of the seats out here. See one of the things that the accessibility rules demand is that you can't put all the wheelchairs in one place. In other words, they have to be able to sit down here, they have to be able to sit up here in order to be able to achieve the goals of universal access, and that's where the difficulty comes in because this ramp is too steep, I mean there's just all kinds of problems. So you actually have to be able to get someone to this level and someone to that level and to the stage level, so its pretty torturous. I was just going to point out the acoustic clouds. These have been redone. They were redone in 1997, and its very interesting. We're not supposed to be doing anything with the acoustics. MIT is getting letters from alumni, from music professors, saying 'Oh I understand you're working in Kresge. Let me tell you about all the acoustic problems.' So that remains an open question at this point as to whether we will get some additional services to look at the acoustics.

H: When you said that they were redone, do you mean that they were replaced?

D: They were reconfigured. Ascentec [?] did the original acoustics here and Leo Boranic did, and there were problems with it. Ascentec went back and redid it in 1997. Ascentec is on our team now and we've frankly been told by MIT that if we are going to touch the acoustics, that people here on the music faculty are so sensitive about this, that we probably will not be able to use Ascentec. They feel that they've had their chance and they want to give it to somebody else.

C: So the ones that are up now, are these anything like the original in the shape, colour etc.?

D: Yeah, but they are different. The sort of basic locations of the clouds are the same but they are not the same as what was there originally. The other thing that was changed, you can't really see the purple and green seats right now, but the seats are all purple and green and they're plastic, and those were not original either. Why exactly, what possessed them to do that at the time, we don't know.

C: So would you go back to the original seats?

D: We'd try to, if we could.

H: Well they were absorptive originally.

D: They were absorptive, yes, and again, that was not part of our original scope..

H: I'm wondering whether Ascentec allowed that to happen?

D: Hmm, probably yeah. That's a good question.
C: Sorry, they were what originally?

D: Absorptive. They were fabric backed rather than hard backed. In some auditoriums they actually make a hard back seat because its more resonant, but no, these were always soft backed. And again, you can't really see but there is a lot of this vertical wood slat detailing like you find in Aalto buildings. It's funny, of course Saarinen and Aalto knew each other very well, and Saarinen followed Aalto here, and as a matter of fact, Aalto's last assistant who took Baker House through construction, Olaf Hammerstrom, as soon as he finished with Baker House, he jumped ship and went to Cranbrook to work for Saarinen, and then he came back here to get these buildings done. So there was a lot of the same - the brick, there's an awful lot of the same feeling there. The commission for this came 3 years after Baker House was finished. But when I say he went back to Cranbrook, that's where his office was, in Bluefield Hills.

C: How concerned is MIT that what you do is sensitive to the original design?

D: Absolutely. Very concerned. Concerned and very cooperative, and they want to do the right thing by these buildings. They recognise that these are buildings of international importance and that they'd be foolish not to treat them that way. But on the other hand, they have to work. The acoustics, accessibility, the systems, fire protections, everything.

H: I think that sensitivity has, if not begun, but has increased within our professional lifetimes because when I think back to what they did at the pool, the Alumni Swimming Pool, that was pretty awful.

D: And frankly, that was done after I did Baker House.

H: Wow. I didn't remember that.

D: That was the aftermath of the Stada. That was the sort of last phase of the Stada Center, was the renovation of the [Alumni Pool], and they just let ... you know, I think these buildings and Baker House are obvious. They're world famous architects, that was just good of Lawrence Anderson, and it was just another... They saw it as a utilitarian building. I don't think anybody really enlightened them. They didn't ask the right people. They didn't ask us, they didn't ask anybody else 'Does this building matter?' [39:08] And I think that probably…

H: I remember that and they told him he [who?] had no right to talk to people about the building. This was 1987.

D: Ok, so that's even earlier. I mean, Baker House was... We got the commission for Baker House in 1996 and there was a beginning of a sea change in a way that all of Bill Mitchell's grand programme happened right after that. And he told me, he said, 'This really is kicking it off. MIT is putting its foot down and saying We are architectural stewards and we're starting by showing them what a good job we're going to do with this building, and now we're going to build all this great new stuff as well, and we're going to go back to the glory days that existed when Aalto and Saarinen were here.'

H: Another piece of that is that the influence of you and your colleagues has been helpful in that conversation here, because you hear it from more directions.

D: Yes, it has. We took it very [seriously]. I mean the fact that when we went into our interviews and said, 'We won't take this commission unless you send us to Finland before we get started, because we simply are not going to enter into this without completely immersing ourselves into it and making sure that we have a thorough understanding as to what is involved with getting in to this building.'

H: Plus we have all the original buildings [laughs]
D: [laughs] That helped too. Ok... and with that, that's a great transition. Time to go over [to the Baker House].

H: So David, these are solar films [?] above the door?

D: Yeah.

H: Every elevation?

D: Well in the back, they just made it opaque, and that's one of the things we're changing. Well, there are some metal panels that have been put in there, so we're taking those out. It's all going to be glass when we're done, and we're designing a better spandrel system where it all has to be spandrel. We're trying to leave as much, the original intention was to leave as much of it transparent, even the back stage as possible, and its a matter of how much tolerance they have for the junk that's back there as to whether it will remain transparent.

H: Ok, lets go over to Baker House.
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H: [speaking about student center] Just look at that classic eagle over those doors! [laughs]

C: So what year is that?

D: 1969? It was open in '69 because I went in it then, so probably it was '68. It was brand new then.

H: It was being built when I was a GSD student, and I graduated in '70, hating that building.

D: You know I walked by Judy [Seldon's?] building, the chemistry building, that Judy did with Goody Clancy. The patches on that are just like a quilt, I mean, they really stand out. I don't know if they did when they were first done, but they sure do now. You of anyone know how difficult that can be. I don't know how the latest round you've done at Peabody Terrace is doing.

H: Well BU is where we're still struggling. What we've done, we're getting there by fine-tuning the release agent for precast repairs in-situ... The cast-in-place is very tough.

D: It is. The first project I ever really had on a serious modern building was doing concrete repairs for Boston City Hall. We were very lucky considering it was public bid, we actually got them to do 30 different colours and it was for both the precast and the cast-in-place that's on that building. The pre-cast was all, most of it that you could see anyway, was in the courtyard, but the cast-in-place is on the mayor's office and the city council chambers. And its actually held up reasonably well.

H: Did you work with their staff?

D: No, NER did that... As a sub to whoever, one of these ridiculous public big contractors that come and go, and change their company name for every job.

H: Every lawsuit

D: Exactly. Was it Fairview...? Boston Building and Bridge! That's who it was! The guy who owned...what was his name? He owned... the famous eatery in Faneuil Hall... Dirgin Park [?]

44:08
D: So here's Baker House, 1946-49. You can see the issue with the windows. Those windows are actually in fine condition, its just the way, they're teak. And if you don't oil the teak periodically, that's what happens, they just sort of weather...

C: Teak on the exterior?!

D: Teak on the exterior.

C: Does anybody do that in Finland?

D: They use oak. Do you know what they do in Finland?

C: Why would they use teak here?

D: Because nobody oils it, because nobody takes care of it. In Finland, they oil them every year like they're boats, and so its fine. And if you oil these every year they'd be fine too. ... [we?] used both oak and teak depending on where you are (hard to understand). But these are durotherm windows, they are meant to weather, they're meant to weather to that kind of grey, and actually, the colour that you see is almost identical to the original painted window colour. The windows were originally wood. They were torn out in the 1970s and replaced with horrible aluminum units, which actually made our job easier because there was no question that we'd have to replace the windows. The original ones were gone, the ones that were there bronze anodized aluminum and they were cheap units that were already falling apart. So we really wanted to put back wood, but MIT refused to accept painted wood windows, so we said, 'Ok, we'll give you something that...' Well we said, 'You still have to maintain these but you don't have to paint them. They will last.' So despite how they look, there are no issues. It's purely aesthetic. There's not a structural or durability issue there.

H: Don't the have the same problem as Gerivella's (?) windows?

D: They do, they do. Only Gerivella's windows, they actually have mildew on them. These at least, they're starting to weather to their proper grey, its only where you can see right under the edge where it doesn't get wet as much that its not. We also redid the stucco and this is a very interesting story because Aalto tried several different ideas about what to do with that facade. The first one was actually to make it aluminum, because he was fascinated with aluminum, you know it was an American material and, 'I'm in America. I should use it.' And then he said it was too bright, and of course, Aalto being Aalto, he was like Kahn, you don't paint things if you don't have to, so he said, 'If I can't use natural aluminum, then I don't want to use it.' Then he looked at what was called euphemistically black copper, and if you know Aalto's work in Finland, you'll know that the copper there does weather, it gets this very black, especially towards the seams and areas where it isn't washing as much, you get this sort of black deposits on it. They didn't use that. Finally he settled on a vertically striated terra cotta tile, which would have been very interesting, but the contractor, while they were in construction, came to MIT and said, 'Look. We can save you a lot of money, a lot of time, and guarantee this wall, which we will NOT if we have to put up this wall because we don't think it's going to work.' This is actually a very early example of light-gauge steel stud construction. There's a concrete frame, concrete floors, but off of that, from which they just hung light-gauge steel studs, put this cemesto (?) panel over it and a mesh, and put the stucco on. And the mesh was originally going to just hold the mortar for the tile, and frankly the contractor was right. If they had done what Aalto had originally designed, it probably would have failed miserably, as many other tile installations like that have over the years. And Aalto himself learned his lesson and before he really started doing this, he realised he needed something much more robust, and hence, you get those kind of horseshoe-shaped tubular tiles that he uses, which you can pack with 3 inches of mortar and reinforcement, so even in a place like Sineoki [Finland?] or Rovenyimmyp up near the arctic circle, you can put them up there and they'll last, but you couldn't have done it with these. And both the tile that he wants to use here and that tile, and many other variations, were all things he experimented with on his summer house in Moritsau [?], in the courtyard you see that famous wall where he's got that all of this sort of different tiles, and he tried
to get a write-off from the Finnish government saying, this was his laboratory so he shouldn't have to pay for it. Tried to write it off as a business expense and they wouldn't let him do it.

48:13

D: Ok, so what we had to do, is we had to provide accessibility here so you see that ramp there? That ramp is our addition. The other thing we had to do at the same time, was because of clearance issues, we had to actually bring the steps out slightly. Fortunately they were already behind the face of that planter wall, so we had room to do that without changing it. And we had to increase the depth of the steel vestibule that you see there. Those are the original doors restored, but we had to completely rebuild the steel behind that just to get those few extra inches. And these were trade-offs again with the [various boards?], saying, 'We'll let you do certain things, but you've got to make other things conform.'

C: Are the doors teak?

D: No they're oak. (So were the original windows oak?)

H: David, is the depth of this canopy the same as the depth of the stone surrounding the dining area?

D: No, I think the stone surrounding dining area [loud truck driving by]... I believe it is... It’s actually packed full of a fair amount of stuff. It is slate with bronze clips.

H: And is it bluestone or limestone on the other side?

D: It's limestone.

H: That explains the detailing a lot better.

D: One of the other things we lost is this all used to be... Well, first of all, I should say, when this building was first built, even these planters weren't here. The street was right here. Right on that line is where the street was, and this was changed, they pushed Amherst Alley out in the 1970s and when they did the work in the 70s, they put these planters in. But we accepted that as a sort of fete-d'accompli. That was just part of the building now. Ok, so have your IDs ready.

51:40

[getting access through security]

D: One thing I can point out while we're here right now is the wall of this space used to be right here. This wall. The one programmatic issue that didn't really work in here was this desk [welcome and security desk]. It couldn't see into the vestibule and it was blinded by the afternoon sun at certain times of the year, when it was over here. So there was a wall here with a desk behind it. The other thing we had to do was ... [interrupted by security guard] So this side of the elevator didn't exist before. It only opened on the other side, so you had to go a half step up or a half step down, so again, in order to create universal access, we had to figure out a way to make it work on this level, so we made it a two-sided elevator and we were able to give them more space in the lobby by pushing that wall back. We brought back all the original post boxes that had been removed before and replaced with cheap aluminum units, and moved the desk 90 degrees to where it is now. [Ascending up lift to rooftop deck] Now tragically, they don't allow students to use the rooftop deck anymore. This was a big part of Aalto's design.

H: Because of suicides?

D: Um I think it’s because of suicides and just because of people throwing things off and whatnot.
C: Were there a number of suicides here?

D: There were. MIT has a disturbing suicide rate. It is a very high-pressure place. There are people who just don't make it.

H: I wonder if demographically, those are predominantly Asian?

D: I don't know, certainly I know of a couple of specific instances where they were, but I don't know... So what we did, they never actually finished the space and part of our mandate when we were given it, was to say, 'What can you do with the roof?' And so, Aalto had always imagined that there was going to be some kind of a, either a trellis or canopy connecting this penthouse to that penthouse. So what we did is we put in this trellis, which both provides the continuity, the path [cap?] between the two, helps to kind of focus you back toward that way, and also provides with all of these boxes, they had both power and data hook-up, to be able to use their computers up here.

C: But nobody can use it now?

D: No, not now... Well I don't know, I mean, these chairs look pretty new so maybe they changed the rules again. Now, you see this? This is all teak, so if you let it weather evenly, this is what it would look like. This is all natural teak, as are the benches. This up here, its actually weathered to a fair...I mean here its a little splotchy, but a pretty even grey.

C: Did you put this in? [the railing]

D: Yeah, we did. We designed it.

H: So Caroline, you asked about cost of those buildings [Kresge & chapel]. This was actually an expensive building when it was built.

D: It was, for a dormitory, yes.

C: And why did MIT [feel it was necessary to spend more than usual on a dorm?]

D: They were embarking at that time on... this was the first time MIT got serious about providing housing for its students. Everett Moor Baker, for whom this building was named, was the Dean of Students at the end of the War, and he wrote light paper about, basically about humanising the MIT experience, about creating a legitimate student life experience. They had one set of dormitories, the East Parallels, before that. Everybody else just lived around. There were frats over there, houses, people just... It was more like a German University where they say, 'Just go find a place to live, and that's not our concern. Our concern is educating you. You deal with the rest of it.' And this represented a real sea change. So this was the first, and then they built, you know, you see all the way marching down there, I mean they built lots of them here along the river. This was their stake in the ground. It was also their answer to Gropius, who was MIT's, you know, the unspoken, 'Ok, Gropius has gone to Harvard...', and the interesting thing is, this building was designed at exactly the same time, designed and constructed, as Harkness Commons, the Harvard Graduate Center, which is the closest thing you will find in this country of Central European workers housing in the United States. And it was designed for Harvard Law School students. They still resent it. Well you know our most recent Supreme Court Justice, Elena Kagen, did everything in her power to get them torn down. She couldn't stand them.

H: In our interview, she said, 'Do you like these buildings?' I said, 'Do you?' She said, 'I AM asking the questions.' Lee Cott said to her, 'I can tell you one thing, you do not want to be known for demolishing and ruining these buildings.' And then we realised, Yes she does! [laughs]

D: That's right! But you do have great views up here and it's a great spot to watch the fireworks. You get the sense that one of the reasons Aalto wanted this form, besides the fact that he loved
waved forms, was the idea that, he said, 'If you're facing a road - or a river for that matter - you
 don't want to be parallel with it. You want to be able to have an aspect at an angle, up or down or
 across', and this way, there are very few people, really its only just one set of rooms, that are
 actually parallel with the road. The rest of them are all at an angle one way or another. Also by the
 different shapes of the rooms, there is to a certain degree, a sense of individuality, especially
 where we are now, starting right at that point and going around to the far east end of the building
 where the rooms vary tremendously in shape as you go along. That's where the larger double
 and triple dorms are. That was the noisy side of the building; this is the quiet side. Aalto's original
 intent was to have 100% of the rooms facing the river and he actually achieved it and they were in
 construction when MIT demanded that they add 50 more rooms. He wanted to walk away. His
 wife talked him out of it. Aino said, 'No, no, no.' He said, 'I believe in a clean shirt. I want to start
 over.' And he was going to go back and just do a dumb double-loaded corridor scheme and say,
 'Here. Take that! I'm not having anything to do with you.' But she calmed him down and that, the
 echelon that you have at the end there - she came up with that. She was a very good architect
 herself.

H: The question that I've never asked you before is do you think that this was used when Sert was
 doing Next House [?] as an example of a more humane dormitory approach than they wanted,
 instead of other limestone...

D: You know, this has been consistently since it was built, the most popular dorm on campus.
 Even Steven Hall did his best to try to up it, but that project turned into a nightmare.

C: Did it?

D: Well, its an interesting work of architecture, but its a very disturbing building. I mean, I was
 part of that because the firm that I was working for that did this, Steven won that commission
 while we were doing this, and they paired us up. They said, 'Do you want to work with these guys
 because they understand student life at MIT and Aalto, and all of the qualities that need to go into
 these buildings?' And he made all the right noises, but ... and he knew frankly from the beginning
 exactly what he wanted. When he designed those rooms over there, my colleague, who was
 working most closely with him, wanted to build a mock-up of it. He refused to let him because he
 knew, if anybody actually saw what those rooms would be like, they wouldn't want to build it.
 They're awful. They're really awful, but as an architectural st

C: The skin?

D: Yeah. Those windows are so tiny and they're all in the wrong place. If you stand up on that roof
[?], you are looking at a solid panel. There's a window above you, a window below you, and a
 window a desk, but you can't see out of the room as you're walking around.

H: And David, it’s un-air-conditioned isn't it?

D: Yeah. It's ... it's a disturbing building. A great looking object... That's exactly it. It's one of those
 buildings that you have to try to like whereas with this building. The more you experience it, the
 more it fits you like a glove. Every time you come back here, you discover something new that's
 nice about it. It's not overwhelming at the beginning. It doesn't hit you as a great work of
 architecture. It's subtle, and it gets into you and you learn to, it just feels right. And that's the way
 Aalto designed. Ok, we should descend.

1:02:00

H: Did Eric Ward work with you on this building?

D: No, Eric... I was in [firm name?] ... When I came to EYP, the facade work, the window work,
 we did was EYP and I was a consultant for that. It was still under PRU's [?] contract.
H: Where did Eric come from to EYP?

D: I don't remember the exact order, but I think it was Beyer-Blunder... John Brendon...

H: He is a very good, self-effacing architect.

D: He really is. He's like a practice within the practice. He just gets things done.

H: And one day David asked him how he is, and he says, 'Well, I've been given 3 months to live.'

C: Really!

H: And that was 8 years ago? 12 years ago?

D: It was about 7 or 8 years ago. He had cancer. He had cancer in his, not throat, it was cateroid... and there's no sign of it today. He just beat it. They literally gave him a 20% chance and he beat it. ... So this is the top floor, this is the 6th floor. This is the area, because of the cascade of the stair, that has the most interior space, so you can actually perambulate around this center area here, and one of the things that distinguishes this building is that every floor does have a slightly different configuration of lounges, which helps to personalise it, as well as the different shapes of the rooms. The furniture you see here is the furniture that we provided. It is not Aalto furniture. This building was originally fully furnished with Artek furniture. It all was either broken or it disappeared within five years. Except for, what you see here - that is Aalto designed.

C: The sofa?

D: Yeah, the sofa. But they're not Artek. These were designed by Aalto's people and built (hard to hear)... One of the things we did which is a little controversial is we designed... This building was very poorly lit. Aino Aalto, his wife and first partner, died while this building was in construction of cancer, so Aalto never came back at the end, but more importantly, she never got to do all the refinements - the landscape, fabric, furniture, lighting, that she normally did to kind of finish off his buildings. And so, it was [finished off] by the engineers who provided the light fixtures, and they were just standard off-the-shelf things, and a lot of them were just bare bulbs with silver coated bottoms. So we actually designed a programme of lights for the building. This is one of them. We designed them in concert with the Louis Poulsen Company in Denmark to try to be in the spirit of [the others]. There's one here, there's one there. There were four or five that we did all together, and even the recessed lights which you see here, these are custom... So these are American, the rest of them [aren't?]. And then this, this is a replication of an original [diffuser]. The guts are better, it works better in terms of air distribution, but the appearance is the same so that's essentially kind of a restoration.

H: I've always thought that was a real contribution you guys made here. These lights.

D: It's the one thing Larry Spect... took me to task about. He said, 'It's not awful, but you're stretching the bounds.' I'd rather err on that side.

C: Is it because people would think that they're original?

D: Yeah, and people would confuse it as being original. Not that they're bad, but it was just that, you know, is it too Aalto-esque?

H: The trouble is Larry, if you cared that much, you'd be able to find the replicas.

C: Well I used to work for Danish Teak Classics in Minneapolis, and I apprenticed with them to do furniture restoration, so I know exactly what a Poulsen light looks like, and what Aalto furniture looks like, so I would know that.
D: That that isn't?

C: Yes, or that that's meant to reference it

D: I wrote a lot about this. It was a great experience for me because I was just really getting into it and it gave me an opportunity to sort of lay out a whole philosophy about it, and we made a very early conscious decision that we were not going to try to be different in the kind of Secretary of the Interior Standards way of being distinctive. We wanted to be a little more evolutionary than that, to be subtly distinctive, but to really provide an extension, because anything else we did would look stupid and dated within 10 years, if we tried to be sort of contemporary to a late-90s or contemporary aesthetic. We tried it and we knew, so we said, 'Nope, we're just going to be subtle and if people worry about that...'

H: Brown Morton and Gary ... the guys who wrote the Secretary of Interiors Standards, the reason that's in there is to calm owners down that they don't have to do labour intensive carvings and things of that nature. They said it wasn't philosophical in terms of contrast. There is that, but...

D: Really! Huh. That makes sense, especially given the time when there weren't people around who could do that without digging for months and spending thousands of dollars.

H: Right!

D: This was an interesting little exercise [1:08:22]. This, like the brick floor in Kresge, was all glazed. One of the biggest and most labour intensive efforts of this entire project was getting the glaze off.

C: Why was it glazed?

D: It took Kennedy and Ross forever.

C: Is that just going around and scrubbing it off?

D: Using an environmentally sensitive cleaner to get rid of it. And they put it on as an anti-graffiti measure. That's why they did it. But it really makes such a difference, because you can imagine, this was shiny. It was awful. Ok let's go find the stair. We're supposed to meet Greg at 3:30?

H: Yeah...

D: Oh let me just show you the west lounge. This end is consistent on every floor, and the glass block is not original. The glass block was added. So they all have these [mule?] lounges on the west side, and again, as Aalto envisioned, these are all the doubles, triples and quads and this is a much more loud, gregarious, and tends to be younger side, although it was built as a seniors dormitory, now the way the MIT housing works - they have this crazy rush. You come in here as a freshman and you have to pick a house, and so most people stay in the same dormitory for all four years, but you just get progressively better rooms.

H: They used to just dump you here as freshman, and you would rush fraternities and things like that. Part of what they realised is that they were building their [donor?] base in terms of class years.

D: Ok, so lets go to the stairs.

H: Incidentally, what I had hoped is that Greg could meet Caroline and maybe talk about some of the advocacy issues. His specific building litigation is less...

D: This is a very very quick but kind of a funny note - These used to be telephone rooms, and they are now the IT closets which we felt was appropriate. But this is the MIT project manager at her
best; the IT team wanted a closet that would have come out to here, and she kept putting her foot down and saying, 'You can't do it.' And they kept saying, 'We have to do it.' She finally just backed them up against a wall and said, 'You're going to do it this way. It's going to get done and I'm not going to hear another word about it. You're just going to do it.' It was one of the few times that I've heard someone in facilities shout down their engineering people, and just say, 'You have to find a way to make this work.' So they did, and it was fine.

1:11:55

D: The one thing I want to point out about the windows is that on the inside, they're maple. So again, they don't have to be painted, but they have a more harmonious finish on the inside. This ductwork was a source of great... concern. Our mechanical engineer didn't quite get it right the first time, and this same woman, Susan, she really put the screws to them to not only redesign it but to help pay for reinstallation to get things right, because they simply didn't have it the first time. ... Well, you see we won the project with [BR Prosek?], and Susan said, 'No, I want you to use Gary Vanderwatt because he has convinced us he a touch with historic buildings.' And so when he botched this, she called him up and said, 'Oh Gary, I am holding you to your word on this and you are going to pay for it.' And he did.

D: [walking down the stairway] [These doors] take you into each of the other floors, so actually to walk up, its six flights but it doesn't feel like it. It's very generous. So I think just in the interest of time, I want to show you the main spaces. Things like this used to be vinyl asbestos tile, and we were very fortunate to be able to find a rubber tile which is virtually exactly the same, so we were able to get the same effect and... This stained glass is also not original. So now we are in the main lounge and you can see its a very amorphous space. So here is where we came in. So you come up and you see... its all about intuition and experience. If I go this way there is light but it's outdoors, if I go that way there's light, and there's a room! So it kind of draws you... you have to learn, to find your way around. The idea is to encourage movement one way or the other.

H: What this reminds me of is Lutyens - the diagonal movement.

D: And Aalto was not a structural rationalist. He did not lay out grids and then figure out his buildings, he figured out his buildings and figured, 'Ok, I've got to put structure somewhere.' So it’s kind of prepare as you go. And he makes a big deal out of these - these are original. They're the drainpipes from the roof. He makes them look sculptural [columns in main lounge]. One of the things that we had to do in here, since we did add air conditioning, these used to be back here so we extended it out, same vocabulary. Its a very interesting thing... when we started this project, before I really sort of got my own feet on the ground about this, I was consulting an architectural historian who had written a book on Aalto, and we were talking about this site, and I had always thought [Aalto always used natural wood], so I said, 'Well should we change this to natural wood?'

and he said, 'Oh absolutely, absolutely.' So we built these originally in natural wood, and then I went to Finland again the following summer and did a tour of Aalto buildings, because I basically did... Fortunately the way we were doing this over successive summers, it gave me a chance to say, 'Ok, we can go look and see if there are adjustments we need to make,' and sure enough, both in Jervascula [?] and at Otenyami [?], at the university there, there was the same detail and it was all painted white [wood slat detail over air conditioning ducts]. I said, 'Nope. We're going to go back. They were white originally and that's what they were meant to be.' But the difference is, where we made these... these are all basically an extension of Aalto's originals, when you get on this side [entering the dining hall], we had to put this in ourselves. This is a complete new addition in order to get the piping and ductwork that we needed in here. So that we left stained. We said, 'Ok, this is different.' And this is new too, as a bar.

C: Oh is that like a student bar?

D: Yeah.

1:16:34
This was an interesting exercise... Well this wall, and this was sort of the greatest challenge we had because this is an iconic space, and the top of this wall used to be down about here [speaking of the guard railing overlooking the lower dining space], so again, you have this same guardrail problem. And we discovered that Aalto originally wanted no guardrail at all. That he wanted a solid wall up to 3 feet. And what we were finally able to convince... we did a tremendous series of mock-ups. We did a dozen different iterations as to what this might be. Aalto's assistant who was still alive at this time, this fellow Olaf Hammerstrom said, 'Absolutely. It should have been a high wall.' He said he felt miserable that it was done the way it was. So we discovered that ok, you could do this at 3 feet and put a little strut here. You could get away with a 6 inch gap here in a way that you can't now, but in those days, and frankly, the City of Cambridge was saying 'Just do what you want to do. It's up to MIT's insurance. Let them determine it.' So what we did is, these are the original struts, the original handrail and the original cap, we just lifted it all up and filled in the wall below it. And now... you see what Aalto had intended is that the very subtle light coming in through all these skylights is to reflect off this [guard wall] and provide more light below, AND by having a higher solid wall, you have better separation between the balcony and the area below, which I really do believe. The other thing we had to do is [can't hear]... It was a compromise because some people wanted no wall, just a railing and Aalto who wanted a high wall. And Hammerstrom said they just couldn't decide in the end... [1:18:23] The other thing we did is, Aalto had originally designed the ceiling as you see it now, but it was built as all plaster, much in the way that Viipuri and many of the buildings in Finland are. We needed to put [dahork?] in here, we needed to put diffusers in here, we needed to put sprinklers in here, and we needed to change the lights. When you do all that in a plaster ceiling with many skylights, you end up with a mess, and you don't get the acoustic thickness. So having found these drawings, we basically went and we put this in. Not something we would normally sanction doing, but since the intent was there, it made it a better space and this now is very much like what you see at, if you've ever been out to Mount Angel, I don't know, the library he did in Oregon? It's this effect.

H: I think it's very important in the space.

D: I think it is, but it does change it. I mean it is still an iconic space. It's an iconic space that...

H: So is it down 6 inches?

D: Oh the ceiling? It's in the same place. The only thing we did was change the material.

H: But Viipuri had a slatted ceiling didn't it?

D: In the lecture hall. It has the undulated ceiling in the lecture hall, but the ceiling in the reading room is just plaster.

H: I think it [looks great].

D: Its both more finished and more Finish. [laughs] It is. It's true. We had a wonderful... I think maybe I'll tell you what. Let's just walk down here and walk up and then we should really go to meet Greg. And I can tell you stories on the way. We had to change the heating. Those are ours, those radiators. There used to be just nasty little thin-tubed cabinets there. These are more durable. The kitchen was completely redone, but that was not an Aalto kitchen. He had nothing to do with that originally. And these doors were added by us. We had a little fun in there. We did our sort of play on a Scandinavian kitchen. This [the ceiling] had to be dropped an inch in order to accommodate the ductwork, and we had to completely redo the plaster here because it was all asbestos. So that inch is taken up in that facia, the bottom board of this detail here is an inch deeper than it used to be. I don't think anyone has noticed that. And there's another, you see along the outside there, that's another one of the custom light fixtures that we did. You know, it was great. I got to go over and spend a week with Poulsen in Nehagen, Denmark. Did you ever go over there when you were doing that?

C: No, I was just an apprentice.
D: We did these steps here, just turned it into a very, very subtle [ramp?]. And we built out this whole lower area here. This used to be just chain-link fence and storage, so we gave them a little fitness center and a little study area, and this again is a partition system of our design...

H: David, does Nehaven have stepped edge on one side of that?

D: [As at Harvard? Yes. That dig into the channels, yes.] Ok. [Leaving Baker House]

1:22:50

D: So the story I was going to tell you was that we were doing the mock-ups in the main space there, in the dining room, and we had a visit from the Alvar Aalto Gaselshaft in Munich, which is this fella and Antero Marko, who is this 300 pound Finn who heads up this group, and he kind of wanders in like this, and he's trailed by 20 yammering Germans, and they spread out throughout the building and their constantly talking, gesticulating and this and that, and I'm sitting in a corner, 'Saying oh my god, what is going to come of this?' And Antero comes up so I say, 'What do they think?' He said, 'Oh David, this is wonderful! This is just what you should be doing, but you have to understand something - It doesn't matter what you do. It will be wrong.'

H: It's like working with a Mies building.

D: That's the conundrum of any preservation project. When you have to change something, somebody will always second-guess your decision. There's no right way, there's a better way. You pick the optimal solution, not the perfect solution. There is no perfect solution.

C: Would you have done anything differently here now?

D: No, not really, I don't think so. There are maybe some subtle things with the lights that I would have toned down a tiny bit, but other than that... One thing I couldn't show you was that, in the student rooms, we also ran soffits over the window and the door, again to [change the systems]. And I think it warms up the room, I think it gives them a warmer, more homey quality, and it keeps all the systems out of the corridor, which is where they would have had to go otherwise. No, I have no regrets about that. I'm quite happy with it.

C: You said earlier that one thing that wasn't a consideration is the energy efficiency.

D: No, but it wasn't... put it this way, it wasn't a big issue, but it is a better functioning building than it was before. It has better glass, it has better windows, it has more efficient systems. So even though sustainability per se was not an issue, the issue of making it more efficient and economical was so therefore it is. There just isn't a big sustainability story about it. I mean it's a much more efficient building now than it was when it was first built.

C: Is there a conservation plan for the MIT campus?

D: Not strictly speaking. They've done many masterplans and it's hard to... Oh I just want to point out one thing as we're walking by here. One of the possible solutions we have for the handicap restroom is to hang it off of this wall, on the alley [looking at opposite side of Saarinen chapel]. Bexley is coming down!

C: So this whole building here to the back of the chapel?

D: No, not this one here, the one behind it. No Bexley is the older building. This may come down too, but Bexley is definitely coming down, and so once they figure out what they're going to do with that, they may figure out a way to actually make a connection, and indoor connection through to the chapel and put a little handicap restroom.

H: This is a crazy campus. This is a post-war university in a lot of ways.
D: It really is, I mean, except for this [large building on Mass Ave], but other than that, it really is. This is an astounding structure. The fact that it is now just about 100 years old, it’s going to celebrate its 100th anniversary in 2016, and they are still so robust, so effective, so flexible. They're built like factories and they still function like factories.

C: What is housed in these buildings?

D: All kinds of things. This is the Naval Architecture, Chemistry, Physics… I mean you name it. Architecture is over there.

H: And its incredible how mixed they are Caroline. You can walk down an alleyway behind the building and see a classroom, a lab, see people blowing glass in an open kiln.

C: It sounds a little bit like the Edinburgh College of Art

D: And right in here is the main sort of Pantheon space, which I also restored about 12 years ago.

D: So how long have you been in Edinburgh?

C: 4 years

D: And do you have a timetable for how much longer you're going to be there? Indefinitely?

C: Well my visa is good until December 2016...

[hopping into a cab to meet Greg at Old City Hall]

D: I was born in Britain and my family moved to the States when I was 2, and we lived in Chicago between the ages of 2 and 9, but that's where my sort of primal idea of what architecture should be is from my visions of Chicago, the All White City and the skyscrapers and everything. I still love going back there. It's a wonderful city. I've done two stints on the board of the Society of Architectural Historians, and they're headquartered there, so I went there at least twice a year for that purpose. And they're in a wonderful part of town. They're in the Truman Perskey House, which is on the Gold Coast, and I think one of the most splendid neighbourhoods in this country, if not in the world. And to me, one of the really interesting things I find about that part of Chicago is it’s a real object lesson about preservation, about preservation planning, because it is a historic district but it has towers in it, newer towers, and typically within a district like this, you could not build high-rise buildings, and yet it works. It actually works very well, and I think it’s a real lesson to the fact that if you really think about this, if you do it properly, there's no reason why you can't build that kind of density into a historic neighbourhood without destroying it. And I think frankly, most of these buildings were there before it was declared a historic district and that's why they were there, and its more difficult now, but the fact remains to me anyway, as somebody who loves to walk around Kensington or Chelsea or any of the finest urban neighbourhoods in the world, it’s its own unique thing, it’s a Chicago thing, but you know, so much of what Chicago is is tall buildings. But I think it’s something people need to pay attention to. Vancouver is really interesting to me, because to me, Vancouver is a 21st century city in the way that cities like Shanghai and Dubai and Seoul are. Not so much demolishing and rebuilding, but that so much of it is just new. It is a crystal city, kind of an emerald city, but they are very careful in Vancouver. One of the things that they're very clever about there is that they don't bring the glass all the way to the ground, and it makes all the difference in the world because you walk around, Kendall Square is a perfect example of that, or Houston, these cities where it is all glass and it's very cold, it’s disconcerting, it’s not a friendly urban experience. In Vancouver, when you get down to about the 4 or 5 storey level, it becomes stone, and yeah it’s still contemporary, it’s still modern, but it’s not just these sheer glass walls. It has depth, variation, plants, setbacks, paving, you know they just do nice things to create a wonderful walking city and it makes all the difference. It's really clever, and apparently it’s very conscious. I was talking to people I know in Vancouver and they said they had this genius of a planner who set this thing out about 15 years ago.
DT: So it is a planning commissioner that's made it a requirement?

D: That's right. And this particular part of Vancouver, Coal Harbour, which was an old industrial district that has been very gentrified, it's as nice of a place that I've stayed, certainly in all of America. Very interesting city. Not a lot of great architecture in terms of individual buildings, but I mean, every part of Arthur Erickson, and I think Erickson was at best of middling talent, I mean he may have been great for Canada, but... but the overall effect, the urbanism is very effective. They have this wonderful convention center which kind of rises out of the water with this bright green roof, acres and acres of green roof and you can just walk up on it. That's very recent.

DT: Do you have any sense of what the economic draw is to Vancouver?

D: [British turnover of Hong Kong to China....]

1:35:00

C: I'm going to the Docomomo Conference in Seoul.

D: You are! Are you giving a paper?

C: I am.

D: Good for you. I would like to go. I'm not sure that we can justify the expense, but I would like to go. What's your paper on?

C: It's the on the renovation of the buildings around George Square at the University of Edinburgh, and the conservation theory for universities.

D: That's wonderful. Is you institution subsidising you for that?

C: A little bit. I'm hoping to get more!

D: Well I have to say, my son had the good fortune a couple of years ago to go to both Koreas. He was able to go to North Korea, but he LOVED Seoul. He said Seoul is amazing. Albeit, he was 20 at the time, but he said that if you're a young person and you're into new things and new technologies, there is no better place in the world. It is just so amazing.

C: Well I'll be there for a good few days because there's a workshop looking at this megastructure that sort of chops Seoul in half, so we'll be looking at what to do with that. And I think they've done something similar to the 'big dig' here, so I'll check that out.

D: And the scale of development projects there is astounding and the city is completely unrecognisable from what it was 20 years ago, from what I hear. People I know who went there in the 70s and 80s said it was kind of boring, it wasn't much of anything, but now, of course, its exploded and now it has the best technology infrastructure in the world, fastest internet. We're really falling behind as far as that goes... [1:41:00] Everything is falling apart in this country. There has been a lot of press lately about the highway safety, because we need hundreds of billions of dollars of infrastructure to repair them and the government is running out of money for it.

C: It's just that refusal to raise taxes, especially on businesses and the super rich

D: That's right, that's right.

C: I mean its not as bad in Britain, but the top 1% are still taxed much less than what the public assumes they are.
D: And it wasn't always that way. This is post-Thatcherite politics... And all of this, this whole Kendall Square [driving through at moment], this was all nothing 20 years ago. There was nothing here 20-30 years ago.

C: So this is the Kendall Square area?

D: Yeah, this is.

C: And this is all owned by MIT?

D: A lot of it is private development. MIT owns some of it, but a lot of it is biotech and software, and research institutions. It's here because of MIT.

DT: It's so lifeless.

D: It is. It’s really, I mean, this is Mosha Softe masterplanning, and I'll tell you... Henry, you know Joe Mulligan in the City? He's the deputy commissioner for PFD and he's the guy really in charge of capital projects in the city, and I know him because he used to be an office boy at Perry Dean when I was first there. And he came up to visit me in my office and we were looking across at the horrible new development in four point channel, all the new stuff that's going up there, and he looked at me and he said, 'Didn't we learn anything from Kendall Square?'. I said, 'Joe its your city!', but he said, 'Yeah, but its not public. This is the mayor and his developer cronies', the previous mayor who just got all that stuff in under the wire before he got out. It really is true. You'll see when I take you up to my office. It's just a horrible missed opportunity. It's just these dull, dull buildings going up, and going up like jack rabbits, just flying up. We've only been in this location for two years and its just completely changed already. But its all speculative stuff. But again, its primarily software and biotech.

[going over the bridge to Boston - discussing public works and number of bridge repairs needed throughout the country]

1:47:12

D: So have you had any dealings with Historic Scotland?

C: Uh huh.

D: Or Docomomo Scotland? Do you know Miles Glendinning?

C: I do! He's my advisor.

D: Ok. That says a lot. I'm sure he's very rigorous. Miles takes no prisoners.

C: [laughs] No, he's great to work with.

D: I'm sure he is.

C: Yeah, I've talked with a number of people at Historic Scotland, and I actually had a job interview with them the morning I came over here.

D: Diane Watters, is she still active? Do you know Diane?

C: Yes!

D: Tell her I say hello. See if she remembers me, but we struck up a great friendship in 1998 in Stockholm, at the conference there. I think I've only seen her once since then.
C: No, I saw her quite recently. We organised a small Docomomo Urbanism & Landscape conference in Edinburgh and she gave a paper at it, so actually I need to bug her about it and tell her to get it to me for publication. But no, she's great. It really is a small community.

D: It is. And I was involved for 10 years with the [Docomomo] Registers Committee, internationally. So I'd go over to Europe every summer to meet with them. And although neither Miles nor Diane were on that, just having that exposure to that larger group... And Miles of course has been a part of Docomomo forever. Probably 20 years now, or more.

C: So everyone now is working on a new Register, or updating the existing one?

D: That's what we're doing. That's what the update of the Register is, although I am no longer officially on the committee. It's not as active... We were one of the most fully functional committees for, I mean I don't want to say it was because of me, its just how it was at the time, the ten years that I was on it we would be rigorous about giving out homework every year, reviewing the things, about getting them into the NAI [?] archives. We did the book; you've seen the Docomomo book from 2000, the Registers book? That was a great exercise, spending a week editing that at the NAI. Contentious with Dennis Sharp and Catherine Croft...

C: I never met Dennis Sharp

D: Yeah, Dennis unfortunately died a few years ago. He was quite a character; he was a wonderful guy, full of stories, almost too much at times. I mean, you could never get a straight answer out of him; it was always elliptical through these endless series of stories. He knew everybody, and had great stories about everyone, so it was fine.

1:50:50

D: By any chance, have you met Alan Cunningham? I think he's kind of pulled away from things.

C: No, I mean, I've read quite a lot of the things he's written...

D: Of course, and he is in his 70s now and I think he actually got rather bitter on a number of fronts, one about some of the direction Docomomo was taking, but also because, very unceremoniously, at his university, the day he turned 65, they closed his office and said, 'You're done. Pack your stuff up and go home.' Apparently, they had been telling him this and he didn't believe it. He wanted to stay on. They said, 'that's the law, that's the rules, that's the way we do things. You're done. '

C: Wow. That would be very hurtful. Where was he at?

D: I'm trying to remember... it wasn't the Bartlett and it wasn't the AA

C: University College London?

D: Might have been. Does Royal College of Art have a school of architecture?

H: Both do. He was very probably at [??]

D: I just found out yesterday that a former classmate of mine from Columbia teaches at the Bartlett. He's really not an architect anymore; he's sort of this conceptual artist. He was the best drafter in our class. He just did these sublime drawings and he still doesn't work on a computer, he's still doing it all by hand.

C: Who is this?

D: His name is Perry Kulper.
DT: He just had Pamphlet Architecture come out, didn't he?

D: That's right! Pamphlet 34. Perry and I spent two long years together in studio... So have you seen this? I haven't seen Pamphlet 34 yet.

DT: Yes. Beautiful drawings.

C: Pamphlet 34. What is that? I've never heard of it.

D: Pamphlet Architecture series. This goes way back years now, what it started in the 70s or early 80s. Bill Stout started it. Little polemical documents. Steven Hall was very involved in the very beginning. That's one of the ways that Steven sort of promoted himself into that level. And they are literally pamphlets, you know, 7" x 8.5", a sheet of legal paper folded in half, and made into a little book.

DT: And they've republished them in series. I think the first ten, second ten, third ten, etc.

D: I'll have to pick up Perry's. [http://www.papress.com/html/book.details.page.tpl?isbn=9781616891732] When we were in school, of course, this was the late 70s - early 80s, he could do perfect Michael Graves drawings. That was the fashion and he could do it. He could do Michael Graves better than Michael Graves. ... But he's a wonderful guy.

1:55:52

C: So do people still absolutely hate the Boston City Hall?

D: Yeah, a lot of people do, uh huh. I think a lot of people do. Although, I think when you really drill down, you realise what people hate more is the plaza, just the sort of emptiness of the plaza, but they don't like it. They think that the building is ugly.

C: Is it under threat still?

D: I wouldn't say it's under threat, although, we are being very careful, and Greg will talk about this, but we are trying to build a coalition once again as we did with the last mayor to, basically a Friends of City Hall group... We're basically trying to convince the mayor that he can be a hero by treating this building as a model of how to do a sustainable adaptation of a building of this era, recognising that ok, it's not perfect, but... One of the things that I've always advocated is that you can do pretty robust change in this building and still not lose its essence. It's not about restoring it. It's about transforming it. And we would love to be able to convince him that could be seen as a leading light in urban mayors by being able to take this and turn it into a showpiece. Don't tear it down; make it something special, because better or worse, its a great symbol of Boston and I think its an important one, and frankly, what that is at the heart of this development, and so much of the rest that happened, the Christian Science and other things, that created the Boston we have today. Before this, Boston was a real backwater, at the time that this work was done, and the people who planned this and executed this knew that, and knew that this was a kind of bootstrap operation to say 'We're bringing Boston into the 20th century. We're staking a place here. This is an important city and nobody knows it, and here, we're going to proclaim that.' And it worked. Having lived through much of that, I know it worked. There was a palpable transformation that began when this work was done in the 1960s; it really turned Boston into a very different city than it was before, into the cosmopolitan place it is today. It was not a cosmopolitan city in the 1950s.

C: Just that nobody came here to see it?

D: No. They came to Harvard and MIT, and there were a bunch of stuffy old bankers downtown. The economy other than that was pretty much dead, and these people saw urban renewal as a chance to sort of plant the flag and say 'Ok, here we are.' And for better or worse, it did, it
transformed things, you know, the universities started to grow, the research communities started to
grow... The other driving force in this region really was the information revolution, started by
MIT. I had a wonderful perspective on this because my best friend growing up, Bob Shannon, his
father was Claude Shannon. Claude Shannon wrote information theory. Information theory is the
basis upon digital computing is based. That's it. Without information theory, you don't have
computers, so it is sort of the pretext of the information age, and the procession of people in
and out of that house that I met when I was a kid, and when I think back on it now it was pretty
amazing, and after I got out of architecture school, he called me and he said... He had trophies and
honours and things from like 60 countries around the world, so I built him a museum, as a little
addition to his house, to display all his stuff.

C: Was that your first project?

D: Yep. Oh and the house itself is amazing. The house they lived in was a house built by Thomas
Jefferson's great-granddaughter, Ellen Randolph Coolidge, and it was built from Jefferson
drawings, because her brother, Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, was the inheritor of Jefferson's
architectural drawings, which are now in the Massachusetts Historical Society over on the
Fenway, which he donated them to. But at that time, she had access to these drawings and if you
look at the original plan of that house that they built, which is a bracketed Italianate villa, but the
plan is Monticello, the original Monticello. The first Monticello. That's it. It's exactly the same.

C: What's being done here? Are they working on the plaza?

D: No, no. They are doing a new T station [metro station]. The old brick bunker that used to be
there has been torn out and they're putting in a much bigger and glassy entrance to the subway.

C: Are there any thoughts of redoing the plaza?

D: Oh, it's been redone! Actually, I did a maintenance upgrade and an accessibility upgrade. I
made the plaza completely accessible in the 1990s as part of the work I was doing then, so we re-
graded a lot. But then, in the late 90s, there was a plan afoot to actually put a hotel on the upper
part of the plaza, which would have shrunk it down and it would have actually been very nice.
You know who killed that? The Feds. Because the low building of the JFK Building was the
headquarters of the FBI, and the FBI said, 'You are NOT building a building in front of us. End of
story. Don't even ask.' So, so many of the woes that would have been relieved, but it was purely
politics. The FBI just could not stomach the thought of somebody blocking their view.

C: So the chance of filling that in is...

D: Well the FBI is going to move out of there, and when the FBI moves out, I think we'll get a
chance [laughs]. We don't really know. At this point, no one knows what's on the table. And that
was also under the impetus of a guy named Norman Levanthal, who while still alive, is sort of
beyond his age of activity, though I'm not sure that anybody has really stepped forward to sort of
lead the charge from the private side the way that he did then. OK, we are here finally.

[walking into the Boston Preservation Alliance]

2:05:17

G: So how have your travels been? Have they kept you busy?

C: Yes, very! So I've heard a lot of the background, about the problems with these buildings, and
what can realistically be done, so talking with you, I would like to get an understanding of all the
different organisations in Boston, what sort of role you play vs the Boston Preservation
Commission vs the National Trust, etc.

G: If I go astray, why don't you just drag me back? I mean I think the biggest challenge for us and maybe you've covered some of this ground, is support. I mean these are buildings people love to hate. Due to a lack of understanding or problems that we admit that they all have, that they don't work well for a lot of reasons, and all that, we believe is resolvable but it's hard to get past that. I'll give you an example, just a week or two ago, my daughter who is in 5th grade, was on a Freedom Trail tour and I jumped on board, and of course, you come by here and they say, 'This is Old City Hall, which is a great looking building, and in a little bit, I'll show you the ugliest building in the city!' It's an inbred notion, I think much like when the Red Sox actually won the World Series, we didn't know what to do with ourselves because it was part of our self-identity, you know this 'we always lose' kind of concept. So it was 'Well, we can't say that anymore. What do we do?' I think the fact that we hate City Hall, or you could talk about the Lindemann Center or others, but that's not as well known. City Hall wins the prize. People just love to pile on! If you get them one-on-one and you try to explain difference and acknowledge that there are problems, and say, 'We're not saying that you should keep it as-is', and then people are like 'Oooh, ok...' and you can kind of bring people along, but as a whole, and in the group think mentality, it's a huge burden and a challenge. And even amongst our board, I still have to update our board periodically about the discussions we've been having and [??] that we energise, and there's always a couple on my board that say, 'Why do we want to save this? Why shouldn't we just blow the darn thing up?' So even amongst the knowing people who should be cognisant and in support of it... Hell, it's not my favourite building by any stretch but, you know, it's always... I think part of it is, part of the reason I like the City Hall discussion is it kind of gets at the crux of what preservation is and isn't. It's not about whether you like the building or we as a group like the building, its about whether its important to the story and to the context, the look of the city, development, etc. etc. And that's what the story is about and that's why we should or shouldn't preserve it. And if you like how the building looks, it certainly makes it a hell of a lot easier, but I'm sure you know, we've always talked about it, these various buildings and perceptions of various eras and types of buildings have changed over time, so... There certainly was a school that hated [H.H.] Richardson, you know, so... It's kind of of ugly in certain ways; we don't generally think so [now]... So for us, that's one of the biggest challenges with these buildings, is trying to get people on board to say, 'Oh yes. We think it’s a terrible thing they want to tear this down. We're on board. We support you. This is a great thing.' The way our organisation works in general is challenging anyway. We have no legal authority. We work all through... Developers sometimes say, 'Well why should I pay attention to you?' I say, 'Well the Landmarks Commission can't call the newspapers to try to get a big story, to get people all riled up. They have to work within their regulatory framework, and in some cases, that's strong if its a landmark, in other cases it's not as strong as we would like, but you know, there is sort of a line to what they can and cannot do. We don't have those kind of lines. We have different lines in that some people don't pay attention to us, but we can scream bloody murder and we can call on professionals like you guys or organisational members and we have an email distribution list of 4,000-ish and we can actually get the National Trust and Preservation Mass, and we can rally the troops and make a big stink. Or, we always tell developers, you can let us work with you early on and help you tweak the project a bit, and get us working for good as opposed to evil, in their perception. You know, we'd much rather be supportive and helpful and do some work behind the scenes, and then help bring the neighbourhood - not so much in City Hall - the neighbours, and the organisational groups [on board]... So there are preservation groups in many of the neighbourhoods - Neighbourhood Association of the Back Bay, 1807 Association, and now there is, where we usually agree with but not always, and that can be a challenge too, but we try to go to the developers or the architects and say, 'Bring us along with you project, come to us early, talk to us, help us understand why you're doing what you're doing, listen to some of our concerns, maybe make some adjustments, then we can help you talk to some of those other neighbourhood groups, we can go to the Landmarks Commission and speak in support of your project, and often times, we'll say, 'Initially we didn't love this project. Initially we had some concerns and they were addressed, we understand it better, and we think we can help you and the Landmarks Commission.
come along with us and understand it better.' That can play a big role and be very helpful for people, but there are others who [??} through their own way and say, 'To hell with you', and sometimes its fine and sometimes it's not. They kind of do it at their own peril.

2:11:30

H: There's a structural answer to your question though, which Greg may be assuming, the Boston Preservation Alliance was set up as the head of an umbrella organisation for many neighbourhood groups. I don't think there were 29, I think there were 13 or something like that [at the time], but de facto, it was also the voice for the midtown, the not so residential areas, and at times, have just withdrawn to the core and spoken to these issues, and at other times it becomes much more connected to the neighbourhoods.

G: Right, right. So the history of us was that, you know, no one was living downtown so one of the main reasons for us to form 35-36 years ago was to speak for that group, and the other was that these neighbourhood groups weren't so savvy about speaking to City Hall, weren't so sure of the process. The thing that is challenging now is 35 years later, those groups have evolved and have been very successful and have become very savvy on their own, and like I said, we don't always agree with them all the time, so it gets a bit tricky at times negotiating our relationship with them and trying to clarify what our role is. In fact, I should give you a copy of our strategic plan.

H: Greg, would neighbourhoods like Hyde Park and Field Corner [??], places like that, do they call on you when the City is looking at rezoning?

G: Not enough and that's a place I'm trying to establish ourselves. So one thing, in terms of, so having been here 6 months or so, I said, 'We need to figure out what we're doing and be a little more clear.' Because these relationships have changed, our role as an umbrella has sort of shifted, and one of the things I'm trying to establish us as is the common voice for preservation and historic resources in this city. Not that we all agree about everything, and actually, David took part in a summit we did with many of our organisational partners, of which there are now 30 something, and diversifying, which makes it a little tricky too, but to try to say, 'Look, we don't agree on everything but there's a hell of a lot that we do agree on', in that preservation is a bit tent and we want to be the tent leader in the common voice for many issues. Because for the City or for people on specific projects, it's often hard to know who to go to and what is the common voice. So that's one place we're trying to be in, and we're also promoting being more proactive and not so reactive, which tend to be, so part of that will be playing a stronger role in zoning. And from this summit, one of the things that came up was a discussion of really pushing the City on some master planning, and a better inventory of resources. What often happens now is that someone buys a building with the assumption that they're going to tear it down and do something new with it, they pay some ridiculous price for it with that assumption, then suddenly they're surprised that people are concerned about this resource. And certainly, with the mid-century modern stuff, its going to be even more of an issue, although Docomomo generated a list, and we need to get back to that list.

D: We do, and we generated the list, but to what degree its been institutionalised?

G: Well, it hasn't been and that's the problem.

H: The City refuses to acknowledge that they've ever received that letter from me.

D: Who did it go to at the time?

H: Ellen Lipsey [executive director of the Boston Landmarks Commission] and the Mayor. There were 24-25 buildings on it, and what we said is that we do not think these buildings are protected, but you have to know before you start to alter them that we will be taking them very seriously.
G: And that's the kind of tone I want to take more generally throughout the whole city and we've been getting a little bit of traction. I think people are starting to listen and say, 'We'd be a lot better off to expend some energy now and figure this out and save some time...' The City has generally been working as one-offs, that's how Menino liked it [Boston Mayor, July 1993-January 2014], you know, everything was down-zoned and every project was nice negotiation where he could grab a little piece of action and get what he wants. It seems, I'm hearing that there's a tone that we want to do things differently now. I don't know if that's going to really happen or not, but there is some discussion of actually doing some real zoning and some real planning, because that's so slow. I mean, the new Mayor [Martin Walsh] keeps talking about streamlining the process, well that's totally at odds with making every project a unique discussion. It is a challenge, the Rudolph building. Did you guys talk about the Blue Cross building?

D: We haven't gone there yet.

G: So there's a good example of a building we've identified as significant, we think it's important, I mean, David, you and I were talking about that one. Not long after I started, it came up as 'This is coming down the pipe. We know its going to happen.'

D: And its one of those things that is somewhat ambiguous because Rudolph himself was very ambivalent about it, but it is an important building. It's not what he intended. He wanted something taller and it was kind of truncated, but as an idea about structure and services and being an innovative solution to the problem of urban infill downtown, its a remarkable building. And it actually works very well. This is the sad irony. It just isn't tall. This is where the prior mayor wanted to put a 1,000 ft tower on the site, and actually, it was never said it was going to go on the site of the Rudolph building, it was going to go on the site next door which is a parking garage, but anybody trying to build a 1,000 ft building on that footprint naturally says, 'Well, yeah, but I can't I just take that too?'. So the only proposal that was submitted was by the guy who owned the Rudolph building and fully intended to tear it down.

G: And then it went away. He got in a fight with his architect or whatnot...

D: Well yes, Renzo Piano was the design architect, and Renzo Piano walked away because he felt that the design wasn't up to his own standards.

H: Well what happened was that the developer kept saying that the footprint isn't economic enough, so do this, and then the proportions of the tower changed and Renzo, bless him, also fired the executive architect from another project, the Isabella Stuart Gardener, because of that association at the time.

G: And then the economy tanked and then it kind of went nowhere, but we've known that its going to come back. And the garage has been condemned and everyone agrees the garage should go, so in the past 6 weeks or so, I've seen some stuff in the press that the new mayor wants something out of the garage, exactly what we don't know... So at our board meeting, I brought it up and 'Ok, I know we were involved before. What do we want to do?' And again, I got some board members saying, 'I don't really care about that thing.' 'My office is right next door and it's hideous.' And I say, 'No, it's a cool building.' Now, David and I, Henry - I don't know if you and I have talked about it, you know - Is that a building we totally go to town for?


G: David and I have said, 'Meeeh, I'm not sure.' So there's a difference in opinion.

D: The story, it should be fully vetted. Whether in the end you want to spend a lot of political capital making a full press block, but it certainly should be fully vetted. We shouldn't let it slip through.
G: And we still need to have a discussion and raise awareness that it’s essentially a threatened building.

H: My friend David Hamlin was, I think, hired by the owner of the building to give his opinion as an architectural historian, and I thought he was going to say there are more important buildings. He said, 'This is a very significant building.' And he hadn't read Tim Rowan's piece [Challenging the Curtain Wall: Paul Rudolph's Blue Cross and Blue Shield Building, JSAH- March 2007], so I thought that was a very interesting triangulation.

G: When was that? Was that recently?

H: It was 5 years ago or something like that.

G: So there's a good example of a building that we're not quite in the middle of yet, but we need to try to engage sooner rather than later and figure out. And I did hear that CBT is working with it?

D: Well they were Piano's architects. They were the one's Piano separated himself from, and in the end, when we finally got a presentation on that building, it was from, I can't remember his name...

H: David Hancock

D: Yeah, David Hancock, from CBT, and it was without Piano though. It was clearly…

H: And they didn't have clue about how that building met the ground or how the area around it was going to connect to different street levels. I think we embarrassed him. He never came back. But before we sent that list of 'these are buildings that we care about' to the City, and I forget what the blasting cap was, but it was that 'Oh we never knew that anybody cared about that building', and there were 2-4 of those discussions...

D: One of them was that, for instance, that the arch street, the Saint Anthony Shrine was listed as a building of absolutely no value.

H: That's right!

D: It got a 5. Just bottom of the barrel, no value whatsoever. I showed that to Ellen Lipsey and I said, 'Ellen we've got to rethink this' and she agreed.

H: And BPA [Boston Preservation Alliance] sensitised me to that

D: Right, and Sarah Kelly, Ellen and I did a walk one afternoon about 5 years ago...

G: Sarah is my predecessor

D: Right, and that's what got this whole effort started.

G: So we need to pick that back up.

H: When we started Docomomo, Ellen Lipsey invited me and David to come and make a presentation about mid-century modern buildings to the commission. Remember that?

D: We gave two! To them and also to MHC [Massachusetts Historical Society]. We gave one to the Greater MHC board and they were even more mystified. I mean some of them just stood there struck dumb and saying, 'You've got to be kidding me.'

G: Right and we still get that reaction a lot, 'Why are you bothering', you know.

C: And when was this?
D: That was quite a while ago, 2000 or 2001, there abouts.

H: I was going to say 12-15 years ago

G: One of the other challenges that we have, and we've talked about this specifically as we're trying to sort of re-energise the City Hall issue, is that not only are these buildings perceived as kind out there with the whole 'who cares, and I don't understand them, they're ugly' [thing], the main proponents supporting them, and don't take this the wrong way, I've said this in front of you [David and Henry], are you know, sort of egghead architects, archigeeks, however you want to phrase it. [And people say], 'Of course they're going to want to save it!' And so, it makes it hard to draw a line within support from a larger public audience if they see only this narrow group of specialists...

D: So I was mentioning Caroline, this group, this Friends of City Hall group, Greg and I are trying to be very careful to bring as many non-architects, non-design professionals as possible, a broad spectrum of the public and of the business community to say that there are people out there besides architects who care about this and who think its the right thing to do to bring this building back.

H: The key to that is to tell Henry Wood somewhere else another time, each time. He's one of those people who worked with the original architects and is crushingly boring.

G: There was one guy who just persisted and persisted in grabbing my staff at the ABX Conference with these giant 3-ring binders of sketches and drawings, mostly of the plaza...

H: That was Wood.

G: I can't remember his name..

H: Well, you mentioned something earlier that I've never thought of which is that today, if you are a Boston Resident and you say you hate City Hall, that is now a community building act. That is a way of creating solidarity with the rest of the city in the way that being a Red Sox fan during their losing streak was. I can't imagine saying 'I Love City Hall' is going to admit you into Dorchester and...

G: No, no. I mean its one of the favourite lines... And we've had a discussion about whether we can talk to the tour groups and have them say to their tour guides, 'Stop saying that City Hall was the packing box for Faneuil Hall', you know, which is another favourite line. This is not helpful. And then there I was with this tour guide, and at that point, I wasn't going to, it wasn't worth engaging him.

H: Have you ever heard about the BAC building? They said, 'Can you believe it? This is a building that architects learn to do architecture in!' [Who said this?]

G: There is a sort of group think, and its not just in Boston, its everywhere, as we know, its nationally a problem and the trust has been trying to work with it. You asked about our relationship with the Trust. The Trust has sort of local and regional partners, of which we are one, but I don't know if you followed all the change in leadership at the National Trust

C: No.

G: So it's a more complicated issue than we have time to go into

H: I've even found it hard

G: I'm new into it at a certain degree; I've been in preservation for a long time but never involved at the level I am here, so. The local and regional partners were one wing of the Trust that got a lot of the Trust's support, and advocacy support, and technical support, and other things. A new
director of the Trust came in, 2 or 3 years ago. She comes from a sort of open-space conservation world and has a different mind-set. Admittedly, the Trust was having financial problems, and they've really pulled back their support and focus on local partners. So the local partners are sort of grumbling about these changes. So that's sort of on-going. We have good relationships with various people in the Trust on historic tax credits. The Boston office, the regional, they switched, they don't really have regional offices anymore. There's still some. Boston used to be what, 10 people, and now it’s down to two. And the staff are really project focused and the project doesn't have to be necessarily, and often isn't, where their region is. So will they eventually suck it all back to Washington or continue to have regional offices? So we call on them periodically, they're helpful and supportive, but I think we're all a bit puzzled about it. 'Ok, when do I call the Trust?' You know, they're friends and their colleagues and we talk, but sort of exactly what their role is...?

Because what they're doing now is this Treasures programme, is what they're really focussing on. So in addition to their 'Most Endangered List', which they've had, they're really picking x number of treasures around the country and really focusing a lot of energy on those treasures, but they don't coordinate with the locals, so there are some treasures in Boston, the lightship in Nantucket, and the Malcolm X house, are both treasures, but they're not really coordinated with us. In fact, Historic Boston Inc., which is another organisation that's more of a CDC, who we're friendly with and collegial, they were very involved with the Malcolm X House, and they actually pulled out and assumed the Trust was going to pull out too, but the Trust is still supporting the Malcolm X project even though HBI is...

2:27:20

H: [on the HBI board] Well we've been dubious for a long time because the owner and their expectations have no basis in reality financially at all

G: Right, I think your perception of the Malcolm X project makes sense, but on this level, where the Trust interacts.

H: What interests me, Caroline, is that during the period of austerity, pre-Cameron, about 2008, I think that membership in the British, including Scotland, National Trust was doing this [going up], and the American Trust hit the wall financially and also its membership was doing that [going down]. And so, I forget Robin's last name from the National Trust of Scotland, he'd come there from wildlife conservation. Stephanie Meeks has also come in from land and natural systems conservation. They have massive memberships. It is much easier for them to raise money than it is for historic preservation. In the last decade, the appeal of historic preservation to most people in terms of being slightly countercultural and having pretty high moral standard has dropped, and we've talked about how its dropped in relation to sustainability discussions and the curious thing is that the mid-century modern kind of questions when they arose, would completely alienate the political base, but younger people of a certain intellectual order still seem to be attracted, and we learned that through that insane Hunnington Hartford building in Columbus Circle. The odd thing is that we just did a huge outreach amongst Harvard students, staff and faculty about Sert's Holyoke Center, and they describe it as a horrible grey monsters, the greyest building they've ever seen. A building they love to hate. All of these things... So it's not.. And do you remember the name of the planner lady who left Harvard and went to Northeastern, that was involved in the National Trust piece that you did on modern buildings?

D: Cathy Stubbin?

H: Yes, Cathy. She thought that their new student body was going to be more interested in modern architecture, and they still wanted the brand of a Colonial Revival environment. So I found that very disheartening. That they couldn't have the additive layered way of being in the world.

G: The Trust moved their offices to the Watergate [building] so...

H: I noticed that. That's horrifying.
G: No, I imagine that's a good thing, but in terms of a change in perception...

H: It's just the associations!

G: Oh yeah, it was a bizarre... So in terms of the Trust, just a lot of question marks floating out there... This whole treasures programme, a lot of people are sceptical about it and a lot of people see it really as just a money grab. If you look at where the treasures are laid out, they're all in communities that have money and they're potential donors for the Trust, which of course, that annoys some of us who are trying to raise money locally. So it will be interesting to see. Although, they just announced a new chair who is a local person, from GBH...

D: Oh yeah, I can't remember who that is.

H: But I don't know that support for local historic commissions and advocacy groups is dropping.

G: Commissions and advocacy groups, well monetarily, most of them don't work on much money anyway... Political [strength]... I think it ebbs and flows. I think there's some push back...

D: There is. Phillis, my wife, is on the Westin [?] Historic Commission, and certainly there is... I've been trying to get them, ever since she joined and I became aware of it some years ago, you know in Westin, nothing beyond the Second World War is listed. And I said, can't you at least get them to do 50 years?! And she said, 'It's all we can do to keep it to this.' It's the developers and the high-end property owners and their lawyers that just come after them.

H: It's the teardowns that he's referring to; it's not institutional buildings.

G: One thing we have in Massachusetts that's a huge help is the Community Preservation Act, and I don't know if you've read anything on that...

H: Do you have to leave at 4:30?

G: Yeah so we've got about 5 minutes. You can look into it online if you want, but basically it was a state [?] enabling legislation about nine years ago or so, and then each community has to adopt it. It's a surcharge on the property taxes, 1-3% on your tax levy generates money that goes into a fund that each community controls. The money can go to historic preservation, open space preservation, and affordable housing. 10% has to go to each of those, and then the 70% remainder is up for grabs. So there are about 150 communities in the state that have it now. Boston, we're starting an effort to try to get it in Boston. It failed back in 2001 when it was first offered. I can't remember the year... So that's helped a lot of the communities that have it because it generates money for historic preservation planning or actual work. So that's helped the local commissions, but there is some push back. And the other thing that has been happening I think on the local level, and this came up at a couple of National Trust meetings I've been to, is there is starting to be some push back on the sort of formal strictness of the guidelines, particularly through the Secretary of Interiors Standards and how it matches with the tax credits, particularly as we're getting into the more difficult buildings. The easier stuff has been done, we're getting to the more modern buildings, that as we all know, need some more flexibility or in buildings that are significant in context or part of an assemblage, but you know, aren't as significant in detail as Colonial buildings or whatever. So at the Trust's Partners meeting that I went to a few months ago, there was the discussion of 'Well, do we try to make the tax credits more of on a sliding scale and if you're really strict and do everything to get more credit...' But because the climate is so difficult in Washington anyway and there's a big push to get rid of the tax credits overall, that its probably not really a good time to have that discussion. Yeah, the Camp Bill, there was a budget proposal in March that was floated, a tax reform and it eliminate the Historic Tax Credit. It didn't go anywhere, but the concern of the preservation community is that it's going to be a starting point for discussion. So through the Trust and GMI Preservation Mass upstairs, and others have been trying to gear up now for a full national campaign to save the Historic Tax Credit, and show, I mean there's a lot more data now...
H: You would expect the real estate community to really back that.

G: You would think. You would think. And the investors, but one of the challenges, like some of the investors, some of the big banks and oil companies that tend to buy credits, tend to do it very quietly and for whatever reason, they don't want to make a loud noise about it. So these are early stages of a big national campaign, and people like Don [?] [2:34:55], I don't know if you know his work, he came and did a forum for us... what's the name of his website? I could send you some information.

H: It's the Economics of Building Reuse.

G: Right, its really looking at some data of how preservation and tax credits leverage huge amounts of money, create jobs far more efficiently than most other things.

D: He's got a whole presentation you can see on the web. I don't know if it's youtube or what.

G: In fact, if you go to our website, there's a video of our Forum and you can see Rypkema and some panellists.

D: And that's basically his whole argument laid out.

G: There's more of it I could certainly send you. Sorry, I have to run... So I hope this was helpful!

H: So Greg I'm glad you were able to meet David Turturo. He's interested in being one of your Young Advisors.

G: Oh, you're interested in being part of the Young Advisor Panel? We'll try to get you connected.

H: So that's a terrific innovation of yours

G: It is. And it's been growing. I took like 3 fits and starts to kind of get them moving, but they're engaged and actually come to board meetings, and actually one person has escalated from the Young Advisors to the full board. So we're getting there. It took awhile to get our board on board that young people are ok.
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H: One of Sert's students entered a competition for a new student centre for this campus and won. He took it back to Sert and said, let me join your firm and let's build this. I don't know how much it was redesigned afterward, but he became a partner in Sert's practice and was a teacher of mine, a very quiet, bland kind of guy. Sert then unauthorised by Boston University, came to the college at
one point with a model for the development of the entire campus from that bridge that we just
crossed to way up at the other end. The astounding thing to me was that within 6 years, they built
half of that. And they stopped it there, but they built half of it. So that is late 50s, early 60s, and
most of his work in this area was done in that period - it was designed in '58-'59-'60, built in '60-
'65. That's Peabody Terrace, the Science Center was somewhat later, '68 or something...

DT: It was actually built '70-'73.

H: I can never remember the dates of my own buildings. ...So this is a good view of a building
under rehab. Sert's theory was that he was going to differentiate between windows for view,
windows for light and ventilation panels, which did not have to be transparent. That's what got him
into this thing.

C: And those are the coloured panels?

H: Yes. And if you look at the way he composes these things, I'd say that its derived from the
Unite but I think that it's a little more personal and when we get to Holyoke Center, you'll see how
inventive, I think, he could be. He has kind of a rectilinear core and then he projects from those
these fields of highly repetitive, articulated facade pieces. He does that in various ways all the way
around, things don't quite line up, it keeps everything a little off kilter, and he makes, I think, a
tremendous effect from very small cantilevers. That's a big cantilever at the Paupus ['?] Library, if
you look at that end, but most of them that you'll see around the campus are 2-4 feet. Whereas the
one that we're doing on our addition is, what, I don't know, 17 ft?

C: What kind of budgets did he have to work with?

H: The weren't huge. At the time, they were competitive with steel and other forms of construction
and the cost of concrete vs. steel fluctuated depended on whether it was carpenters or steel workers
who had had the last wage negotiation. So you can see the window replacement. I don't have a
picture of this Paupus Library facade. Caroline, if you look up, you'll see that he's got window,
look at the pieces, and I don't expect you to remember this but one of things I was trying to show
in New York was how those pieces went together. Those concrete elements were put together
three dimensionally and physically, as if they were children's blocks, and there was very little
thought of how to make things overlap and shed water, and so forth. They just put caulk
everywhere. The caulk in those days had an oil in it which is carcinogenic. One of the nightmares
of working with these buildings is the millions of dollars that we've spent dealing with those
contaminants. Even to wash the concrete, you have to pick up and dispose of the effluent as a toxic
product. So, look at how fragile - see those 3" wide fins? Look at the one, if we go up to that
[dubuffet?] looking white and black patch... the piece to the left of that and to the right of it, its got
glass coming into the 3" width of the fin, directly glazed into that, no frame, and then another
piece is coming in there! They are very, very... see the window is coming in at one point and a
fixed, full-height window is coming in at the end of the fin. There is a fragility about those which
is... I don't know how much people appreciate the thought that went into that construction, but it
was all based on monolithic glazing. Didn't care at all about thermal bridging or any of those
things, and it was about caulk. You just sealed that. There was a real belief that that was going to
keep the buildings dry forever.

06:00

The more difficult... if you look 6 down [from the top] you start to see precast panels in which the
edges have been broken away and the reinforcing is visible. It looks like a white line. What we're
doing in instances like that is putting back, and it has been very difficult to work out, putting back
a concrete repair. Two below that you can see where it has broken away. We'll try to get you
closer. Those although have a cathodic protection built into the repair, so there's a sacrificial
element. We used them in the cast-in-place, where they're called pucks ['?] and they're like that,
they're more like a sausage, they're tiny, in the precast elements. So there was a complicated cost
study, the difference between taking the precast elements out and making them new, and repairing them. So generally they're being repaired.

C: And that was more economic?

H: Yeah. The cast in place, practically all of the spalls come from having to rebar too close to the external surface. Steel is protected by an alkaline concrete surrounding. That can break down through wetting, successive long-term wetting. And when it breaks down, that alkalinity, you lose the passive protection of the steel. So the closer the steel is to the outside of the concrete, the more vulnerable it is to that process, and when it starts to rust it exfoliates and breaks away the concrete. So, you can't move it back, so the repair vs. replace argument that may make a lot of sense in terms of wood and limestone, doesn't really work so well here. I don't know if John Allan mentioned that part. It's endemic in these properties.

C: Is this particularly porous concrete?

08:23

H: Not especially. The other thing that happens with concrete is carbonation, and these buildings are fairing very well in that it has only gone in 1/16th to 1/8th an inch, a few millimetres, so we think that in 40 years it still, in general, will not have hit the steel. ... But in a way, what makes these concrete buildings precious is that we're not going to build them like this anymore and they're time bombs because of carbonation.

C: So in 40 years, there's not going to be much you can do or is it just going to be too expensive?

H: Well, one of the things we're doing is trying to make 40 years 70 years by putting a waterproof [silene syloxene?] sealant on to get rid of the water, stop its penetrating, the cathodic protection, and we'll see.

C: So to do the sealant, you need to clean the concrete, get all the chemicals out and off the surface, do the patches, and then seal it? And that's just a clear sealant?

H: Yes. Yes, its matte. People don't see it.

C: Do you try to blend the patches in at all?

H: Not particularly. Our attitude toward patches is that people are very forgiving when they look at limestone, but even then, I would always make the patch what is called 'the Dutchman'. So it's very geometric [square angles]. Early concrete patches we saw are like that, so they have a feathered edge that breaks, but the other thing is they look like hell. What we do is that we pretend that we're creating 'Dutchmen', so if they're geometric and simple, it's less of a problem. What the concrete guys often do is minimise the cutting they have to do, so they do things which I think are too complicated looking. The other issue, of course, is doing the concrete repairs in an existing building takes structure born sound and vibrations up through everybody's psyche. It drives everyone nuts. So you either move everybody out or you doing between 6 and 9 in the morning. All of those things we do.

11:20

H: This is buff Indian limestone, and the reason that's significant is that we were working with concrete and Indian limestone in trying to pick a new stone to put in to link the two buildings. I think Marsh Chapel was late '40s?

DT: Exactly, it was 20 years earlier.
H: But it was designed by [Crammond Ferguson?] ages before that with this monumental tower, very much like Senate House at University College. They didn't build it, and the entire campus had this wonderful green that rolled down to the river. And there was a fundraising document from the 1920s that showed the Santa Maria, the Pinta and whatnot all coming up the Charles River there. Next thing you know they put a highway across the back, narrowed the site and it was that that Sert then began to plan in relation to.

DT: So Crammond Ferguson were famous Gothic and Romanesque Revival architects

H: But Shepley Bulfinch built this, I think working from their plans. ...

C: So is anybody in the Law Tower right now?

H: There had been until we completed the addition, so that the faculty could move into there, and now they're starting to work through the building.

C: When is work set to be complete?

H: September 2015. Boston University was going to spend $2 mil plus with a stack of trailers to relocate the faculty, and what we convinced them to do was to add a floor to the addition instead, move people into that with a phasing of decanting and so forth, and it's working out. See the god-awful windows in the library? And see the concrete repairs? See those are smears as opposed to Dutchmen? So if you look at our cast-in-place, you'll start to see unweathered concrete elements. Those have not been cleaned yet. Generally, when they've been done, you have to really look to see them. And the way we do this, is there is a grid of 24 odd, we call them 'brownies' - 6" by 6" pieces up on the roof of the cast-in-place, where we experiment with different aggregate and cement types and sand mixtures and finishes, so they're all of combinations until you get one that generally works everywhere.

C: So you do this up on the rooftop?

H: Yeah.

C: And you clean the concrete around it, and then you cut it in, place it, let it set?

H. Yes. Stone repairs are a doddle in comparison. What remains difficult are cracks. If you look at the edge of the Paupus Library and go up to the overhang and come back down, you'll see there are two snake-like fissures in that facade. It's very difficult to anything about those. Mortar doesn't work all that well... You'd need to cut everything out and put in a rectilinear patch and that always causes more trouble than it seems to be worth.

C: Are those causing any structural problems or is it just unsightly?

H: No, they're a result of some flexure, but its not significant.

C: Did it happen because it’s such a long cast-in-place panel?

H: Yes, it’s the edge of a slab. You can see how many concrete repairs are involved. If you look up, start at the outer edge and work your way down, you'll see... There are over 650 concrete repairs at Holyoke Center and it is in excellent condition compared to this building [BU Law Tower]. Let's get you closer.

[signing in....]

20:00
H to site worker: We have a woman here from Scotland who is studying the conservation of modern buildings, and she knows what a pain in the ass they are.

Worker: Excellent.

[Highway traffic noise...hard to hear. Walking toward Law Tower]

H: Have you seen the Carpenter Center?

C: No

H: Good, ok.

C: What are the panels constructed of?

H: Those are galvanised steel, and in those days, I don't know why, but there is an acid etched primer that I used to use in Britain and I never had any trouble painting galvanised metal, but in this country somehow that technology was not available for people. So the paint peeled instantly. All of Sert's buildings he painted, immediately all the paint would come off. Peabody Terrace was notorious. This is a very drab rendering of our site... And in a way, this building is so sculptural at a more diagonal view. I've kind of thought that this made it look more like an ordinary office block [referencing construction board on site]. Look at the updraft. See that plastic bag?

23:00

H: So when the highway came, BU had this linear campus a mile long and only this deep, with this nasty road cutting them off from the river. Sert's reaction to that was bizarre. It was, 'Ok, I'm going to compose all of this for a river facade', so in a way, all of the front elevations are for MIT, not for Boston University. So he puts the entrance to the Law Tower over here on the North side. As a result, everybody actually entered it and used through a fire door in the back. They did the same thing with Le Corbusier's Carpenter Center. The intriguing thing to me about the programme is that he put this big model together, towers, low blocks, so on and so forth. No programme. When Holyoke Center was designed in the middle of Harvard Square, there was no programme. The corporation approved it on the basis that at some point it would find a use. When they decided to move Harvard's infirmary into that building, they said, 'Ok, start the first phase. You can only build five storeys.' In the middle of construction, they said, 'Ok, make it ten.' They were just as ridiculous then as they are now as a methodical client. The piece that no one has written about yet to my satisfaction, and you two and your generation may figure it out, is how it was that right after the second world war, Modernism captured the hearts and imagination of the senior people in these universities. Nathan Pewsie [?] was President of Harvard, anti-McCarthy, and he was passionate about Le Corbusier and Sert. When Sert was designing buildings, '53-'56, he was the head of the GSD [Graduate School of Design], had started the Urban Design programme, he was the chairman of the Planning Commission in the City of Cambridge and he had set up, with the help of Pewsie, the planning office for Harvard University, and it had begun to do urban design. Some of which changed roads... What was it about that period that allowed there to be so much confidence in modernism at that level, and then, why was it so disappointing?

DT: Well, do you think it happened between '43 and '53? Or do you think it happened after '53?

H: I think it was a response to the War, and the part that I can't document, and that I think had something to do with it, is that Americans knew about the obliteration of whole city centres and felt that we didn't have enough boldness in our planning, and I think that urban renewal may have had something - even if it was kind of psychological and never really written out...

DT: So in the decade after the war, Europe had to rebuild at a very fast pace, American cities seemed old fashioned.
H: And renew their infrastructure, which gave them a kind of competitive advantage, or so people thought at the time, particularly Marxist historians like [Ian Thompson?] and so forth.

26:49

H: Let's press in here a bit more. So cast-in-place - the only precast in here if it is at all is in those vertical elements, those fins. See what I mean about small cantilevers though? ...I think this... Ok, interesting that you raised that. One of the most challenging things is getting insulated glass or even coated glazing or tempered glass. These are not safe. If this breaks, its like a guillotine. So, when we look at the scale of these things uninterrupted, and I think this is replacement, that these were broken, but I'm not sure about it, and then this aluminum was put in. It's not the steel system that he was using. [Looking at large floor-to-ceiling glass panes on ground level before entering the Law Tower. Check photos] But when we came to this building, [we gave it a work list?], we made a lot of efforts to keep the original glazing sizes, and the cost of the steel to do that with modern wind loads and earthquake, made it prohibitive. What we did is a new composition that looks pretty much as if he would have done it. Not nearly as nice, not as many big panels.

DT: This piece here is 8' x 10'. You can't get insulated glazing in that size.

H: But I think the coatings are the real problem. I've done insulated glazing I think that's about that size, but we may not have had tempered glazing because it was up higher, off the floor. It's this [taps glass] that makes the code kick in.

29:50

C: So those windows there [8' x 10' ground floor windows], are they going to be replaced or will they stay there until one breaks?

H: No, we're going to leave them there until we're forced to change them. So this is uncleaned and untextured... and when the latence [] comes off, the aggregate will be visible and it will blend in much more. But look at the variation.

C: And that's not just weathering?

H: No, it was... the vibration of the mix down at the bottom corner wasn't sufficient. So there's a repair.

C: Oh on the fin? You can barely even see it!

H: We accepted the mix and I rejected the geometry. I said you have to make these things vertical. Those are sample mixes of the in-situ concrete repairs.

C: That rectangle there?

H: Yep.

C: And there are some repairs there at the bottom?

H: I'm not sure that we did those though. I think they were from that period [feathered repairs?].

DT: What is the void there Henry? Is that concrete that's been removed for repair or is that something else?

H: That was a vent. [lots of construction noise. Can't hear David] There's another one of our repairs, that rectilinear piece of the corner.

C: The windows here, are these going to be taken out and replaced?
H: Yes, and I'm very angry at this contractor because they postponed the acceptance of bids on the windows, and all of the design thinking we'd done with a really high quality window manufacturer then became too expensive, so [can't hear]... What I really dislike is we're going to end up... that channel is the most complicated thing to replicate. They're going to be covering it with bent aluminum with a smear of caulk at the ends. And we've fought back ferociously, Ken Gooditz [?], that they told him he couldn't come back to the site [...can't hear]. So it's partly about dollars, but its also about the politics of managing these things. Anyway, these scuppers... this has been cleaned, this concrete, and the scuppers were the darkest, dirtiest thing. Our engineers wanted us - and next time you come, I'll introduce you to Matthew Bronski. Maybe you met him at [APT]. He gave a talk in the session where you and I sat together. He's an engineer with a preservation/conservation degree from Penn and an architecture degree from Tulane.- They wanted to put caps on the upper portions of all of these precast elements. We said that, a) that's unnecessary, and b) we don't want it.

34:44

H: I think that Sert did paint concrete sometimes, and when he did it, it was always white. Interior of the science center and that [lower building near Law Tower]. So they painted the arcade of Holyoke Center grey because people don't like concrete and it somehow takes away all the authenticity and so forth. Normal people consider it an improvement.

DT: Did you mention that wall when they were painting the concrete inside the [Holyoke Center]? Notice how obvious the transition from exposed unpainted to painted with the glass there.

H: I didn't mention it because I didn't want them to do it. So this is Sert's interior, but this ceiling was some kind of later rubbish.

C: Will this be coming out?

H: I think so. I can't remember. So one of the worst things that Sert did was that he put huge classrooms up at the top of the building, so at the changeover between classes, these elevators were the only way that people could handle that, and I think these elevator lobbies are lousy spaces with bad glazing, and alumni's primary recall of their law school experience are these elevator lobbies. And today with backpacks, these little elevators - this is not his interior - they have half the capacity that do if you're not wearing a backpack. So one of the main things we did in the preservation and development study we did for the campus that got us into this was to try to find ways to get large classrooms one level up or down [of ground level]. The water table is high, the ground is full of utilities, very expensive to go down. So this is a poor man's low-tech version of what Renzo did at the Morgan library, is kind of the way I think of it. It's not nearly as sheer, but its a good space.

C: And this will be the main entrance?

H: Yes.

C: I can understand why he put the entrance on the riverside. It's nice, but people are lazy and you can't force them to walk around.

H: Yeah, all you have to do is close the highway... So I think this is working out really well.

C: I love that building [the library], but I do think this does frame it quite nicely.

H: Part of our argument was that that would be the elevation, which is why I wished this were far more sheer. I wish that we didn't have these intermediate glazing bars. The university knows that they've ruin this building [the library], from our point of view, and that it used to look right and that it can be reconstructed. They just ran out of money. Now again, why would they do that building? Why would they yank all the windows out of that whereas at the Holyoke Center, they

426
couldn't [?? 38:50] because of disruption. It's because those are just study carols, so they're basically empty. Easy to get to. So we're changing all the windows here because the building will be empty.

C: So everybody fits into this new addition?

H: The faculty is all going back to the tower, and all the time Caroline, we were talking to everybody. There was a point when I was told, well Lee Cott was told, that I could no longer come to meetings because people thought that if there were a question about their interests vs Sert's interests, I would take Sert's side, because of something I said one day, which was 'You're talking just like Josep Lluis Sert', which really upset them. Anyway, in all of the discussion they had about living and working in this building, no one ever mentioned the views. They only mentioned the things that they disliked, and then their idea of a programme was to write out the opposite of those things, and that is not a programme, but it is absolutely typical of peoples' responses to buildings of this period. They don't do that with a 16th century Oxford College. So this was an open space [now new entrance hall] So they have not replaced all of the windows in the Theology building across the way or cleaned its limestone, and in a way, I think it looks even worse than Paupus Library.

C: When did they replace those windows over there?

H: Great question. Probably 1992 or something like that.

C: So those may only have another decade on them before they start to deteriorate.

H: I'll make that argument. Yeah, before the seals start to rupture. ... We had them relay about a third of this floor...

C: Do you know Basil Spence and his library at the University of Edinburgh? There is all this gorgeous wooden panelling in the entrance hall and it reminds me a bit of this.

H: You know, I have never been to his cathedral. Wood panelling is somehow associated with justice in the minds of people who do courthouses and live in law schools. So what we were trying to do was raised and fielded oak panels, which is what they wanted. So here's a ... all the time we were thinking about the design of this addition, in relation to, we thought its issue was going to be its relation to the tower. When we got into the work, we realised that's the easy part. It's the relation to this library, with a stepped section, with a series of rooftops that are ugly to look at...

We did not appreciate how difficult this was going to be, and it led us to this very aggressive cantilevered complementarity, which Docomomo didn't like, David Fixler wanted to write a letter against it, the Boston Preservation Alliance was generally... Prior to Greg Galer, there was a wonderful woman named Sarah Kelly, prior to her was a guy named Albert Rex, who said to me about modern architecture, 'Say, is there a book I can read or something?' They have no idea how to think about these things. What's great about Greg is that he's pushing for historic preservation as part of the development, of city renewal, not 'Oh, stop.' He had Harry Cobb [?] from IM Pei's office give his annual lecture about the John Hancock Tower, which he did brilliantly, rather than oh, meeting houses from the 1650s or something like that. So its really healthy. One of the things we lost with this addition is the long view across the courtyard of all of this facade. This is temporary - this is just ventilation for the basement while its under construction, but that's not temporary. We'll try to find a way for you to see this. We spent more time trying to design this bloody thing, than other major parts of the building.

44:50

C: So the argument was against the overhang? They felt that it was too much?

H: Yeah, people, ok great transition. People in general, and I think one of the worst examples is [Coots] Bank in London, where people say, 'Oh, here's the old building and we're just going to
slice a chunk out and put in something minimalist', and they put in put on this stupid facade, right
on, I don't know, somewhere in between St Clement's [??] and St Martin [in the Field?]. And
people are still doing that stuff, so the notion is if you're going to have a new addition to an old
building, the new addition has to defer. So you line up the cornice and you make it as minimal as
you can. You make it bland and you call it a 'background building' and it will sail through English
Heritage, maybe you but a mansard [roof] on it to conceal the upper four storeys and that kind of
bullshit. I think one of the testaments that we would like to make is to the robustness of the earlier
buildings and they don't have to have some puny associate, some apologetic associate. So there
were a lot of... and I was interested to hear Sarah Ramsey say, she was comparing what folks are
doing down at the National Theatre [in London] to the minimalist approach that everybody brings
to an addition and saying, 'Oh, these minimalist approaches are so...’ how did she put it... 'naive’ I
think. But that is the default position of all of the review agencies, and what's happened in this
country is that historic commissions have become the design review agencies in almost every
town. Major cities, which I think is tragic, major cities have other agencies, planning authorities
that really evaluate the design, and here, we had two people, one of whom had done a major
addition to the science center, she wanted us to do her building, and Bill [Wan?], who has done a
beautiful new library in Cambridge, all glass facade, and he wanted us to do that. So finally I said,
'But those are your buildings!’ And they just did this [shrugged maybe?], but they passed it.

C: So the Boston Preservation Alliance, do they act as a review board?

H: Yes, particularly... they do and the Boston Society of Architects' Historic Resources Committee
used to be, used to make statements about these advocacy issues.

DT: They just make statements. They don't sit on the design commission board.

H: No, but when I wrote letter, they read them. Jack [who?] has kind of backed away from that I
fear. [47:50] See how fragile these panels are? And how much erosion there is to their upper
edges? This is the Neugar Library and they had put an addition on here that we took away. Just out
there. I didn't tell you, one piece of the story is that we took this buildings away from another firm
of architects, and they had proposed to sheath the tower in blue glass and build a low block all
along the highway in blue glass. And the Boston Redevelopment Authority said to BU, 'I think
you should talk to Bruner/Cott'. It took a long time within the University for them to
deal with the politics because the architect we displaced, who had never done anything of this scale, was a close
vacationing buddy of the Vice President. The Vice President retired...

C: And then they hired you.

H: Yeah. So look at the granular nature of this precast facade and remember it, because at David's
building, the Science Center, it is extremely coarse by comparison, and at Holyoke Center I think
it's much finer than this. So those variations in texture, I think, are very significant, but its still just
a line of caulk between these panels. I'm going to take you up and show you the composition of
this facade.

DT: Its almost entirely aggregate as well, its all you see.

C: Was Holyoke first?

H: No this preceded it, but it was all kind of simultaneous. David, I'm going to ask you to please
remind me to be sure that we look at the New England Gas and Electric. I want to be sure to take
you there to view it because they've replaced all the glazing. So this is the project that won, and
then the boiler plant and the tower were the next things to be built, and then the library in between,
with all of this connectivity. Its this facade that's so bizarre. You can't see it through the trees...
(facade facing highway) As I recall, its absolutely symmetrical. We love these brise soleil. The
depth in the facade has all got to do with these precast elements, everywhere he's working. And
he's comparing that to really flat areas, and I'm sure he's thinking of that as a compliment to this.
But do you know, none of us is getting the water table right. Our building, our addition, Sert's
library, none of those actually meets the ground as well as the Shepley Bullfinch building I think, even though we probably would want to do it in a recessive way. This building had a major internal courtyard up in the building. Sert did diagrams showing sunlight coming in to it. He loved these as refuges against what he hated, which were roads. What he didn't do were diagrams showing snow accumulating in there and water pouring down through skylights into the building for decades. Finally...

C: Was this up on the 1st floor?

H: Yep, its up in here. In a gesture of contempt, the President of the University had a roof put over it, and turned it into a really ugly function room. No design review.

C: Is there any discussion of bringing that back as some sort of green roof?

H: No, not yet. So with our landscape architect partner, we did a study of pedestrian traffic and bicycle traffic down this passage and we found it was almost as high as on Commonwealth Avenue, (standing inside entrance hall, looking out end windows at path running between the library and the Bullfinch building), which amazed us. So it was an even bigger argument for making a main entrance right where that lift is spewing out. This is the Sherman Union, which was the competition-winning scheme that got all this started. Again, I have never seen Gourley's student's submission.

C: So really it was the student who won the commission.

H: Yeah. But I've always liked the eccentricity of these balconies and so forth. If we go in and up a floor, I'll show you a model of the whole area. Let's see if we can sneak into the ruined area...

55:10

H: This was an open courtyard. Exterior brick detailing. So it's a very useful space in a very horrible place, I think. (looking at auditorium room)

DT: The next space over is a very popular lounge.

H: It used to go on to that big courtyard.

C: So this is as it was?

H: Yes, looking into a courtyard. So this is a good place to look at his plyglass windows, which I think is a pilkington product just from a husband and wife team in Wales, and Sert was thinking about [shoji] screens and putting these things right smack on the outside of the building. That's fiberglass between two sheets of glass. So again, this is his theory, this dysfunctional functionalism: view, light, ventilation being three separate things that he wanted to express differently. At least here, these don't block your view (pointing to fiberglass panels). In Holyoke Center, this could be your office, and you might get a little bit of that (pointing to clear glass panel). People have hated it for 50 years. And if we were replacing the windows, we've looked at two things: I've looked at creating a glass that had a dot matrix system that's black on the inside and white on the outside, so that you see through it and it looked more or less like a window screen. From the outside, the attempt was to get a comparable opacity. It was never as good as clear glass on the inside and as opaque as that is from the outside. Hopkins, Sophie Twohig did a really intelligent thing which is, at least the easiest on the 6 facades or whatever they are, she said, 'What if we try to fix it so that anytime they have an office which has 2 windows panels, one of them is clear. How many of them would we have to change?' And it wasn't very many. The trouble is, that was one facade and the rest of the building had a many, many more panels, and where there would be 3 in the front, there were 5 in the back. It was much more complicated to work all that out for future internal layouts. What got me started with the dot matrix glazing replacement was
that they wanted every room to have transparency in case they wanted to turn it into a hotel. So, complicated.

C: So is that what was done?

H: No, what we're going to do... We're working on finding replacements for this (law tower common room), we may end up making the same thing, only where they failed, and we think 500 have failed out of 1500. Harvard is going to spend their money on concrete repairs and then just do what they have to for the glazing and not change its pattern or appearance. So they don't have to fight about it. David I think what we might do is go back down and come along the alleyway, and then back out to the car and then back to Cambridge.

DT: Is the road open?

H: To walk on, I think. With hard hats we should be able to get through.

H: Do you know how to spot asbestos tiles?

C: 8" square?

H: Yep.

C: So these are asbestos?

H: Yeah, these are his original finishes. I don't think those are, but he loved this stuff. (elevator corridor near student help desk) These are his light fixtures, wall treatments... (looking at the model) So this is the BU campus and his design went all the way to here. This is what was built; all that is Sert. And then he was doing the same thing here, but they didn't build it. We can send you images over time. So this is looking from the sky over MIT. And that's where you've been. So you can see what a linear campus it is and BU is assembled, I can never remember the number, but it's like 1400 parcels in order to make a campus. Actually, this is a good view because it shows, that little boiler plant in between the tower and the library - We built over that, leaving it running. The beams that go across that without touching it are deeper than I am tall. Steel.

C: So it seems that the University's approach is to just mainly fix what they have to and to avoid acknowledging the significance of the building?

H: They know that it is, but they don't want to be lumbered and constrained by a preservation approach if they can avoid it. One of the, some evidence of that is that they would not allow us to typify them as... to suggest that they deserve credit for a conservation approach... but they can't help it because that's the way people are talking about it.

C: [Conservation statement written? (can't hear over traffic noise)]

H: Yes, we did it. I will show you that and I should have this morning, but it’s a combination of preservation and development, and we can't remember whether they thought of that or if I thought of it. I think they hired us originally to do a preservation plan, and we understood that the issue really was that they needed to expand their campus at ground level, and that this blue tower idiocy that they were talking about was fundamental to that. And the reason they commissioned us to do the plan was because the Boston Redevelopment Authority had objected to the blue tower. We didn't really know much about that. So we combined the two. And I've always hated preservation plans that were just lists of things you cannot do.

C: So this is the library? (standing near closed off construction site on the side of the river)

H: This is the library. These panels were once coloured. These were red. They've faded out a lot of this stuff.
C: Is that going to come back? The red?

H: If I get a chance. I never thought about the relationship between the green panels and the green glass. The green panels are going to be vividly green. ...Well the north-facing facade has red panels on the tower. I'm sorry I can't get us around for that view. More red... That's a pretty hectic facade actually.

C: (comparing panels to Cedar Riverside)

H: I don't even know the project. Cedar Riverside? In Minneapolis? Rapson? Oh they tore down his theatre. I knew that he had been here and taught here, because he was important at the BAC, the Boston Architectural College, when all those guys were besought with Scandinavia. So is that what you and David were talking about earlier? I've always thought his architecture was over-rated. So you're going back to Minneapolis? My sister-in-law, she publishes the magazine for the state historical commission. I should at least make it possible for you to connect if you want to.

1:11:00

C: Discussing impending demolition of St James Centre

H: You know what's happening here that's interesting, and I haven't seen it really thoroughly documented, but I believe that since the crash in 2008, there have been no new internalised shopping centres built within this country. They're keeping people on the street.

1:12:40

H: This was the facade that we found so hard to keep, and again, it's because of the safety glass issues.

C: What's happening with that?

H: We're changing the relationships so that none of the glass is as large as the big central panel there and around the corner, but you'd have to know what was there before to know how it's changed. The frames we are replacing as I recall. David would know in more detail. I can remember the discussions but not the conclusions.

C: Could I see the documents outlining the work to be done?

H: I don't think there is a confidentiality issue, its just a matter of what we can put together that would be useful and usable. My guess is that we can do that. We can probably develop some pdfs to send to you. We'll just keep in touch and calibrate it so that it doesn't get out of whack at our end and that we don't send you stuff that isn't useful to you. And we won't know that entirely, but some of the... this should be a good before shot, because what interests me is that when you go three blocks away from this, its hard to know whether the coloured panels are going to matter with so much concrete. We are taking out and adding more glazing into areas where there is that precast infill.

C: And why was that there? What purpose did it serve?

H: I think it was compositional, but it backs on to a fake courtroom where students were practicing.

C: And that's not going to be there anymore?

H: Not in the same way. The other thing Caroline is that this building was never lit architecturally. At night, all you see, and night starts at 16:30 in the winter, are those square panels after people have gone home. So we're particularly lighting these zones, which are glazed, that he uses to
levitate those projected fields. So as I said, he wanted another one of these towers right there, and a low block and another one beyond it.

C: When he started building, was there something here?

H: What was here were row houses and a lot of WWII temporary buildings, single storey.

1:17:00

C: These in particular (BU buildings), are they protected at all? I mean, they're private property, so is there any way to protect them from change here?

H: That's not relevant. The level of protection is also a matter of degree. You can knock down a building that's on the National Register of Historic Places within this country, with impunity. People don't know that. Local legislation can be much more powerful. So I remember when a bank in Dublin, the Bank of Ireland, built higher than in the zoning code, they were forced to take a storey off the building. In this country, zoning is very powerful. The preservation laws vary from town to town and state to state, and a lot of it has to do with the political power of the state historic preservation officer, which every state is required to have. In the state of Connecticut, they're a subset of the tourist board. In other areas like New York and here, they're much more powerful. We thought, we were very worried because our state historic preservation group is run by an archeologist. They're very mercurial, they don't know anything about development, and they are not very well organised, and they declined to comment on this building. We were incredibly uptight about what they were going to... What I was afraid of was that they were going to say, 'You can't replace anything. You have to repair everything.'

C: How long has an archeologist been in that seat?

H: The last two, so I would say 12 years.

1:20:25

DT: Henry, how much do you think Sert influenced Corb's thinking?

H: I doubt if it had much influence at all, but I've never been able to stay awake to study CIAM and all of those guys. It could be that Sert had an influence while he was in Corb's office. I don't know. I'm too ignorant to respond. I do think of Le Corbusier as not... I think of him as thinking that ordinary street life symbolised congestion and a historic social stratification and commercial life that was 19th century and all of that, compared to open-air health and all of those other obsessions of his. I think Sert had a much more, a much richer attitude towards it.

C: So the Boston Preservation Commission, would that emit more power over buildings than nationally listing buildings?

H: Yes. Yes. A local landmark will have much more protection in Boston and Cambridge. And one thing they have, and I don't know about the British counterparts, is the demolition delay ordinance. In Cambridge its 90 days, and in Boston its trivial... maybe its 90 days in Boston and a year in Cambridge. And the attempt is to stop people from doing a thoughtless demolition, so its mostly hitting homeowners and small businesses. Real developers just put that into their development schedule.

C: And that's to give conservationists time to develop an argument if need be?

H: An alternative. It’s more a matter of helping people understand what the alternatives might be, because they don't get studied. A church decides to knock their steeple down because somebody on their vestry says, 'My brother-in-law is a roofer and he says that this has got to come down,' 'Oh, ok.' (Driving along the river on the north side to look back at the BU campus)
C: Gosh those panels look awful, don't they?

H: [laughs] So the cantilever doesn't look too aggressive to me from here.

DT: The trees sort of hide it.

H: So this is the very base of the MIT campus.

DT: Henry, I've never heard you talk about Sert's housing here.

H: I've never been able to accept it as his work, although, I've met people who like it. We'll see if you can see it from here.

C: You think it might somebody within his firm? This?

H: No, that is by Stubbins. That is early '40s, late '40s? That's Sert. It's looking better over time actually, to me. Eh, 1970s. The low stuff.

DT: At the end of the '60s, Sert switched and started using more precast modules and started experimenting with smaller corrugated masonry, and bricks... Was he doing that at all before then Henry?

H: Only in infill panels. When was the Center for World Religion?

DT: That was early...

H: Very early wasn't it. It's a lovely building. So there's Baker House, Aalto's building is through the bleachers, which you'll see but not from this distance later today.

DT: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the sequence was something like his house, then the Center for World Religions...then there's Holyoke, does that sound right?

H: Yeah, and then Peabody Terrace, then the Science Center. And I don't know the non-Boston/Cambridge projects.

C: MIT has a new Gehry building, right? I've heard that they've had massive problems with that from the start.

H: I think the problems are really only building envelope failures. I walked by that with an engineer who specialises in building envelopes and structural failures, and he said, 'That's my annuity.' So this [Decherico?] building, that's an atomic reactor. And it's more that 50 years. I've always thought that that should be listed in Cambridge.

DT: This is Maya Lin and Toshi Gamore under construction on the right. You'll see the first curved corner hybrid curtain wall...

1:28:16

H: So the tower you see painted grey, which is what's happening to concrete buildings as they fail, is by Eduardo Catolano, and it's on a site that was designed and planned by Sert. And according to one of the survivors of his office, I'm going to talk to you a little bit about them, Sert lost interest in this parcel once it had been planned, so a piece of it, and Catolano then took it over. But one piece of it, Sert's office, his B team, continued to develop and was doing it simultaneously with the Holyoke Center project, and basically, all of the solutions from Holyoke Center were fed to this other team. So it was a junior version, and in the 1980s, the developer tore out all the translucent glazing, except in the toilet areas, where privacy mattered. Now they've torn it all out.
and replaced it was clear triple glazing. Very expensive, quite green and its totally changed the effect of the building.

DT: Have you been inside yet Henry?

H: Yes, numerous times. And programmatically it is extremely exciting. That work-bar thing is fantastic. It's a club for people to join and to collaborate. It's like a fitness club. When you come in, you put your card in, and up on a bit flat screen is 'Caroline Engel. Historic Preservation. Contemporary Buildings.. blah, blah, blah.'

DT: It's one of these new social entrepreneurship experiments.

H: Everybody will see that you're there if they're in the place... So there's the Sert building. I have always thought it actually quite elegant.

DT: [describing entrepreneurial nature of the neighbourhood]

[Arriving back at Bruner/Cott offices]

H: We're going to go into Harvard Square and then I think by bus we'll go to MIT.

1:34:15

H: I'm going to go get the preservation study we did for this to show you.

1:37:25

H: This is for you. This is a little hand-out I cobbled together for a tour I gave for that group. So this is the plan, half of which was built, and that's where he was putting other things.

C: That part was never constructed?

H: No. ...

1:38:40

H: That was our attempt to visualise that space and so forth. And this is that slot that was so difficult, and this all about how you put windows back into those construction reveals and the original concrete, with no thermal bridging and with insulation and so forth. So when you get your postdoc we'll fill you in on that stuff.

C: That's what I'm interested in, and what I'd like to do next, but this one is just more theoretical...

H: Well I think its a reasonable way to spend your time because you're contextualising these future pieces of work.

C: Is it alright if I take some photos of your drawings and models here?

H: Of course, absolutely.

C: Are these all of the north elevation?

H: We were looking at different logics for colouring the facade. We did it his way (Sert's), or if we did it differently in relation to changes we were making, should it correspond in any way to what's in the building addition or should it just be what he had, which is what we ended up doing. ... We can also send you pdfs of these sort of things if you can remember what you want. So one quick thing interesting to me in my career is that when you're working on a building like this, you're
working on a building people love. When you're working on these buildings, you're working on buildings people hate, but it's the same mind that's working on both of them. And I find that a very interesting social passage to undergo.
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DT: [discussing Le Corbusier's Carpenter Building and the removal of the partitions]

H: And the other thing about that was that Corb's early drawings took the ramp up inside the building and he thought that's how all the movement was going to occur, and it was inspired by looking at student pedestrian flow at the change of classes, but in fact, they discontinued the interior portion of the ramp and everybody uses this fire stair, yet again, as the primary vertical circulation.

C: Now, in your opinion, would it be right to insert that ramp now since all the documents are still there?

H: Generally, I would say no because what you're dealing with is a physical legacy. And David will talk about that because he wanted to put in tile panels in Baker House that were cost-cut out of the project, and they knew what Aalto had wanted. But I don't know how different that is from the advocacy of demolition in circumstances that we're involved with. ... This is John Andrews, this is '68 or something. Sert had a lot of say in the selection of this architect, and loved these stepped sections. The reason I'm bringing you here is because you were talking about substitute materials. Oh incidentally, this is [James] Stirling and its a building that I fear may be vulnerable. The other side was going to have a land bridge over to the Harvard Art Museum, 30 ft wide. The City of Cambridge said 'no'. These two buildings were supposed to have a land bridge, a pedestrian bridge, a connector. That's IM Pei's partner, Harry Cobb. The City said 'no'. So, here you don't see that. He had big columns in front that were going to hold the bridge up.

DT: [interior grand stair that was supposed to tied into the bridge]

H: But now you walk in and you're confronted with a bad stair.

C: Why did the city object? It would have been overtop traffic, right?

H: I think it was breaking up continuity of the street visually and so forth, or just too much gown. [...] So this is a neoprene glazing system that was original (looking at the Harvard Graduate School of Design-GSD). They no longer make this. We designed a complete replacement of these facades that would look like this using a customised version of existing curtain wall systems, but
this is neoprene. Again, the payback was so great on the energy savings that they just decided not
to do it, not to change all of this glazing. But an interesting example is when we did the energy
model for this building, we ended up using a different glass for each facade. These are already
reflective, facing south. What we learned from the energy model is that architects tend to want to
optimise every decision, so you want the best thermal isolation, the best light transmission, and so
on. What we learned is that that could reduce peak loads, particularly for air conditioning, but the
annual energy savings were greater if we had more clear glass in these east-west facades because
of beneficial heating in the winter that came from sunshine. You'd never intuitively pick that up,
so energy models are a really big issue in these buildings.

DT: This is the design school. It was designed as trays, stacked up. Philip Johnson called it one of
the 10 great rooms of the 20th century.

H: I didn't know that. My son liked working in there. We redid all the furniture. He would be more
crammed today. David, were you in one of these houses?

DT: I had a carol in the library. I understand they're saying goodbye to the houses, even though
they're so new, and that there may be an addition coming on the basketball court ...

06:45

C: Sorry, just to go back, you said the energy savings would be so great - so great as in the time it
takes to recoup for the cost of the replacement or what you're actually saving by replacing the
windows?

H: No, overall. No, the payback period was astronomical, but what we learned was that if you
were going to replace them, the difference between annual energy consumption and peak loads,
which could be associated with discomfort, the other being associated with greenhouse gases, so
its just a layer of complication that doesn't come out in ordinary discourse. From here, you can see
the Science Center. Those are cooling towers. You can hear them from here actually.

DT: There's a chiller plant underneath the building.

H: For all the Yard I think (Harvard Yard).

DT: I think it's for most of the buildings north of there. I don't know.

H: Oh. I know they brought chill water from there to University Hall. So it crossed the road. And
that plaza that Chris Reed and Moison did is full of utilities. Just packed. The programming I think
is successful.

C: [asking about a CHP system]

H: To a certain extent, yes, there is a huge power plant down on the river that the University
bought from Cambridge Municipal Light and Power, and it produces steam using natural gas and
using the river to cool itself.

C: How many buildings does that serve?

H: About 200.

C: The cost of energy here must be low then?

H: It's so low that when I was redoing buildings that were connected to that plant, we couldn't
afford to use a geothermal system that we put in for cooling, for heating, because it actually cost
more to run it than simply take steam from the power plant.
C: So this was kind of the end.

H: Yes, a successor generation (of modern architects). Andrews was an Australian architect who practiced in Canada, built some schools, and I thought this was a very exciting building when it was first done. It was, as David said, the interior is under a sloping shed roof with trays for different studios and so forth.

C: It seems like a very social, collaborative environment.

H: I think it is. I think it is.

DT: I think there is two interesting stories here, one is sort of material and the cladding and the other is sort of urban design approach. So ...(can't hear)

H: And David, explain to Caroline about the additions.

DT: So, the largest addition is by [Andrew O'Lears...], which was about a decade ago

C: This is the blue ceiling...?

DT: Yeah, the panel glass with... So the Andrew O'Lears addition, they were sort of trying to reference the staggered modulation of the facades, but what's interesting about it is that Sert and the University was planning a much larger building, but this building was being designed as Sert was leaving Harvard, he was no longer the Dean in 1969 and that's exactly when this building was being designed, so he was starting to take on larger projects elsewhere. This is the same time that Roosevelt Island was being designed by Sert. So the [Lears, Lions, Zeffel?] addition is sort of overturned to the original plan where there would have originally been two large stepping up towers, which you can't really see. But coming from BU, what's interesting here is that BU was an urban design of a bunch of different buildings, a campus plan, this building was always conceived as a bunch of different buildings that are attached to each other so it is sort of considered to be an urban center in one enclosure. But what Lee [Cott] says is the most successful part of this building is that you can actually understand that plan and the distinct elements of the city when you're going through the building on the circulation path. We should be able to walk through it.

H: As a successful interior street, and if you look back at the architectural publications of that period, everybody was talking about interior streets. This one actually works. The one that we'll next does not, or did not.

H: When was the SOM building I wonder?

DT: 1940s? The laboratory next door?


DT: It's early. That's a really unusual wooden curtain wall. Have you ever looked at that? That's back when the curtain wall was being invented.

H: Yes, I've always liked that building.

DT: There's a really thoughtful addition as well by Raphael [Maneo??]

H: It's much maligned as a wind tunnel. I like it.

14:00
[walking through 'interior street' of the Science Center (?)]

C: White, red and green. Did Sert just have an affection for that colour combination?

H: Well I think [Luger] introduced him to this palette. And it isn't just Bauhaus because there's green in it, and they were acquaintances or friends. I think Sert was a brother-in-law of Juan Miro, I don't know for sure, but he did Miro's studio.

DT: I saw them painting one of the downstairs doors blue a few weeks ago and I asked them why they were painting it that colour, because it was such a strikingly Sertian colour, and they said, 'Well we don't want the building to look weird so we just kept painting it the same colour as it was before.' But here, so you can actually see different structural systems for each part of the building as well. This back laboratory piece has these enormous 60 ft long precast strutted beams that cantilever over [??] and go up the whole ways toward the courtyard, and again Sert's idea was that this space would be flexible and you could change its use because there are these holes cut in the beams before they installed them. And again it goes in both directions so you can install new conduit and wiring or plumbing or whatever you need for the laboratories going this way or this way between these columns that all end in shafts at the back of the building, which sort of make that facade identifiable. So, that's the laboratory building on the back and across you see the sculptural modular wall, which is almost exactly the front cover of Le Corbusier's modular right there. A perfect square subdivided into golden rectangles.

C: And that's concrete isn't it?

H: Yeah, board-marked concrete.

C: Wow, it really almost looks like wood.

H: That's because they've used rough-sawn boards. We'll show you more of that.

DT: There are so few cast-in-place moments in this building...

H: This is really a frame infilled with precast. So here's more white concrete.

C: And it would have all have been painted white, if unfinished?

H: We think so.

DT: So that's the laboratory building back there, this is the lecture theatre over here in the weird shape, and then the library up in the front corner.

16:50

H: So David, have you seen what [Mack/Matt??] wants to do in here? Are there sketches out? Is he building a connector back out to the outdoors?

DT: Um I think the main plan is just to get rid of this obstacle here, its really useless and try to make the whole area glass and open to the library, and have this whole level of the library just be open with no obstacles. [Hard to hear. Ask David for plans]

H: So he's not going to do anything on the exterior?

DT: No, I think not.

H: Aw, pity!

DT: Who's the designer of the fountain?
H: Peter Walker. There's a spray, it sprays. And I don't know if it had a steam component, I don't
think so.

C: It just comes up whenever, so people may be sitting there and get doused?

H: No... Well, I want you to see this, well this is probably better. Look how crude this aggregate
is.

C: Oh on the panels?

DT: And look at the colour. It's purple.

C: And those beams on top - those were always there?

DT: So that's the third structural system. When we get further away, you'll see it. It's been
described by different people as a sort of giant tarantula walking toward Harvard Square, because
of the steel suspension system that holds the roof up. But being the sort of transitional period or
the late period of Sert's work...

H: So they couldn't afford precast panels on this building, according to Hugh Lawson.

DT: Coincidentally, these are the ones that seem to have survived the best.

H: Far and away better. ...When I was a kid, here as a student, if I had classes over here and I did,
you had to cross the road. It was a big deal to get back up into here. And this is an overpass and it
came from a diagram that Sert did for the campus plan. He was trying to connect everything from
the river all the way up here. And some of these moves were brilliant, like this one, and some of
these moves were not so brilliant, like arcade at Holyoke Center where we're going now. So this is
the old yard at Harvard on the right. So I've always assumed this began in the 17th century, but
mass halls, I've heard someone say, was 1720, so I don't know.

C: Just out of curiosity, is that a cathedral?

H: That is a memorial church for the slain union soldiers that were graduates of Harvard, 1870s,
and it’s the direct descendant of the English country churches of George Herbert, George Harvey,
I think. MIT trained all the architects in that period, and this guy began writing before the Civil
War and continued after about how Harvard needed something like this. So when they got to the
point of really talking about a memorial building, he had everything ready.

20:48

C: With the Le Corbusier's building vs. Sert's and the other modern buildings on campus, is there
any difference in the maintenance of the buildings.

H: That's a great question. It's had one series of concrete repairs about 20 years ago and they've
been minor. Somehow it was much better built. And when we were standing there looking at it, I
was looking again at these very tall, skinny, precast window mullions and marvelling that none of
them were falling apart. So these are mostly 18th c. buildings, kind of predicated on mill
construction. That's 1815, it was interrupted by the war of 1812... its design and its construction.
Now that's Charles Bullfinch, who was America's first professional architect, allegedly. Where
was Latrobe in all that? This building was reviled when it was built, as being spectral, horrifyingly
ghost-like, white, because this is what they had at the time. And its link corresponds exactly to the
space in the quad, between those two. Here's a quick conservation note: the architect for the big
hall that you were just looking at, the cathedral-like space, built this as an addition to that 1790
building over there, and he just continued it. So he didn't feel that he had to come back and impose
his Victorian (style). Well a really interesting example is a building you see through there. It's a
building that I think influenced H.H. Richardson, because it was here when he was an
undergraduate. The big granite building. It had been so altered by modern architects in the late 50s and 60s, that when it came time to do its renovation, the Cambridge Historical Commission said, 'You can keep what's there, or return it to what it was in 1850', but the interiors were so altered in terms of modern flowing design and so forth, that they decided to keep it as it is, and it probably saved Harvard money, is the reason. I remember being dazzled as a student by these big sheer glass panes in that heavy block of granite. David, do you about Robert Olsen, the local architect? He did the renovation here after Ben Thompson. So they went to the Cambridge Historical Commission with circular infill wooden mullions, so on and so forth, and then this, and they were told, 'Ok. Keep this.'

C: So these windows are what were put in during the 50s or 60s?

H: These are from the 1990s. The 50s looked the same, but they were not insulated glass.

25:50

H: I can send you pictures of this building too.

C: Ok, what are we looking at here?

H: This is Sert's Holyoke Center. It’s built in basically two stages, ending in 1965. So in the 70s, they put a solar film over all of the windows for energy reasons, and one of the things that does it to make them reflective. So the alternation between clear and translucent is muted and you lose all the colour and what he called scaled bars behind it, and those were there by code to keep people from crashing through the glass and falling out. Ok, quick story about this guy. This is his second phase. The first phase had been built and the windows were 2 ft on center, and Sert wrote a Dave Brubeck inspired essay called 'Architecture and Jazz'. President Pusey comes to his office when this is being designed and he said, 'Could you make this one less jazzy?' So Sert moved the, he relaxed the facade by moving the panels further apart, and then said, 'And can you make it out of brick?' So Sert doesn't say anything. At a certain point he sent a guy from his office over with three brick samples to Pusey's office. And he said, 'Which colour brick do you prefer?' Pusey chose one, died the curtains of the building that colour. That was his concession.

C: That's amazing that he was just able to do that to the client.

H: [walking into Holyoke Center] This um, this didn't exist. There was this step down with this passage across. There were no doors in here.

C: Really? It was just an open throughway?

H: Right. It was... And his notion was that this would continue down to the river eventually. It was insane. He had done several studios in the design school doing three installations of this building complex along Massachusetts Avenue, where we were just standing. So one of the reasons it’s a H-shaped tower is that when you keep putting them together, you get these light wells. It was a big deal to him to have this massive 10-storey building fit into the locale. The demolished a whole block of 19th century six-storey commercial buildings with a lot of detail to build this. So that's what I mean by 'What was it about modernism that people found so convincing at the time?'

C: Was there uproar about the buildings being demolished here at the time?

H: No.

C: Not at that time?

H: No.
DT: The reason for those light-wells in the middle of the plot is that you get light down into the new interiors.

H: And into the streets. So in Sert's original design, he wanted this to open out into a courtyard, like the patio on the roof of Boston University. Harvard real estate kept claiming the space back and turning it into retail. [The shop fronts] were further back, so it was kind of a scary place to walk through at night. You couldn't see what was behind these [pillars]. The line of the glazing was about 4 ft back. So it was controversial for the Cambridge Historical Commission to move it out this far. We're talking about making much bigger changes here - knocking out a lot of this stuff, trying to make visual and movement connections east-west across the block, which it now lacks. There are these corridors that are too narrow. We'll go out and loop around. This is the project we're doing with Michael Hopkins office. And I do want you to meet Sophy Twohig from that office (in London), because she never hear of Josep Lluis Sert, and she's responding to it in a very thoughtful way I think. She's the lady who lives in the Barbican. There's no hurry. We'll be working on this long past the time when you've handed in your thesis.

C: I do need to get back in touch with them because I'm following how they are remodelling their heating/cooling system and the way they charge the residents, because there is no way to meter each individual flat, because its one universal system.

H: Why do they just do it pro-rata by square footage? Everybody else does. The way that our... [points out elderly man descending stairs outside of Holyoke Center] He was instrumental in bringing modernism to the Harvard design programme. And his essay in Hashime's book I think is very good. It's a big introductory essay. He was a very important teacher to me, and about 2,000 other people. And it was also listening to his almost religious, cultist way of talking about modern architecture that made me think, "I've got to look elsewhere. There's got to be something more complex than this!" [laughs] So this is the south facade and see how everything is closer together. See the effect of the solar films on these clear panels. I mean this used to be yellow, red... All of this other coloured junk around the base was done by another architect in the 1990s, and when they started to enclose this arcade, the arcade had such a bad reputation as a nasty place that they were trying to reposition it commercially. So I want to walk you to the two streets where he has a very different kind of frontage for the retail.

C: Now what is all in this building?

H: That's the health center up to about five floors. And then this is income producing retail. So I'm arguing that this street is part of Harvard Square and its very much the public realm, and we're going to compare that to the next street, which I think of as a Harvard corridor, although it's not a pure argument. And the reason it's significant is because we're talking about taking down a block like that on the next street. Taking out the retail on Holyoke Street, so that we can build a new glazed, large space that connects back into the base of the building. We'll walk around the front again and then look down the next street.

35:30

H: So practically no one we've seen on this sidewalk so far is a student. We'll see if the Cambridge Historical Commission thinks that has any value at all as a concept.

C: So is this area owned by the University or is it city property?

H: No, the University owns so many buildings. And the restaurants are tenants. David, do you realise this is Dan Rye and Lee Cott did this?

C: This addition? (looking at the yellow 'high-tech' addition to the Au Bon Pain leased section on the front facade of Holyoke)
H: They went to what remained of Sert's office, were hired to do this. This was '84... And Sert's office was non-existent. So basically, the guy said, 'Just do it and I'll sign it'. So we're proposing to take this away, and Hopkins is going to put a two-storey pristine glazed element in, pretty much where that guy is standing with his camera all the way to over here.

DT: I wonder if anyone has realised that these are sliding doors?

H: I have. We're thinking about putting...

C: It doesn't look like it. Look at the cobwebs!

DT: I have never seen these open once.

H: No, neither have I. What Harvard is upset by is that this becomes a kind of gateway when you come out of the subway to Harvard University, and it's primary identification is the Cambridge Trust Bank and Au Bon Pain coffee.

H: So all this glass is not safety glass, and what I'm proposing to do is to keep these steel, thermally inefficient frames, partly because we would never be able to afford to put them back, and put new glass in them. Again, let me show you. A lot of contemporary curtain wall detailing is done so poorly that I thought we should try to miter the corners. So this is an aluminum replacement system, and when I saw it installed, I thought, 'Great Moss. There's a failure.' And what we looked at then, by comparison to the steel, which is welded, rough, but has a kind of solidity about it. So we altered our approach to the curtain wall corner detailing, and this is brilliant compared to what they have inside that other guys did. These are designed subsequently to overlap and interlock in ways to keep it from rotating away, and we taught them not to use any kind of sealant in these joints, because the sealant picks up black dirt that is usually bigger than the joint anyway. So I know these things sound small, but they're part of the decision matrix for the building. If you look up here, you'll see that Sert was trying to do floor-to-ceiling glazing, but he had a perimeter heating coil that ran around a foot off the floor. That's what those porcelainised enamel panels are. So where he had a translucent panel, he brought it down in white. Where he had a clear panel, he used a dark piece. You can see where they got fed up with the translucence and swapped it with something clear where you have a clear glass over white. And on the fifth floor, those are all very early insulated glazing units. The whole fifth floor is clear, and originally had a white scale bar running through it. So it was red and white; he simplified it for the President. And then they came back painted them all red for some reason. We have no idea why.

C: Have a lot of these large windows been replaced on ground level, or have they just never been broken?

H: Yep. Although, I found a snapshot of a lot of glass being replaced on the retail street we just walked up, and I think it was because, during a student riot, they smashed the glazing. But it was 1970 and I wasn't here, so I don't know.

C: And you could still get those large panes of glass?

H: Yes. So this is the block that we think we want to take down so that you can have a... and it's very complicated in section. We want to not go below the existing slab, but build a connection that allows... See the difference in character between these two streets?

C: Yeah! It's so quiet!

H: This is where we want a Hopkins glazed solution.

C: So you'd get rid of this lower block, right?
H: Just the lower block, which was built independently as kind of a third phase. I think its going to be an enormously difficult battle with the Cambridge Historical Commission.

C: Really! They'll want to keep that low block?

H: Absolutely. It's one of the original brushstrokes. But my argument is that this is not a Vermeer. I don't under-rate this building, but in order to make it function as part of the world, we need to create an interior space that can really get it all to work. The only way to do that is by... This is disconnected by levels. It's impossible to go from that back into that arcade area. I want to be able to connect from here to the street physically.

C: So you need to come out (from the low block), and go around the building to get into the arcade?

H: Currently, yes. So it's not going to be an easy sell.

C: And what would the future use be?

H: Its currently Harvard related retail and it will be a sort of giant living room for the Harvard community. The whole programme is to bring different constituent elements of Harvard together in one place. Part of what's awkward about that is that they don't want to be together. Undergraduates and graduate students? Faculty and staff? So, if there's a string quartet performance that particular groups are interested in from within all those different demographic subsets, I can seem them coming together, but we'll see. These buildings were all built in the 1930's during the depression. When I came to Harvard as an undergraduate, I thought they were ancient. They'd been there for about 28 years.

C: They look like 1850-1860... So this is all Harvard? [walking along Mass Ave to get lunch]

H: Yes, and these are the buildings that Sert wanted to replace, and these are the kinds of buildings that they tore down for Holyoke Center. ....So there's an Aalto influenced modernism. This is much more what President Pusey wanted Sert to be doing, when he saw the real thing. Shepley Bullfinch. Richardson and Abbott, It was a successor firm to H.H. Richardson. [break]

5.3.4. FRAMPTON TOLBERT, RECENT PAST PRESERVATION NETWORK

New York, New York

17 Oct 2013

[F]: Frampton Tolbert
[C]: Caroline Engel

F: So the Recent Past Preservation Network is a volunteer board position and so we're all over the country, and so I've never met some of the board members. We rarely ever meet, we really talk online and the Recent Past Preservation Network has really become just an online organisation. I know that one of the things you were talking about was what we're doing with our board and how we're changing our organisational priorities and what that means, so that's one of the reasons we talk a lot is because we've become almost all virtual. We don't ever meet in person to talk about things.
C: So it's all volunteer so similar to Docomomo in a way

F: Yeah, so Docomomo US has an executive director, Elizabeth Takus, who is based in NY and so she is paid by Docomomo and I'm actually working with her on an article that is supposed to come out today or tomorrow on midcentury bus terminals, and we're actually referencing the Preston bus station in England that was just listed and how that was an interesting story and the big fight that went on and on and on, and actually Catherine Croft from 20th Century Society was here on a HDC [?] tour last week I think. We did a tour of library renovations and she just happened to be friends with the tour guide and showed up with her daughter, and was like "I'm here. I'm taking my daughter to a barmitzva or something and so I'm just going to go on this architecture tour." And I was like "Oh I'll just talk to you about what you're up to."

C: She's a strong woman to be leading the c20 Soc. They meet a lot of opposition.

F: She doesn't seem to be really [cowed] by that at all. She's like "No, we'll just keep going." And when I was over there, I was over there for a programme in the summer for the Victorian Society Summer School which comes over to the UK for a week and half in June and July and we do London, Birmingham, Liverpool and Manchester. And talk about Victorian architecture and Victorian preservation whilst we are there.

C: Is that sort of studios?

F: Well, a lot of it was focused on the decorative arts, looking at church interiors and important architects and that sort of thing, so a lot of lectures and site visits but not a whole lot of hands on.

C: So what is the main focus here?

F: Historic Defence Council? So we are the citywide grassroots non-profit that works with neighbourhood groups on preservation and landmarking issues. We're based in this building, which is the neighbourhood preservation centre, which is sort of a research centre. You can come here and learn about researching or looking up landmark buildings in the city, that sort of thing. So we're the citywide group; there's also the Greenwich Village Society for Historic Preservation and they are the professionally staffed preservation organisation for Greenwich Village which is a large neighbourhood on the west side of Manhattan. And so we're the two groups in this building, with the St Mark's Landmarks Fund, which is the organisation that is in charge of raising money to restore the church next door. ...Friends of the Highline, they started here in this building so it's kind of for people who have an idea and a new non-profit to kind of get of the ground and then go somewhere else. We've been here now I think since it opened so probably around 1990.

C: So, funding? How are you guys funded and how do these non-profit groups - is that just private donations?

F: No, I mean, well, I'm talking about the HDC now, not the RPPN, HDC we get a mix of public and private. I'd say that our budget is around $570,000 now, so not that large, half a million dollars, not a substantial amount. We have 6 staff members and I'd say that 2/3 of that is private money. The art gala raises about $150,000 of that and the rest of it is from individual foundations, so I'd say there's about $50,000 of that is government funding, and that's from the city and the state. We do get some government money but government money has tended to become unreliable at this point for various reasons, cut backs, so NY state no longer gives out - you know the people who are in our legislature in NY State, our assembly members, our state senators, they've eliminated giving out an personal money, you know they used to give up line items in the budget,
$5,000 for HDC, because of budget cutbacks, they’ve eliminated all member items out of their budget for the foreseeable future. So we were getting a lot of money through that, so we had to kind of find a source of revenue, so we try and diversify so that if the foundation is not giving us money, then we have the government and that sort of thing. We have been fairly successful. We got our grant yesterday from the state, which was twice what we usually get. There's still money out there from the government, its just shifting. It’s very competitive.

C: Has this been since 2008?

F: Yeah, it was around 2009 when they eliminated the member items and it kind of became unclear what people were going to get from the state. The city has stayed about the same but even that, you can get money from your local council person but you apply to a competitive fund from the city with about 700 non-profits and you are reviewed by a panel of your peers and they decide how much money you should get, if anything. Its very competitive.

C: So there are about 700 non-profits in Manhattan?

R: No, all the city who apply for that programme. There are probably thousands of non-profits, but only 700-750 apply to the city for that specific programme that we apply to. I mean there's also a group of non-profits in the city, like the MET, which are base lined in the budget because they're so big, they're call CIGs I think - Cultural Institution Group - they always get money from the city, a huge amount of money and its always in the budget as a line for them. Us small non-profits have to fight for what's left. We don't need the $18 million that they get. We'd like it, but we're not going to get it.

8:10

C: So what's the main focus of the HDC?

F: So we mainly work with neighbourhood groups, block associations, civic associations, that sort of thing, on preservation issues - getting their neighbourhoods locally designated by the city, local landmarks, sometimes on the state and national register of historic places, which is another type of designation, or... their neighbourhood is landmarked but they have an empty lot and someone wants to put a 10 storey building on that lot, you so, the Landmark Preservation Commission, which is the local regulatory agency, we review all major proposals that come to the Commission, every Friday, we have a public review session, where we review all the proposals, look at all the boards, and make our own comments, so at the public hearing, HDC gets up and says, 'This is what we think about these proposals.' Every Friday or every other Friday, we review 20-40 proposals and we have a committee of architects and advocates who review them with our staff, and we write our testimony about what we feel about those projects.

C: Do you get that many each week or is that a backlog of proposals?

F: Because of the way, well, when the economy went down, construction projects went down, people didn't have as much money to do rear yard additions or rooftop additions, but in the past year I'd say, we've seen the proposals go way back up. There's a lot of money in NYC, I mean there will always be a sort of baseline of people who can afford to do those projects, so we've seen a lot more projects recently for new buildings, and then a lot of people who want to excavate their basement for a swimming pool or put on an addition or that sort of thing. We've been seeing around 50 proposals each Friday, which is a huge amount to look at.

C: That must take all day?

F: Yeah, we have one staff member whose job is devoted to that and then all she does is work with the committee, because then she has to write up all the testimony on Monday and then present it all on Tuesday. It's quite time consuming.
C: So with the neighbourhood designation. What sort of protection does that provide?

F: So in NYC, a locally designated historic district or individual landmark protects the entire exterior of the building. Any changes you want to make to the exterior, you have to ask permission from the Landmarks Preservation Commission, and they review those changes.

C: Ok, but not for the interior unless apply separately for that?

F: Yeah, there's a category of interior landmarks in NYC and those have to be publicly accessible spaces. They cannot be a private residence. So it's mostly bank lobbies, hotel lobbies, department stores; it has to be something that people generally access, office building lobbies, that sort of thing, but it can't be, no matter how immaculate your house is, they can't landmark the interior of your house.

C: Is that for resale purposes?

F: That was just the way the Landmarks law was written. I think it just also has to do with private property rights being stronger in the US than in Europe. People are very much like 'You can't tell me what to do with the interior of my house' sort of thing.

C: Right so if they were to sell it on, somebody might be very angry down the line to have to deal with a landmarked interior.

F: Right, so its just, in other cities, I don't know. I don't know if there are any cities in the US that affect interior and exterior. That, to me, seems to be much more of a European thing. In the UK, there are some interiors that are private but are considered to be of extraordinary significance, but here, there's nothing like that.

C: I know the Barbican, that was listed in 2000, but at this point, they're all privately owned, and it wasn't like it was ever social housing or anything - it was designed for the upper-middle class, and so by this time, so many [flats] have been changed, and you can make changes, you just have to apply to the estates office and have it reviewed.

F: So it's locally regulated?

C: Yeah, a lot of that is in the Barbican Management Plan, and since they did all that, they've started up a salvage room, so if things have been changed and you'd like to revert it back closer to the original, you can go down there and find doorknobs, doors, fixtures, etc. But you still can make changes. And you know, bathrooms, kitchens, you can't expect people not to change them.

C: I've been walking around a little bit and I've noticed quite a few modern high-rise apartment buildings and modern buildings- are any of those designated? Some of them are looking pretty shabby. There was a church, a mid-century church...

F: There's a midcentury church down on the bottom of 2nd Ave and 2nd St, if I'm thinking of the one you're thinking of, its all kind of concrete slab planes and there's a bell tower on it, and there's a glass Greek Orthodox church up here on the park... No, I mean the Landmarks Commission has been hesitant to do modern architecture preservation, but they are doing more of it, but its tending to be of course the really top notch Skidmore, Owings and Merrill (SOM) buildings. They just did Chase Manhattan Plaza, they landmarked it about 2 months ago, which is a huge skyscraper downtown which is a SOM building with a Noguchi sculpture in the front and a sunken garden, its like very very top tier modernism from that era. That's really what they've been doing, and I think that's one of the reasons ....when they did the Saarinen JFK terminal, well that they landmarked it and then it stayed vacant for however long and the Port Authority is like 'We don't know what to do with this. We would like to demolish it.' But they landmarked it anyway and it just kind of sat there, but right next door to it was an I.M. Pei terminal that was torn down I think six months ago, and then there's the World Port, which was the Delta terminal and it had this big saucer-like roof
that was amazing too and they're dismantling that right now too at the airport. So there's those kind of things where they did the Saarinen terminal and then said, 'Well it didn't really work out that well, so we're not going to do it anymore' and about 4 years ago, they did a bank in Queens called the Jamaica Savings Bank, which was not really done, it was done by this guy Sermento, who was a midwestern bank architect, who only I think people who are interested in modern architecture know about, and he only designed banks for the American Bank Corporation. It kind of looks like the JFK terminal. It's a triangle with a swooping back to it, and it's great. So they landmarked that probably about 5 years ago and the city council was like 'Why would you do this? This is such an ugly building. We don't understand.' and so they overturned the landmarking; they delandmarked it - the city council did. And they just said, 'We think this is so ugly and stupid and why in the world would you do this.' And so there was a fairly big fight, and they [LPC] were like, 'Its an interesting building, it references the JFK terminal, or it references modern...' and they [city council] were like 'nope' and so the city council overturned it.

C: And what's happened to it now?

F: It's still a bank. I mean, its still sitting there.

C: Its just not protected at all?

F: Yeah it could be demolished any day, and I think its now a Capital One bank, you know one of those big banking companies who are like 'We will tear this down at some point.' So there is that and then there was the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Building. I don't know if you've walked past it but I would definitely recommend it. It's on 5th Ave and 43rd St? It's right above the main library at Bryant Park - the Central Library, and it was, it is a 4 storey, 5 storey bank by Skidmore, Owings and Merrill that was one of the first banks where you could see through the whole thing.

So you look through the front and you saw the bank vault, the door and the door was open and you could see into the vault. The escalators went up to the second floor banking floor, and everything was open. The exterior was landmarked but the interior was not, but its an all-glass building so people are like 'How can you landmark the exterior and not the interior because if they make changes to the interior it ruins the whole building because you can see all of the changes.' So Landmarks ended up landmarking the interior after this big fight, but ended up the new owners completely rip out the entire interior and replace it with some changes, so now the escalators don't go sideways along the side of the building, they go up, and took out the bank vault and left the bank door and turned the inside of the vault into a restaurant and took out all the vault walls, so there's just the door, but the door doesn't lead to anything, the vault door is just hanging out in space. So there was a fight about that because people were saying its now a clothing store called Joe Fresh, it's a Canadian company like H&M, it's just like a big department store but in this old banking hall. And so people were kind of disappointed by that because said it was a very important modern building, and Landmarks landmarked it then let them essentially destroy it. So there are still a lot of those kinds of... I say every modern landmarking has been a heavy lift and has been fairly controversial or just a lot of work. So that's kind of where they are. ...It's a beautiful building, it still looks beautiful, but just going in, you can see the floors, they redid all the floors, they redid all the ceilings to what it looked like originally, they moved the escalators, then in the back of the upstairs there is this gorgeous bronze sculpture that goes from floor to ceiling. Its enormous. It was taken out of the space and then whoever bought it, I think it was sold to Sutherby's or something, and then whoever bought it donated it back to the owners and said it could stay there indefinitely as long as it's in that space.

C: So the owners of the building don't own it.

F: Right, it was lent back because it had been created for that space and the preservationists were like, 'Without that sculpture...that was the whole charm of the space.' So you can go upstairs and look at it. It's really fascinating.

20:10
C: Yeah, there's the same problem in the UK in that a listing for a modern building doesn't hold the same weight that a listing for a Georgian building does, in that, if you were to go and change the interior of a listed Georgian building, people would be extremely angry, but if you do it to a modern building, they're like 'Oh that's nice.'

C: Do you see any sort of thematic studies going on, because that's how they're moving forward with the listing in the UK and looking at all the modern churches, saying look at this grouping.

F: Yeah and I talked with Catherine Croft and she said a few people in her office have started doing a library survey. So, a little bit. I don't know if you met Andrew Dolkart at APT, he's in the Columbia Preservation Program, a group of his preservation students did a study on midcentury schools in NYC, which is online but most of it is like 'more information coming soon'.

C: He said they're publishing it next Friday on their Columbia webpage.

F: Oh really! Because I was writing about it and I was like 'well...' But yeah, that was a big deal because Edward Durrell Stone who was a fairly well-known American architect, he has a school on 72nd or 79th St or something on the West side that is one storey or two storey, really long building, that just goes end to end on the block but it's not that tall, so about 6 months ago, the city proposed to demolish it and building a high-rise with a new school in the basement, and the parents were like 'How dare you. We love this school.' and everybody is like 'but it's so ugly', and people were like, 'No, this is by Edward Durell Stone' but it had no protection, Landmarks won't go anywhere near it...

C: still?

F: No, they have not touched it. So I think Andrew's study is the first to look at how these schools were/are significant in their own right. That is one, and my understanding is that someone out there is doing a study of public housing development in NYC. What do you call it? Council flats? So someone has just started doing that study in NYC because the state historic preservation office has said they know that some of these sites are very significant but they had no research on it... and there was a proposal this year to take some of the open space at those sites and building private luxury housing on those open spaces.

C: In the middle of the public housing?

F: Yeah, facing away from the public housing, so you didn't look at the public housing. So all the windows would face the street, but essentially taking up the open space. So someone was like, 'Look! Somewhere to build! So we'll just take this greenery area from the public housing poor residents and we'll just put in luxury housing that will generate income to pay for the upkeep of the public housing, but they won't have any more open space.' People were very, not preservationists but the general public, were enraged by that proposal.

C: Upset on the basis that it would be morally wrong?

F: Yeah, you can't... how is this helpful? It's like segregating residents. Oh this is a rich building, this is a poor building, now make sure that they never have any connection.

C: So would it have been a gated community?

F: Yeah it would essentially be like that. It would be like building a walled-off building on that same property. That was their solution to the fact that the public housing... the agency that runs the public housing in NYC said that they have like $80 billion worth of repairs that they don't have any money for, you know the elevators don't work, they replace people's windows, and they're like, 'the only way that we can raise the money to repair people's housing is by selling off these little plots for new housing.' That was their solution. I don't think it will go forward. The new
mayor... the lead candidate in our mayor's race is very against that proposal. The race for the mayor that will come in in January.'

C: Who's that?

F: Bill De Blasio. So he is very progressive and he's very against that proposal. So those are the two that I can think of: schools and the public housing. Nothing else really, I mean, we've been fighting about the libraries here, but mostly about the older libraries. They're demolishing a midcentury library in Brooklyn right now. Everyone is complaining that they want to keep a library, but no one is clamouring to save the building. They're like, 'No that's fine. Tear down the building. We just want there to be a library somewhere.' No one cared about the library itself. They're more worried about our Carnegie library, which is like a 1900 branch in Brooklyn that they also want to demolish.

C: Really?! I thought that Carnegie libraries were sacred?

F: They're supposed to be but they're not. This one is on a plot of land that is incredibly, incredibly valuable, so the library system is like, 'We'll build a library over there if you let us demolish this' and so the community is really fighting them. It's the first Carnegie library in Brooklyn, so yeah, there's a big fight over that right now. The community is like 'This building should not be considered for sale at all.'

26:20

C: Back to the public housing study, so that was commissioned by the state preservation office?

F: I have not figured out who is actually doing it, but the state just said, 'We are interested in looking at this, but someone needs to do the research for us. Its too big of a project for us to take on.' And so I know they asked and some architectural historian has taken it on, I just don't know who actually did. Andrew would probably know the answer to that.

C: I know there's a book that I've been trying to find, it's called 'Public Housing that Worked'. Its by Nicolas Bloom.

F: Yeah, I didn't know about that. That's really interesting. It's only been talked about just recently I feel like...

C: So this would be separate from that project?

F: Yeah, I think so. I think so. At Columbia, there was a thing called the Fitch Forum about 2 years ago. It's like a colloquium where you bring people, and that had people who deal with public housing from around the world. I think there was someone from Edinburgh, there was someone from the Netherlands, someone from Russia, someone from Brazil, and they were all talking about how they deal with modern midcentury public housing in their countries.

C: Do you know if anything was published?

F: No, but you should be able to find something online. If you look up Fitch Forum 2012, and it was something like 'Does public housing work?' or something like that. You could at least get a list of speakers and maybe a link to their papers. Their presentations were wildly varying, some of them were terrible and some of them were great. The French presentation, I couldn't understand a word he was saying. It was completely unintelligible to me, and the Russian presentation was essentially like 'We have no regulations. They can tear down whatever they want to and this is all very sad.' And then you were just like, 'God this is terrible!' Amsterdam, they were just talking about all the public housing they had converted to fantastic mixed-use housing and how they just have all these things figured out, and its just like 'Well how come we can't do that?'
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C: It's frustrating isn't it.

F: Yeah, they're plans were just gorgeous and all the work they were doing was just phenomenal...

C: I saw a Swiss presentation a few months ago at a New Tenement conference, and it was how they're still building together because in Europe it's ok to rent your whole life, and they were just showing all the wonderful things they're doing...

F: The woman from Scotland, I think was talking about these very, very tall council estates that were being demolished.

C: It must have been the Red Road flats

F: Yes! Yes, so she talked a lot about their significance

C: Was it Diane Watters?

F: Maybe. Was she, is she connected to the government?

C: She's all over the place. Actually, I think she's with the Royal Commission...

F: Ok, that sounds right. I think it was her talking about how they were significant and how they just couldn't overcome public opinion that these were like the worst thing ever.

C: That whole area was cleared for slum clearance, so they just tore down all these tenements that were in terrible shape, you know, they didn't have any indoor toilets, or indoor baths, and yeah they tore them down and built these high-rise flats, and didn't maintain them and services broke and people had to walk up to the 21st floor. It was really, really terrible and the stigma now attached to them has been impossible to overcome.

F: Yeah, I've been trying to follow some of that and now Robin Hood Gardens, and how I don't know what happened with that, if that ended up being demolished?

C: Um, that's been on the bill for demolition since I think 2008. Nothing has happened to it yet, just because the developer hasn't been pushing for it because of the economic downturn, but yeah, it's still scheduled for demolition. It isn't listed. It's been proposed and rejected, but I think, the situation there is that there are a lot of things that didn't work with it, and it is Peter and Allison Smithson, it's this design that they had put forward for a number of competitions over two decades and they didn't win these other competitions, and then they won this one, and so by the time they built it, it wasn't innovative anymore. Some people would say it is not as significant as its made out to be. Other people love it, so we'll see.

31:45

C: So with the Recent Past Preservation Network, so that is more of an educational programme? Is your goal educational advocacy? Getting the public interested in midcentury modern architecture?

F: Um, it started out with advocacy. It kind of grew out of, originally, the fight to save Richard Neutra's Cyclorama at Gettysburg, which was demolished fairly recently and was the visitor centre at the Gettysburg Civil War national site and it was part of the Mission 66, US National Park Service building all those significant park buildings, which now they don't want anymore. At places like Gettysburg, they're like, 'No, we want it to look pristine like it did in 1865, so we're going to bury the new visitors centre underground so you look out and you see it as if you were there.'

C: That's similar to the Minnesota Historical Society. They have one underground that people just hate.
F: Well, I'm sure in 20 or 30 years, they'll want to tear this one down because it won't work. So that was kind of what the RPPN grew out of was an organisation whose main goal was to fight for the preservation of that building which went on since the 1990s or early 2000s. When I came on board it was 2005 or 2006 and it had already been going on for several years. That was one of the main focuses and then it grew into just being kind of more a voice for advocacy, because Docomomo doesn't do advocacy in the US the way that maybe they do in other countries. Docomomo here was and still is somewhat of a very high style, high minded [organisation]. I mean, don't get me wrong, I know a lot of the Docomomo people - I like them - but it really has been like 'let's talk in a very scholarly intellectual way about modern architecture. We're not interested in working to preserve it. We're just interested in talking about it.' And so, some of those big fights about modern architecture in the US, Docomomo just wasn't there. That wasn't their place to step in and say, 'Should we preserve this?' No, they say, 'We think its incredibly significant but we'll just talk about it. We'll publish a paper on it.' So I think also that Recent Past is more of the scrappy, grassroots group, that was like, 'No, we need to be fighting for these kinds of buildings. We'll get a coalition together. We'll do that sort of thing.' So we were doing some of that, working on Prentice Hospital in Chicago that's being demolished right at the moment, and there was a Gropius campus in Chicago that was demolished around the Olympics in an effort to clear everything for the Olympics which they didn't get, but they demolished the whole campus anyway so they could show that they had a clear site. That was all Sasachi [Nagasachi?] landscape and Gropius campus. If you look it up, what was it called... I can't remember what the hospital was called, but if you look up Gropius and Sasachi, they were two of the people involved, and it was just demolished very quickly before there was any sort of outcry. I mean, it was very late in Gropius' career. It was from like the 50s and Gropius advised on it, but he wasn't really as involved. So we were involved in that, and we were involved in some other big fights... but Docomomo has becoming more involved I'd say, depending on the chapter. We did work with them some on the Manufacturer's Hanover Trust. They were there at the hearings, commenting. The local New York chapter has become more active, so I just think it depends. They have tried to become more advocacy [focused], but they're still very moderate. They wouldn't come out for a bank that no one [has heard of]... like the bank in Queens, I can't see them doing that. [Indecipherable bit] There's still a ways to go with them. And so that's where I think the RPPN can be helpful is trying to rally support around that.

36:00

C: It seems similar to the way that Docomomo UK and the C20 Society operate. Docomomo UK, the members are basically architects, but with the C20 Society, it's anybody, and its much more focused on advocacy and putting out these flash news stories, trying to get people rallied around buildings.

F: Yeah, so we're kind of like that but we're not nearly as competent or powerful or just present as the C20 Society. Once the Neutra Cyclorama project was done, we were kind of like where do we go from here? What is our purpose? So right now, we're regrouping. We had a program called the State Reps program, which I am heading up, which is essentially getting a representative from all 50 states - at least one - and you can be anybody. A lot of them are going to be working in the preservation field, but it just has to be somebody who has their ear to the ground in that state, and they're going to be feeding to us what's going on in their state in terms of modern architecture preservation. There's a lot out there, when we talked to people in North Carolina, they said their state historic preservation office just did a survey of modern houses in suburban North Carolina. And so that needs to get out there. That's fascinating news.

C: Is this something that you'll have online, where the state reps can just upload recent news?

F: yeah, I'm hoping that essentially. We'll be using their news to populate our online news letter, that sort of thing. [North Carolina Modernist Triangle Houses]

C: So it would be a way to collect this research that isn't going to go in to a scholarly journal?
F: Right, right. And we also are looking at the recent past that is never going to be of interest to Docomomo, or one of our people in Hawaii is like 'When are we going to start preserving tiki?' Do you know tiki? So tiki is a very kitschy, 50s and 60s, its very Hawaiian and you have tiki bars and the whole bar would be made out of bamboo and you'd be drinking out of these mugs shaped like gods and everybody is wearing leis and it's just very fun kitschy 50s and 60s, but its that or goofy fast food restaurants or diners that have funny architecture. That doesn't seem like anything that Docomomo is ever going to take strong interest in. But we can. We're interested in roadside architecture, we're interested in lesser modernism, regional modernism. Of Docomomo in the US, there are only maybe 8 or 10, I think there are 10 chapters now, which is great. I mean there's a new northwest Docomomo chapter, which I think is Washington state and Oregon, and there's a new one in southern California [Hawaiian?], but there's probably never going to be a Docomomo Idaho or Docomomo Wisconsin...

C: I think there is a Docomomo Minnesota

F: Oh yeah, there is a Docomomo Minnesota, but you know, like a Docomomo Kansas... but there is someone in that state that's interested in this and we should give them an outlet for talking about it, but there may not be enough for a whole chapter to do. So that's kind of where we're hoping to fit in. And I've talked with Liz at Docomomo and I said I want to make sure that our missions - because she's based here in NY and I'm the only RPPN board member whom I think you emailed with who is our firm president is based in Maryland - So I've been talking a lot with Liz and saying that I want to make sure that Docomomo and Recent Past are compatible, we can work together so that we're not stepping on each other's toes.

C: So while they're still focusing on the more iconic modernism, you can look at the more everyday, regional modernism.

F: Yeah, and she also wants to make sure that we're not poaching her interests. She's interested in other things too.

F: Yeah, and Recent Past, we've also eliminated membership as part of our guidelines. When we raised money, we used to have members, and we raised a bunch of money but besides the Cyclorama, we didn't really need money. Most of our publications now, we have a great newsletter, but its all online, and we're trying to be as web-based as possible. So we've eliminated the paid membership component. I mean, I've talked about an endangered list for modern buildings, which there isn't one in the US.

C: There isn't?

F: Not for modern buildings specifically [from a nomination point], so that's project that we would maybe take on in the future, would be to start something like that.

C: So the National Register - they're not interested in starting something like this?

F: The National Register is fed by the state registers, so depending on... but being on the state or national register in the US is largely honorific. It doesn't protect you except in the case of federal or state projects, if there's federal or state money. So if you are a homeowner and your house is on the national register, you can tear it down without asking anybody. You can just tear it down. But, if they were to build a road through your neighbourhood and they wanted to take your house for building the road and it was on the national register, they would have to go through a Section 106 process, which means they have to look at the negative impacts of building this road on your historic structure and they would have to find a way to mitigate that, either not do that or pick up and move your house, or do drawings of your house before they demolish it. We just went through a Section 106 process in Brooklyn a few years ago where there were officers quarters from the Civil War, and they wanted to build a supermarket on that site, so we fought them and fought them through the whole Section 106 process and now of the 10 buildings, they're keeping 2 of them. They're keeping the most important one and they're keeping one called the timber shed, where they
dried timbers to build boats, and they're tearing down the rest of them. So it wasn't ideal, but it was this whole long process of 'what are you going to give us', 'we need to find a way...'. Ok, well financially, it seems like all that's going to work is to keep 2 of the 10 and it doesn't really thrill anybody, but its the resolution that the government came to. So that's really... and you can get tax benefits or tax credits if your house is on the national register and you want to do a restoration, and you do it according to the state's guidelines, you get a tax break. You get money back from the state on that. But other than that, the national register is mostly just populated with what is listed on the state registers, so its known to properties but there is no protection unless you're doing some major project. National Register properties are demolished all the time. So they wouldn't do, they're not an advocacy group for governmental listing.

C: They just manage the list.

F: Right. And the national organisation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, they do have an endangered list and they have listed occasional modern buildings on that. I think theirs is called 13 buildings... I can't remember, but each one has a theme. But I think last year one of them was a modern stadium in Miami that was on the water, it was a stadium that was open to the bay and they had concerts, shows and that sort of thing, and it was all covered in graffiti, and that was one of their priorities. But then, you know, another priority would be barns, so its... its a jumble. It would be themes, but it would be like 'This year its subdivisions'. So there's no one who is just focusing on modernism as an endangered.

C: It seems like, with the listing, if the government wants to go ahead with a project and there is this listed building, they'll go ahead with it, because its the government against the government isn't it?

F: Uh hmm. So as part of the Section 106, they have to invite in stake holders for that process, so if they, let's say, there's a very important church and they want to build a road through that church and demolish that church, the church has to have representatives or local officials, local advocacy groups like the local preservation group at this process. They are mandated to have a place at the table for all the stake holders who are listed, they're identified and those are the people who hammer and halt whatever they don't agree on.

C: Oh so its not just discussions behind closed doors with government officials...

F: No, no. We went to all those Section 106 hearings with those buildings in Brooklyn and all we did was we would go there and scream at them. You know, they would say, 'These two buildings are too far gone. They're uncovered, they're exposed to the elements and they're about to fall over.' And we would say, 'That is because you won't mothball them! This is your fault. If you mothballed them 10 years ago, you would be preserving. You are terrible people!' We were able to be in the room at least and be on the record as expressing that they had not done their due diligence and that they were terrible, terrible people. We at least had our place at the table even though, in the end, we weren't thrilled with the result. Some of the people were. The elected officials were largely happy with saving two buildings and demolishing the rest for a supermarket which they felt the community desperately needed.

48:18

C: These people who were saying that these building were unsavable, were they architects or who were they?

F: The person who headed up the Section 106 process there was the US Army Corps of Engineers because they were the group that technically owned the buildings. It was a government property and they technically owned the buildings, so they were the kind of lead of the hearings. So I suppose there was money out there years ago to mothball these buildings and it had never been done and so the blame was just floating around between all the state agencies and they were saying 'Well we weren't supposed to do it. They were.' 'Oh no, we weren't supposed to do it. They were.'
And so it was just a lot of finger pointing and it was very hard to get to the bottom of that. In the end, we could have sued them, but we just felt like, we had gone through the whole process, it took 3 years, and we were just like 'I think we're done.' We all signed the memorandum or the agreement at the end where we all say we agree with what the final decision was, and we signed it, but we were like 'We're not happy.' And some people didn't sign it. Some people refused to sign it. And that's fine. That's their choice.

C: So the memorandum is saying, 'Ok we're done with this. We won't sue.'

F: Yeah, or just that we agree with the findings. That we've all come to an agreement that keeping 2 buildings is the most feasible and appropriate way to handle this. So that's the National Register. It's a very strange kind of beast. It doesn't really protect that much and when it does protect, you have to go through this kind of long, laborious process that is not perfect, but it does sometimes save... I have a friend who works for the National Park Service, which oversees that process, and yeah, in some cases, they'll say 'You have to make the road go that way. Why have you not looked at making the road go that way instead of this way?' And the state will be like, 'Fine. If you insist.' Or 'We'll pick up the property and we'll move it, and we'll pay for that.' So it's a case by case basis.

C: So moving forward, do you think more advocacy would help.

F: Yeah, I think so. Definitely. For modern, I think that's the only thing. Its still a heavy lift. Even in NYC, which it shouldn't be that difficult. Besides Docomomo, there's not really a strong interest in how to preserve all these modern buildings. It's still very quiet in NYC, which it seems like, if any place in the US, New York would be... but LA seems to be the city that is really taken on [the challenge], and I have to give major credit to the LA Conservancy. They have done amazing work on preserving modern architecture.

C: I suppose the modern architecture they have out there is so tied up with show business.

F: Some of it, and some of it not. A lot of it, a lot of their architecture is modern, but right now, they're trying to save a bank, and they're like 'Well, this bank branch actually replaced a very important building that was demolished in the 60s that we fought to save, so this bank, we should be angry - you know, it's talking about modern buildings replaced buildings you were trying to save in the first place. But the bank branch doesn't seem of particular significance, but they're saying that it is just as part of the development of that area. They're doing so much. They just got Beverly Hills to put in a preservation ordinance. It had no preservation ordinance at all. You could just demolish anything in Beverly Hills no matter how important it was, and now Beverly Hills has a list of the, I want to say it's a list of the 26 or so 'Master Architects', and if your building was built by one of those master architects, you have to go to the City of Beverly Hills and talk to them before you demolish it. And before that, in Beverly Hills, you could demolish whatever you wanted to without talking to anybody.

C: So essentially, if your building was built by Neutra, any of those, you're building is 'listed'?

F: Well, it's not 'listed'. My understanding is that there is an injunction put there, so... There's one right now, it might be by Frank Lloyd Wright's son, Lloyd Wright, and I'm not sure, there's a building right now that someone just applied for a demolition permit and they had to go to the City. And I don't know what the next step is. Essentially, there is a hearing, I believe there is a board at the City of Beverly Hills that now reviews and says, 'Ok, should we list this building?' But they can also say, 'No it's fine. It's Neutra, but we actually think its a lesser Neutra work. Sure you can go ahead and demolish it.' So its not perfect, but its a hold, you place a hold on that building for the stage of the review. But it's so new; it hasn't really been tested yet.

C: So its the LA Conservancy and the Beverly Hills Preservation Ordinance?
F: Yeah, I would just call the LA Conservancy. Linda... she's the executive director of that. She's fantastic. She's been there for like 30 years.

C: The Getty in LA: do they have a modern programme now?

F: Right. And that was one thing with Linda, who is now one of the people in charge of the Survey LA, which is surveying all of LA, everything. They're surveying everything in LA. They're essentially just surveying the whole city and going through every subdivision and saying, 'Ok, this subdivision is possibly significant. This subdivision is not significant.' They have never had a city-wide survey, so the Getty is paying for essentially a survey of every building in LA.

C: Wow. I wonder how many people they're employing.

F: A lot. It's a lot of consultants and the main thing, she explained it, that they're maybe an eighth of the way through the project. It's going to take years.

F: When I was out there a few years ago, they were doing tours... It was when they did a whole programme called 'The 60s turn 50'.

C: And that was through the Getty?

F: No, that was through the LA Conservancy, but the Getty was involved because we toured a building on the Getty grounds and they were involved in that. And now they're advocating and looking at 70s architecture, which I don't think anyone else is doing.

C: Wow. English Heritage has just started. Elain Harwood just put out a book called 'The Seventies' or something like that.

F: Yeah, but yeah, they're doing tours of 70s architecture and even early 80s architecture, and they're explaining to people why this architecture is important.

C: the 80s would be a hard sell

F: Yeah, but they have their group of Frank Gehry and those kind of, I don't know what its called, but it's like Frank Gehry and his group of architects that were out there. I think they're all still around, but its just talking about did this really work and this is why it's important. Its all very postmodern. People are like, 'But this went up like 15 years ago...'
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C: Post-war tower block housing at NYU? Do you know anything about that?

F: Yeah, so there is Washington Square Village, there's Silver Towers, which is an IM Pei development. So there is 3 towers, 2 of which I believe, they are landmarked, they were landmarked about 4 years ago. That was another thing where people were like 'Why are we landmarking this? This is urban renewal.' But the people who are there love them. So two of them are NYU faculty housing and one of them is private residences. So that's been a big issue because NYU wants to build, and so on that site that's not landmarked is a grocery store, like a one storey grocery store in the corner, so NYU wants to build a similar tower on that and people are like 'No, no, no. We have to keep the open space here.' So there's been that kind of fight, and then in front of that is Washington Square Village, which is a lower-rise, maybe 8 storey buildings of white brick. I believe it is also faculty housing for NYU. I don't know how you would describe it - more traditional, its like a square and there's a big courtyard in the middle that's Sasaki, its a Sasaki landscape. These buildings each have a balcony and each balcony has a different coloured panel on the front of it. You'll recognise the kind of typology of it. And so NYU would like to remove the Sasaki garden in the middle and put a large - I think they call it the zipper - a large building in the middle of the courtyard for classrooms. So essentially take out the open space and put in a
building. It's all owned by NYU. And so the NYU faculty has been really fighting this. There's a group called NYU against the Sexton plan.

C: Sexton is the developer?

F: No, he's the president of the university and its his plan. And so, we've been involved in suing the pants off of NYU about this plan and how it would destroy the neighbourhood. And its affecting almost all modern buildings [and landscapes]. Silver Towers is landmarked. Washington Square Village is not landmarked.

1:02:50

F: So there's the modern church up here that's not landmarked and then there's another one down on 2nd Ave that's very brutalist. But that church down there, its very brutalist, its not really by anybody [important], it's done by these New Jersey architects who did a lot of Catholic churches, and they just did a historic district down 2nd Ave and cut that out. Yep, it goes right around the building.

C: What? So that's 2nd Ave and?

F: 2nd Ave and 2nd St I believe. I think it's beautiful but people really hate it. And it was built on the site of a really gorgeous 1870s gothic church that burnt down in the 60s, but it was by a very important architect. There are some landmarked churches in NYC that are midcentury, but happen to fall within historic districts, so they're not landmarked through their own merit, but they're landmarked because they are in a neighbourhood...

C: And they haven't drawn the line around them...

F: Yeah, they're right smack in the middle of the neighbourhood so you couldn't draw the line around them, so you just include it. They'll cut you out on the edge, but they won't cut you out of the centre. So there's that, I'm trying to think of anything else modern... I don't know if you've been up Park Avenue to see the Seagram Building and...

C: Oh yeah, that was part of a walking tour

F: Yeah, so the Seagram Building and the Lever House across the street, those are the two that people think of when you say landmarked modern buildings in NYC.

C: I feel like landmarking commercial buildings would be the most controversial in terms of property value. I mean, they are incredible, but I think it’s a bit funny that they haven't gone for some of the smaller buildings, like churches by famous architects

F: I think churches here are a heavy lift because the congregations are shrinking and the money is not there, so the churches are say, 'We don't have the money to maintain this', whereas with the office buildings, the developers are saying 'we don't want this, but are wealthy enough that we'll deal with it.' I mean, there is a big fight up there now around Lever House and the Seagram Building because they're doing this - did they talk about the midtown rezoning? And how they want to build super towers, and people like HDC and other preservation groups think that there are other modern buildings that should be landmarked and the developers are saying, 'No that's it. Those two. There's not really anything else up here that we think is worth keeping.' And we're like, 'No, we think there's quite a bit more.' Did they talk about the Frank Lloyd Wright showroom? Ok, so like a few blocks North of the Seagrams Building, there was an office building with a Frank Lloyd Wright auto showroom in it. It was just one storey and it had a little ramp like at the Guggenheim and it was I think Jaguar was the car dealership that was there, and they just moved out, so the Landmarks Commission said, 'Oh! We should landmark this!' And the owners of the building immediately ripped the whole showroom out. So the Landmarks Commission sent them a letter saying we're interested in landmarking this, and they didn't hear back, so they sent them
another letter and within a day or two the owner just demolished the whole showroom down to the bare space and said, 'Well you can't do it now.' It had been largely altered but it was still all white, mirrored and white. It was very seventies and very cool. But because they're worried about more landmarking coming up in that area, they tore it down. And there's another building down the street that was not midcentury, it was 1920s and it had all this tile work on the front of it. So the Landmarks Commission said, 'We think this is kind of interesting' and the owners tore all the tile off the front of it and said, 'Well you can't landmark it now. All the tiles are gone.' So we're seeing more of that up there where people are quickly moving to do something to make sure that they are not landmarked. So I think that will continue to be a big fight up there.

C: I don't know if I'd have the heart to work here.

F: It's not boring!

C: The Guggenheim is landmarked though, isn't it?

F: Yep, and again, I don't know if the Guggenheim is landmarked out of its own significance, which it has, or if it is part of the 5th Avenue [historic district]. That's also part of the large Upper East Side, because the Guggenheim is largely surrounded by mansions, Victorian mansions and that sort of thing so it could have been thrown in there when it was originally landmarked back in the 1990s and actually it wasn't considered on its own. I mean it should be its own individual, and maybe it is, but I think those kinds of buildings its like 'Yes lets save it' but it wasn't saved on its own, it just happened to be near other beautiful buildings.

5.3.5. ELIZABETH GALES, HESS ROISE AND COMPANY - CEDAR SQUARE WEST

Minneapolis, Minnesota

3 July 2013

[E]: Elizabeth Gales
[C]: Caroline Engel

C: Basically, just to start, just to explain what your role was in writing the nomination and anything to do with that?

E: Ok, so our company, we're historical consultants. We are regularly hired to do national register nominations, often times, most people aren't just nominating for the heck of it, its because they're required to by say the government, because I don't know how familiar you are with the historic preservation in the US, section 106 process

C: I did most of my education in the UK so I don't know it as well as I should.

E: Right, ok. I'll do a little background. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 has a section called 106, which means that any time a federal agency does a project and federal funds are involved, the have to access whether or not cultural resources will be impacted. The National Environment Protection Act (NEPA), which was passed I think in '68, reinforced that. So for example, Central Corridor, there were lots of historic resources along University Avenue that have been impacted, therefore the MET Council is paying for the National Register Nominations to put all those resources on the National Register. Another example, the University of Minnesota Northrup Mall area had already been sort of determined to be a historic district, so I'm not sure
who's paying for what, if the Metropolitan Council is paying the University money, but the University will list Northrup Mall and the historic district on the National Historic Register eventually.

C: And that's along the green line corridor.

E: Yeah, it's across from Washington Avenue. So, that's one reason why people list things on the National Registers - because they have to - or a lot of times because of historic tax credits. So the Historic Tax Credits, I want to say it was created in the 1970s as part of that whole legislation. And then people took advantage of it. It used to be for every historic property including private residences, and people maybe abused it a little bit, so during the Reagan era, it was restructured. Now you can only get tax credits if its an income generating property, so for example, condominiums, which are owned, or houses owned and lived in by that person, are not eligible. Apartments - yes. Offices - yes. Because its a rental and there's an income. Commercial properties, things that you can generate income from - yes. Some states have state tax credit programmes that cover the holes; Minnesota does not. So how does this relate to Cedar Square West, otherwise know as Riverside Plaza - that's its current name. Well the company that owns it, Sherman Associates, has done a lot of historic tax credit projects. We'd worked with them on other developments. And they had reached a point with this property where they needed to put a significant amount of money basically into infrastructure, so sanitary and water lines, mechanical systems, mechanical plant, and essentially, all that work that had been done in the 1970s, some of it had reached the end of its life. In the case of the sanitary lines, it had been improperly insulated so it was rusting from the outside in. And so they had, for example, in the 39-storey building - 39 storeys of failing 100-year cast iron. And the building engineer was this amazing man, who said, "Yeah, I've stood in a shower of sewage."

C: In that building?

E: Uh huh, trying to get to the shut off valve at 35 storeys, because of course, everything is vertically stacked. So huge expensive replacements to deal with. They also had problems with sliding doors that had outlived their lifespan, you know just the wear and tear, they were heavy and hard to operate. It turns out they were inadequate. The windload values and the analysis of windloads have changed since the 1970s, so they were structurally inadequate for the windloads. So there were things like that that really needed to be done. So to finance it, because it was going to be a heck of a finance, they were also, and to understand the details of the ownership, I still don't quite... The original owners who defaulted on their loan to HUD, and HUD took over the property, and then sold it to Sherman... Sherman was really part of a limited partnership that owned it. The City of Minneapolis also had a stake in it, and the City was very interested with getting out. They didn't care to be a property owner anymore after 30 years, so as part of this deal, they were restructuring the mortgage because essentially they were selling the property to a new entity, of which Sherman would be the majority owner. And so there was a lot of very complex financing that was going on, not just for the rehab work but for refinancing this 30-year mortgage. And I believe HUD was involved with that as well. HUD has really always been involved with the project as affordable housing. And they also had the Google Foundation put money in.

C: Really?
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E: Yeah, Google invested in it, as did the foundation for AFLCIO, which is a labour union.

C: What would be the benefit to them to invest in it?

E: Well, it was a job creator for the construction industry, and AFLCIO was related to the construction industry, and also its essentially a retirement foundation so its a good investment opportunity. A good return on their money. So historic tax credits was a huge part of the financing,
and the timing that they did I think wait, because they have been trying to pass for a years a Minnesota tax credit programme, which would be a 20% match to the federal.

C: So it would be 40% total?

E: Yeah, 40% of the eligible costs.

C: For anything that's listed on the National Register? Or is it just for any historic building?

E: It has to be listed on the National Register, or if it's a local district, it has to have been determined eligible for the Register. So they hadn't done any analysis of history, so they approached us, 1. to find out if it was eligible, and when Charlene who is my boss, who has a pretty good gut instinct after years of doing this, she says, 'Oh yeah, oooh yeah. This is a good one. People are going to hate that we are listing it on the National Register!'

C: Did they?

E: Oh yeah! It was a travesty against history! Some people really hated it. Well, because it tore down structures back in the day and these are people who remember that and the original development had a lot of corruption issues with it, with the owner, which is why it never spread beyond what you see. I mean, originally the whole West Bank was supposed to look like.

C: Yeah, I've been in the archives and I had no idea how large the project was meant to be, but where was the money going? Was it going into pockets?

E: I don't think it had to do with money. It had to do with, they were skimping on their environmental regulations, at least that's what they got them under. Keith Heller though was notorious for, you know, nobody liked him.

C: I read the Rapson book, and he's painted quite nicely in there.

E: Well, two sides to every story, or more than two sides. So, there were some issues with it that it never got beyond that first phase, but our response was, 'Whether you love it or hate it, there's no denying that it was important for what it did with the city and what it did for affordable housing.' It was its own, there were only two developments from HUD in that phase...

C: What was the other one?

E: I'm not sure what it was called but it was on Roosevelt Island in New York

C: Oh right, yeah, it's by Josep Lluis Sert...

E: I'm not sure either, but it was the 'New Town In Town' programme. There were really only two large projects - this one and that one. So, it is essentially one of only two examples of this important phase in public housing. So its definitely historic. We prepared the National Register with the knowledge that it would be going because of historic tax credits, so they did kind of wait, because it was getting closer and closer to passing, and it finally did, the state programme. And it passed as part of a jobs creation bill, along with a lot of support from the construction industry, and it succeeded. I mean this project (Cedar Riverside) put at least 300 people to work over a couple of years. It was interesting... [9:30] It has always been part of jobs creation since it was passed, as part of your state programme, you have to account for how many construction jobs you've created, because that's part of the tracking, and you know costs toward labour as opposed to costs toward materials, they want to make sure that that... So I think its been very successful in that sense. At the time when it was passed, I can't remember if it was 2008 or 2009, I mean it was pretty much at one of the low points of the recession, construction industry had basically come to a standstill, and it seemed that once work started that most of the big work was historic tax credits. I mean, that's my biased opinion, but Cedar Square was a huge one, we worked on the Ford Center, which is
over by the ballpark. You'll see it when you go over there. It's right across from the lightrail station. It's a tall, 10-storey warehouse building with a lot of glazing. It was the original Ford plant, where they made Model T's. And then, right as they were building that, Ford created this concept of the horizontal assembly line. So they finished, they did the vertical thing, so basically the car would get assembled all the way down and they had giant freight elevators that you could drive a car into, and then you would drive it out the door or put it on a train. And so they used that building while they pursued another property purchase, and they finally bought what became the Highland Park plant in the 1920s.

C: Which has just been demolished?

E: Exactly, so this ironically is now one of the only remnants of Ford's assembly in Minnesota.
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C: Would the one on Highland Park ever have been eligible for listing?

E: We evaluated it, parts of it would have been, but they had actually demolished parts to build new sections, new sections kind of swallowed up old ones.

C: It had been in use for over 50 years...

E: Yeah, so unfortunately the integrity was the issue when it came down to it. We actually did the evaluation, and we really really wanted it to be, but it didn't shake out.

C: And what's the one by the ballpark used for now?

E: Offices. Honeywell, who did, you know, thermostats and radiators. And they also built bombs. They built the timer parts that go on to munitions. Anyway, they owned it for quite awhile, until like the 1990s, and then it was used for small offices, got subdivided and then they rehabbed it under this programme. And the company that rehabbed it is part of the family that owns the Twins. So they wisely bought the property when it was cheap, held on to it until the right moment, redeveloped it, because they really wanted good real estate around the ballpark, so there's an example of that. It looks good. So that why Cedar Square was listed in the National Register, and you said you were able to get a hold of the nomination online?

C: Yep, I've had a read through that.

E: So it's pretty lengthy because it had to be since the 50-year guidance that the National Register has - this definitely is not 50 years old, so we had to make the case for it being exceptionally significant.

C: So Criteria G...

E: Criteria Consideration G

C: Right, so its not that you list it under A, B, C, etc?

E: Yeah, there are four Criteria - A, B, C, D - D is archaeological, A is for patterns of events which is what a lot of buildings are eligible under, B is for significant people, and C is for architectural and engineering. So its eligible under A and C, I believe, because of its importance in city development planning related to HUD and public housing, and then under C for its connection to Ralph Rapson. And then there are the Criteria Consideration, which are religious properties, cemeteries, um if half a building has been removed and reconstructed, there are many of these, and then the last one is less than 50 years of age.

C: Criteria Considerations - are these sort of exemptions?
E: Yes. So essentially, for example, let's say a church gets nominated, it would be I think Criteria Consideration A, so essentially these are considerations that you apply to the criteria A, B, C, D. So Criteria Consideration A I believe is the one for religious properties. Usually a religious property isn't significant because it's religious. It's significant for another reason, because all people's faith is important to them, and then all religious properties would be significant. So you're saying that it meets this criteria consideration because it's important for one of these other reasons. So in this case, it is exceptionally significant even though it's young, relatively young, and here's why. And so they tell you that you have to provide scholarly background that shows that that has been reviewed by various scholars and that they say its important, its not just because you do. So that's one of the reasons why we had such a very thorough statement of significance or argument for the history, but actually, I think there were people in Washington D.C. at the National Park Service, who over sees the programme, who were pretty excited.

C: Really?

E: Yeah, because you know, the recent past, I think there are a lot of people who don't want to deal with it, and they're part of the old guard, because they were the ones who were battling against teardown, and I can appreciate that. But then there are people who are like, 'Well, you know what, they're here to stay. What are we going to do?' They're, I think, looking for as much information as they can so they can start figuring out how to analyse them. So I think that helped to set some foundations for them. And we've done some other projects that at the time we nominated them, they were built in the early 60s and we nominated them in the early 2000s, and so we had to do a lot of work.

C: Did they go through?

E: Uh huh.

C: Which ones were those?

E: Um the one that comes to mind what's now Westin Minneapolis. It's an old bank building on 6th Street and Marquette. It has half naked men on the front, it has [base relief] sculptures of a farmer and a mechanic because it was Farmer and Mechanics Savings Bank, and the banking hall dates from the 1940s, but behind it is an International Style office tower that was built in '63. And we nominated it when it was only 45 years old. Again, it was tax credits for a hotel, and so we really needed the office tower, which is where the hotel rooms are at, to be contributing or else they wouldn't be able to get any money out of it. And the banking hall is the lobby and restaurant. And so we did a great history of urban renewal in Minneapolis and how this actually is an example. The bank could have moved, but the bank drew a line in the sand, and said 'We believe in downtown Minneapolis' when all the other corporations were fleeing, and said 'look, we're going to build this office tower'. And then they also invested money in new construction that was going on in the urban renewal area. They said, 'we're going to give loans to this construction because we believe in this new construction', the irony being that a lot of its now been torn down. So we made a very convincing argument for it and its been rehabbed, and its a fabulous building. And now its the Westin for a few years. So its really good to walk by it. If you get a chance, you should go into the 40s section and take a look. [18:05] The exterior of the curtain wall system on the office tower had been painted grey and some of it was peeling, and they really wanted to tear it off because it was terrible, and we have the photos, and it was three shades of [aqua?] blue with the anodised aluminum... I mean, just so midcentury fabulous, and so, they got up there and they put somebody out on a rigging with some orange cleaner, like household orange cleaner and water, and they were able to just scrub off all the paint because the [porcelainised?] enamel panels were fine. It turns out the paint was just insecure, so they basically just washed, they just had someone with a soft brush and household cleaner, and they were like, 'This is the best money we've ever spent!' The bang for your buck! I think everybody loved it. It was like this great reveal; it went from being blah to being fabulous.
E: So our company is kind of known, and in fact, our success with the Westin also convinced the developer to trust us on Cedar Square, because we locally have built a reputation for not being afraid to challenge and go for, to do the research and make the case for these buildings that some people may otherwise over look.

C: Mary Tyler Moor!

E: I know! That too! I mean it was really an interesting idea. I think Rapson, if you read his book you'll know, he meant it to really be this interesting, lovely ideological thing. Of course, reality didn't really work out that way, for a lot of reasons. I actually met an architect who had worked on Rapson's team when he was right out of college, so yeah, he was probably one of the guys doing all the hand drafting at Cedar Riverside, and he said the inflation when they were constructing it, it was like almost every month the materials costs were just increasing, and he said they had to keep cutting things out of the project to save money. And he said it was so heart-breaking and frustrating for the design team because what finally did get built was not what their original vision had included. It was built relatively cheaply because of all the financing and issues that were involved. He said he basically spent the first couple years of his career revising the drawings because of inflation. Fixtures, even construction materials... They found issues when they were doing the rehab where they had skimped on structure! Can you believe it?

C: Not enough rebar?

E: Well in one case, no framing. So you know there are those two little white commercial buildings that sit in the middle of the courtyards?

C: Yeah and they've got those slanted roofs?

E: Yep, yep, and they're not mostly used for the charter school that is there. So they sort of float on the structure of the parking garage. I like to think of it like a [??] or a strawberry plant, right? The slabs of the parking garage are basically all connected to the slabs of the towers, and so the towers kind of grow out of the parking garage. Its not quite an honest comparison, but the post-tension concrete slabs are all interconnected. Those two little buildings essentially sit on top of that post concrete structure. They could be demolished and it wouldn't impact the parking garage structure except for a little... They're essentially framed structures sitting on top of the massive concrete structure. You kind of get a sense when you go over there of the multiple grade separations that he was envisioning for the whole West Bank. So they're an example. Anyway, all the exposed faces, like any parts of those buildings that didn't have any overhang shielding the windows, the windows were in terrible shape, they were hollow steel, they rusted through. So for example, one side of the charter school building that overlooks what used to be a swimming pool and is now a playground, all those windows had to be replaced. They were rusting out and the glazing... just terrible. So they figured, they found a good aluminum insulated glazing system that would work and they were allowed to do operable windows - I think some of the other windows had operable sections. They took them out and realised the walls had not been framed. The exterior walls had not been framed. The windows were essentially holding up the walls. I mean it was just such a silly, 'you couldn't believe they actually got away with it' construction thing, but they figured they must have done it so cheaply... They also found within the apartment units on the towers [24:00] that there were sections where the walls went into glass windows and they weren't properly fitted out.

C: So it was just like window butted up to concrete wall?

E: Up to jipboard wall without any structural reinforcing and framing.

C: So the windows could really just have fallen out?

E: Yeah, yeah! Or the wall could have shifted if the pressure of the slabs weren't holding it together. It's like they cut all these little corners. And so the architect would call and we'd be like,
'What is it now?' And it wasn't too bad, but it was 'What now? What's wrong?' and he'd say, 'Well, we've discovered that this window isn't really being supported by anything and so we needed to add some framing.' And I'm like, 'It's fine. It's fine. They will understand.'

C: So do they have to go through you for the tax credit funds? Do you have to approve everything they're doing?

E: Yeah, so the way our company works with historic tax credits, its a lot of paperwork, you have to do an itemised scope of work. And every project is a little different in how you break down that scope of work. A lot of times, you can do exterior and masonry together unless there is a lot of variety in the masonry or the repair that has to be done. Different windows will be different items. We advise them on what will be accepted, because there are some architecture firms that specialise in historic preservation, and they do their own tax credit applications, but a lot of them don't. And modern building practice in architecture doesn't consider reuse and preservation, and so that's why we have a job. And so we advise them, you know, there are these standards laid out by the federal government - yes this is going to meet it or no it won't. We try to help them think of compromises and creative ideas to deal with issues. So we fill out all the paperwork, there's all these photographs that have to come in before the work is done, all the drawings, they want to review them. You have to include all the information from specks within the volume. Sometimes they'll actually want to see the speck. This project actually changed their mind. They were like, 'We don't ever need to see a speck again', because they had such a large mass of paper that had to come with this project.

C: And this goes out to Washington?

E: Yeah, so it goes through the State Historic Preservation Office first. They get a first look. Sometimes they'll advise you if they want things changed, and then they'll send comments with it to Washington, and then Washington will also use them as their eyes on the ground, since Washington can't get out here. So let's say there's something that, doesn't matter how you photograph it, you need to see it in person, they'll come and make a site visit. So often times they'll approve masonry, repointing, stucco repair, in this case, the colour of the panels, which was restored.

C: Right. Are those original?

E: Yep, that's the original colour scheme, and they have been painted pink and brown, like all the grey at some point... The rumour that we kept hearing from different people, we never found written documentation, was that… remember the City had an ownership stake in it. Somebody at the city hated the grey, and so they said, 'You should paint it happier colours', and so the colours they chose were a dark brown and a Pepto-Bismol pink, which did not age well, the pink especially. And then the other, the sort of basic primary colour panels had faded significantly, so the light blue one, for example, looked like it was grey, and then the dark blue one looked like it was light blue, the red looked kind of orangey, so we were lucky that Rapson had put paint schedules or colour schedules on his elevation, and we had an aerial, this colour historic photograph that gave us a sense of how vivid they were.

C: Was this just after construction?

E: Yeah, and so they went through with Sherwin Williams and figured out a concrete paint colour that would hold up, and that was pretty close. It was a relatively small part of the budget, and that the developer considered cutting, but everybody, the architect and we kept telling him, 'No, no, because nobody else has seen what you're doing with the interior. This is going to be what gets you public support', and sure enough, everybody I think agrees that the repainting was a good idea. And a lot of the modern architecture fans around town, every time I saw them, because they knew we were working on it, they were like 'Oh my God, Thank you! I almost crashed into another car.
on the interstate, I couldn't believe how good it looked!' So that really had a lot of bang for the buck, a lot of good will was won there.

C: And is that the extent of restoration that they did with this project?

E: They also did stuff with the post-tension cable pockets, which you wouldn't notice, but the post-tension cable pockets come to the end of the slabs and are exposed on the exterior, and they were mortared, so essentially a slightly softer concrete than the slab itself. They had had a couple of the cables fail in the past and essentially they snapped and the ends came into a person's living room. Luckily nobody was injured, but basically their ceiling gave way because the ceiling is just jip board against the concrete slab, and so essentially you have this giant steel cable... Luckily only a couple have snapped, but as part of this deal, they had a structural engineer check everything, which is a heck of a lot to review on all of those giant towers. And so they decided they should re-mortar all of them, as part of the checking they had to dig the mortar out, and it took a lot, but we got permission with the help of a conservator to put an elastomeric coating on the edges of the concrete slabs that allowed water, some breathability but also really protected the pockets. The hope is that it will give them a longer lifespan before they have to redo the mortar again. But again, a sign of how cheaply it was built that they would leave, in the harsh climate that is Minnesota, that they would leave these mortar pockets exposed on the exterior with just some concrete on them. So they recoated all the exterior. They had to do some concrete repair where there was spalling, a lot of times where the balcony met the concrete, and then they did...

C: Was it the railings that were rusting?

E: The railings were pretty good, but there was some rusting. It kind of depended on the face of the building. So they did repair, rather than completely replace the railings... You probably heard about the little child that... You didn't hear about the accident?

C: No, was that recent?

E: Yeah, yeah, this spring. [31:20] A 18 month old or 2 year old somehow either got through the railing or climbed over the railing and fell 11 storeys. Luckily he fell onto an area with mulch and he lived. He had a punctured lung and his skull was fractured, but he was conscious when they came and picked him up for the hospital. The father was alone with the kids, him and a 3 or 4-year-old girl, and the dad went into the kitchen and the little girl came in and said the baby fell. And it was interesting because the community was like 'We need to make sure everything is safe', but then it died down pretty quick and I have a feeling, because they're all new patio doors, I have a feeling their patio door lock may have been broken and they may not have reported it for repairs because they probably would have been charged. The lawyer who works for the developer suggested that that might be the case. So they promised to look into childproof locks, and you know they will do the old heavy dowel in the door to keep it closed, but essentially, you know, there might have been as much parental error as... So the railings are wider than 4", I think they're 5.5", but they do meet code because the building was grandfathered in. So they just essentially did welding repairs to make sure they're all stable, but to replace all the railings would have been very, very, very expensive. In an ideal world, they would have done it, and done the 4" gap, but the height is fine. So in some ways it benefited from being a recent past building because a lot of it met contemporary code, you know, handrails in the stairwells - they were fine. So a lot of it was really very straightforward. The other thing that was nice about the historic tax credits is because everything was this unit that was just repeated on a very large scale, it was actually sometimes a more straightforward application than some of our other buildings. All the railings are the same, here's what we're going to do to repair them. All the ceilings, here's what we're going to do to repair them. So even though it was multiplied by 1400, it was a lot more straightforward than a quirky old building that has lots of various things that have happened to it.

C: And they refurbished the interior of the flats? Was that just to get anything out from the 1970s?

E: No, not necessarily.
C: No? They kept some stuff?

E: Yeah, well the apartments are essentially white boxes with the texture-finished ceilings - which is asbestos. So they painted for encapsulation. They essentially repainted the units. They repaired anything that was broken because of wear and tear, but they, for example, the cabinets. They have a cabinetmaker on site because they are consistently having to repair cabinets. The cabinets are particle board laminate and they kept the historic... the architect said this is the first time in his career he has specked out a faux walnut veneer laminate cabinet because its so very much of the period. They did do accessibility improvements. They had to sprinkle every unit, which was huge - for fire protection. Previously the corridors had been sprinkled, so there were these soffits that went down the corridors and there was a sidewalk that went into the units and covered the door, but the City required them to sprinkle all the high-rise towers. That was something we had to work with because its a very open plan within the units, and we were very concerned with having soffits cross these very floor-to-ceiling openings. So we did it very carefully in the hallways, tried to conceal things, put them in the nooks and corners of bedrooms and have sidewalls, and it worked out really well. But as long as people don't disturb the ceilings, they just repaint it for encapsulation because otherwise, to scrape that off would have been expensive because of the abatement. So they repainted everybody's units, if there was asbestos in the flooring, then they replaced the flooring with new vinyl tile, but it was actually pretty straightforward. The first few units [36:05], they hadn't planned to repaint, and what they did was they set up one building in preparation, as people moved out, they kept it vacant, and so they were able to shift people into other units until the whole building was vacant, and they turned it into a hotel. This was really interesting logistically for them, because a lot of these people have government-financed housing. They can't be out of their unit for any longer than 28 days, even in this case. Then you would have to go through all new paperwork and re-file for everything, which would be a terrible, terrible thing. Some of them might lose their status, etc. So essentially, they had to do all the work, get them out of their apartment, do the work, and get them back into their apartment in 28 days. So they first figured out how... remember most of this was sewage, heating lines that had to be replaced, the little fan coil units had to be replaced or refurbished, so they figured out that units were vertically stacked [37:15], so they would get a group around that unit, that would be what they would address first. They would move everybody out; they had the hotel units fully furnished with furniture, a tv, kitchen equipment, they asked people to take their clothes and anything important to them. Everything else they left in the apartment. They took pictures of everything and how it looked, then they moved everything over to one side and sealed off that area, so it was out of the way of all the work they had to do, depending on what the scope was. They did all the work, moved everything back to how it looked using the photographs, and then moved [the occupants] back in. Although the first group of people thought they were getting their units repainted and they weren't, and it was a huge deal, and so from then on, they repainted the units. So then, they would shift the furniture over, repaint, shift the furniture over, seal it off, do all the work, repaint the rest of the unit, put everything back to the way it should be, then bring them back in. They got it down pat. Because I didn't spend as much time over there as the architects or obviously the contractors, the contractors and everybody who spent any time over there went through a cultural sensitivity training, because of the diversity of the population and some of the sensitive cultural issues involved especially with the East African community, and the fact that many of the people there during the day are women, alone you know. So they were very careful about that and trying to make sure... They hired extra staff in the administrative visiting office with interpreters and everything, to make sure that everybody was able to communicate. Basically they were doing everything the possibly could to make sure that people understood what was going on, to have people be able to communicate. I think they did a good job. There will always be people who criticise, but overall, I think it was a vast improvement and the changes that they did were huge, because you know, having reliable water and sewer and updating all the different machinery that supplied that was a big deal.

C: So all this work, did it cost the residents anything?

E: No.

C: They still have the same rent or subsidized rent payments?
E: Exactly, exactly. And that was part of the deal, part of the reason for the 28 days.

C: And is it all affordable housing in there?

E: I wouldn't say 100%, but its really really high. And actually, through this process, people who hadn't been, who were not already subsidized, they did do an evaluation and there was an increase, which they had planned in. They realised that some people probably were. The especially had some older people who I don't think had been evaluated. And they've actually had some folks who have lived there since it was built. It's a perfect location for them, why would they move?

C: Were you able to talk to any of them?

E: You know, I didn't necessarily, but they did come out. The developer was very good about having spokes people come and talk at events, and so there was Laotian gentleman and he and his family moved there when it first opened, they were refugees, and he's like, 'I went to college here. Why would I leave? This is perfect for me.' He's been there since 1973-74. I imagine he's probably moved units but...

C: There are like 3 and 4 bedroom units, correct?

E: Yes, 2 and 3.

C: So the ones that were originally designed as luxury flats, like Chase House, have those been subdivided or converted?

E: Nope. Those are still very much... you know the finishes are very simple. If you've seen any of the pictures, like we came across publicity materials that showed that people wallpapered the units, put in shag carpeting.

C: That wasn't included?

E: No, I think maybe the people in Chase House were allowed to do what they wanted, but now its a hard surface floor, its sort of a white box. And because of sensitivity cultural issues, most of the units we saw were always vacant. So they'd already been stripped of any of their stuff, so I don't know how people decorate, or how they're allowed to decorate, but I have a feeling they, you know, everybody makes it their home, so.

C: Is it private property, or would I be allowed to walk in there?

E: Yeah, you can walk in there. They do have security, and so security might ask you know, 'What's going on?', and when we had started the project, the stuff with Al-Shebaab had hit the news, the terrorist organisation in Somalia, and they had recruited young men from Minneapolis to go over there and be suicide bombers, that had kind of hit the news right as we were doing this, and Charlene went over there with permission of the owner, and somebody from the National Park Service was recording a little video and they had to make sure it was ok, because somebody from the BBC had been over there to do an expose about being recruited and they hadn't asked for permission. Evidently they were upsetting the residents and so the security had to ask the BBC to leave, because they hadn't asked for permission to come and put a microphone in people's face and ask what they think about young men dying. They just showed up. But in general, if you walk through and act like you know where you're going, and if people say 'Why are you here?' just say, 'Oh well, I'm a historian. I'm an architecture fan. I just want to see the property', they mostly are ok with that.

C: Well, I was just asking because I went there before I came here...
E: Did you get in trouble?

C: [laughs] Not in trouble, but I didn't get the warmest welcome. I was just walking through and looking around the outdoor public spaces, and I found this resident's office, so I went up, the door was open, and I said, you know, 'I'm a PhD researcher from Scotland. Do you mind if I ask you some questions about the renovation?' And she, 'How did you get in here? That was done a few years ago. There's nobody here to talk to you.'

E: Oh, that's too bad. Yeah, I think they sometimes are a little sensitive. Technically it's private property, but it's also a public sort of area.

C: Yeah, obviously its private accommodation, but then I thought I may have been mistaken in assuming the outdoor spaces were public.

E: And its an interesting experience, I'll be blunt, if your skin was a different colour, you probably would never have been questioned, which in the United States, is an interesting situation.

C: I mean, everybody else was smiling, and they looked a little bit curious, and then I received sort of a rude welcome from her, but I imagine she does have to deal with problematic people or reporters coming in, painting an image they don't want.

E: I mean, I never had any problems there, though I remember once, you know, people in the Somali community, they have problems with the young men being in gangs, so sometimes there is violence, but that's why they have a security force. Part of this [work] actually was increasing the number of cameras around, and they redid the entire security office so that it was more up to date with its communication systems. When I went around to do my [??] photography, the security guard who came with me was former military. Yes, he's been in Iraq and Afghanistan, and it was interesting, he told me that, one thing I hadn't heard, he said, 'One of the things between the Somali people, the fighting between the Somali gangs - because there had been some shootings out there unfortunately at the time, not in Cedar Riverside, just in the community in general, and some young men had been killed - he said they actually had brought over tribal [feuds]... It was north and south Somali, evidently they brought over the conflict from Somali, and so they had actually segregated themselves here according to their geographical location in Somali. And so the tensions, he said its one of those cases where they are fighting something that they've been told, 'Oh we hate these people because...' It didn't really have to do with turf here so much as bringing over some old hate.

C: And so do they live separately here? Is there a sort of North and South Somali in Cedar Square West?

E: He seemed to suggest that there was. He seemed to suggest that Cedar might be more North and that the area around Lake St/Seward might be more South. I didn't know how much I could believe him, but it was interesting. It sounded plausible that, it makes complete sense that you bring those [traditions], you know, you mom tells you that you can't trust them, they did this to your grandfather, you know, stories that you hear. You know, I grew up in Texas and depending where you grew up there may be interstate tensions [relating to Mexico].

C: It's the same in Northern Ireland still, and it's not so much... you know the peace pact was made in the 1990s, but they keep having these riots and it's the sons of the fathers, and their fathers have all these glory stories and still harbour hatred toward the other side, and the kids just want to be a part of that.

E: It's not very healthy.

C: No, no. Most people don't live in the centre of Belfast anymore because of that. They live outside where people get along and they have a sensible head on their shoulders.
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E: Yeah, so it’s a weird thing, it doesn't make sense, but it's emotional. So yeah, whenever we went over, we would give a heads up, and of course they knew we were part of the construction crew if we had a construction hat on and a reflective vest.

[47:55]

E: I think it was a good thing, well I know it was a good thing. Of course when the newspaper published articles about it, there were racist comments made.

C: In the newspaper?!

E: Yeah, I remember the architect. They first published the article saying its been listed in the National Register and they're going to do this huge [renovation], they're going to invest how many hundreds of millions of dollars in this to improve the living conditions. This is very important, and so on. And the architect, he told me that he read the comment section on the Star Tribune website, and people were using the n-word and saying, 'why are you putting money into them when we need a new football stadium'. I was like, ‘you've got to be flipping kidding me. We're talking about somebody's life. We're not talking about your entertainment. We're talking about the place where you raise your children.’ And the architect got really upset, and I'm like, ‘don't read it.’ Who the heck has time to comment at 10a on Monday morning? People who have nothing better to do in their lives. Don't read it. So I think most people were very supportive. And the developers, early caught on because of long-time residents and residents who are there, for most people who come to the Twin Cities, when its come to the historic ways of the immigrant groups since the 1970s, starting with the Laotians, Cambodians, Hmong... They land here because it's affordable housing, because its a huge [development], I mean it's the most densely lived on block in the state of Minnesota. Essentially 5,000-6,000 people live on that block, and Minnesota doesn't have that density. And so, many of the reactions are from people who just aren't used to high-density living.

C: And many of the people coming in are used to that, and they're able to retain some of that close connectivity with neighbours.

E: Or compared to a refugee camp, this is a much better place and it’s affordable. And often times, a generation live there for a few years, they get their feet underneath them, and they're able to move somewhere else. And so, I must say, the local paper [Star Tribune] did a really good job at being supportive. They ran articles about East African families who lived there originally for maybe 5-10 years, and then moved out into the community, like this one family that they quoted. The husband was killed in Somali, back in the 90s and 2000s in the terrible war. The mother and her two or three daughters came here. They lived in Cedar Square; they lived in McKnight, the tall tower. Those kids went to school and the mother worked all sorts of cleaning jobs, but her daughter said she was nervous about the fire and what would happen if the girls became disoriented, so she would do these fire drills in the middle of the night, and wake them up at 3 in the morning. She had taught them this system. They lived like on one of the upper floors and they would take the stairs all the way down, and the idea was, she would do this randomly, so the idea was that if a fire broke out, her daughters wouldn't have to think, their bodies would kick in. They would grab whatever they were supposed to grab, and take the stairs, and she said, luckily she let them take the elevator back up. But you know, she said, yeah, maybe I was a little bit paranoid, but she said, you know, there were so many people living there, and I want to make sure my girls were ok. But now, one is a doctor, one is an accountant, and the other is a lawyer or something. I mean its just like this phenomenal American success story. And she talked about, I think she owns a shop now and they own their own house, and she's like, 'its very important for me to get there and not have to worry.' And the sense of community was there. She saved up money, she learned English, and the girls learned English, so how can you argue with that.

C: And is it Minnesota, or just Minneapolis, that is a refugee haven?

E: St. Paul as well, I don't know the policy. I think lots of communities within the state have taken on people and there must be something somewhere that would tell you where. You know, there are
lots of Latinos here. St. Paul has a Mexican consulate that just opened in the early 2000s. I want to say there may be places out-state that might have more Eastern European recent immigrants. I think it has to do with the social services. Lutheran social services, Catholic charities, I think there were a lot of private social services that were really well developed that were able to work through church groups to bring people over or through even the government because they had the structural system in place. I have to think that that's part of it. I remember when I was growing up in Iowa, and my parents talked about, I think Lutheran social services was big with helping the Hmong, and then just helping to find people to support them and welcome them into the community.

53:45

E: So do you have any other questions?

C: Um... What didn't the refurbishment save that you would have liked to see kept?

E: Well... I mean they really dealt with what needed to be dealt with... Landscape wise, the landscape was originally done by Sasaki Walker Associates and I would have liked to see them invest a little bit more into...

C: So what's there now is not original?

E: No, maybe some of the trees might be, but I mean it's tough because that plaza is essentially the roof of the parking garage and some of the plantings that Sasaki had done were not very sustainable. And they have somebody who's like a master gardener who came to them and said, let me plant it. So now there's lots of like prairie grass. Well, one could argue maybe that's a proper update, maybe it's a more sustainable thing, but it would have been nice to... We didn't really even get into a discussion about landscape, just because of finances. I think that's always the case with landscape. It always gets saved until last. Also, after years of experience, they talked about how originally there was gravel in the planters. Bad idea with small children and lots of windows! They had a terrible time with that. They said, as it is, they have a glazing company who has a workshop on site because they have to replace glass so often with so many people living there, so they said, woodchip is safe - woodchip can't break glass. So the things that you learn about through trial and error. I don't know, I think the units they stuck pretty close to what was consider the historic box, even though for some people they would question if that was nice, but from a management perspective, they can maintain their white box and after someone moves out, they can clean it. So i don't know that there was necessarily anything... you know, we fought very hard for the paint colour. The signage that they've put on the building, the big Riverside Plaza sign, and some of the signage around, I don't think they've updated all of it. They did repaint the way finding arrows telling you which way to go, and I think they would have liked to have redone signage, but there just wasn't the financing, and what is there does meet their needs.

56:30

C: So what is there? Is it from when it was renamed Riverside Plaza in the 1990s?

E: I think they were hoping to bring back some way finding signs, and I don't know if they have installed them within the plaza to help you figure out which tower is which, because the first couple of times you're there, its very disorienting. And then they had wanted to put sort of out on Cedar Avenue, I think its 6th Street, where there's an access and a little plaza, we would have liked to have put something that... I know the architect came up with some vertical - not too tall - but some vertical signage that referenced to the modern, you know, the primary colours. And then they also got, strangely enough, push back from the City. The City has zoning about the number of signs you can have. It was really silly. The City was accusing them of having too much signage. Directional signs are ok, but a sign that says Riverside Plaza on the corner... So the last I've heard on that point was, you know, 'lets just get the rest of it done and then we'll fight the City on this', and then I haven't heard anything else since. They were trying to figure out a way to call it art,
because there's a different zoning for that. The City allows a lot of art according to zoning, so yeah, a sculptural piece that happens to have a name.

C: The one thing that I noticed that had changed was the pool.

E: Oh yeah, that was fairly early on. It was a completely a life-safety insurance [reason behind that], and there was never any plan to bring that back, just because the amount of life insurance coverage they would have to carry, life guarding, and also the climate. So basically, the pool is there, it's just filled in. So if somebody did want to come along and do it, they probably could, and the fence that's around it is from the pool... And then some of the landscape... Did you see the pipes that curved? That was a fountain. It would spray water down, but it's right in line with a break in the buildings where you can see downtown. The north wind comes through there and the building engineer told us that it would essentially blow the water all across the plaza. The water actually never stayed in the area where it was supposed to drain. He said it was a nightmare. And then there had been a sandbox that is now a planter, and he said the kids would throw the sand everywhere and it would clog the storm drains, so they turned it into a planter and then focused the playground areas away from that. And then they put... the building owner, I must admit it was clever, considered one of his greatest moments ever, that when they discontinued the fountain, they put lights in it, so that was before we even got involved in the project. This happened in the 1980s. So essentially they're down lights now, and he's like, 'Well I put lights in there. It's like a light fountain!' Which is clever that they... It could have been worse. They could have just torn it out but he did keep it because it is a very quirky, 70s, modern or post-modern kind of thing, but they were like, 'It never made sense because the water just kept getting blown!' So now it's a light fixture.

C: I think that's a great compromise actually.

E: Yeah. So there are some examples of, like the pool, things that were a great idea, but then liability or the actual physical characteristic of the place... you had to modify it.

1:00:55

C: I'm actually going to be comparing this to the Barbican in London. Have you heard of that?

E: The name is familiar. Is there like a concert hall? That's what I've heard the name from.

C: Yes, it's a huge complex. It's like a 'New Town In Town', only they didn't call it by that name, but it has a school and apartments and all this, but the difference there is that it has always been private and its always remained popular, and even more so since rents have gone up in London.

E: Is it affordable or is it market rate?

C: Market rate I believe. You have a lot of architects living there, academics, the creative types...

E: So in some ways it's a success where Cedar Riverside perhaps is not. Cedar Riverside had this very ideological, mixed income...

C: Umm, they had the same sort of intention

E: But it went high end?

C: Yeah, the Barbican did have some affordable housing, but the market pushed it out. Do you think Cedar Riverside would ever go back to the way it was intended?

E: You know, I don't know. That's a very good question. I couldn't say. I've met people who are middle aged, who lived there when they went to college at the U of M, and a lot of them are architects. I think that there would have to be a change in the market. The Green Line just opened
up, so it will be interesting to see how that drives things. I know along the Blue Line out on Hiawatha Avenue, you know, the City has been pushing for lots more density development down there where the grain elevators are.

C: Oh I saw a new building down there.

E: Yeah! Right on 38th. That's the same owner as this one, as Cedar Riverside. Sherman Associates did that one. Somebody else had planned it, they didn't make it through the recession, Sherman bought it and built it up, because we actually did the documentation of the Purina animal food elevator that used to be there. It was not fun. Don'tcha know, there was a room that was full of molasses.

C: Molasses?

E: Because molasses is apparently a key feature of horse feed that Purina did, and the room literally was like a molasses tank. And so when we walked in, it had been drained, but the floor was like permanently covered with like 2 inches of stickiness. I had to throw away my work boots because the sole came unglued. And there was no light because it was a giant windowless grain elevator, so we had headlights on. It was not fun.

C: Wait, so that's now apartments?

E: That got torn down, completely torn down, and that's now where the Longfellow Station Apartments are. So the City has envisioned that and I don't think that's quite lived up to the density yet, and some of that is because the grain elevators are still active, but it'll be interesting. The current mayor who just got elected last fall, Betsy Hodges. She was a council member. Mayor Rybek didn't run for re-election. He'd been in there for about 10 years, so once he retired... It was a very interesting race. There were lots of candidates. At once point, there were 35 candidates, because we have this ranked voting, so you put in your top three choices three times. So my top choice was Betsy Hodges... [explains voting procedure]. Anyway, her goal... Minneapolis at it's height, right before suburban development in the 1950s, had about a half million people. Her goal is to 500,000 people in the city. And this year, we have 400,000. So people are definitely moving back and people tend to be, especially the millenials - I hate that, I hate giving generation names, but the younger people really want density, the want public transportation, they don't want to have to have a car. They'd rather do car-share, ride their bikes, take transit, and frankly, single family housing is just too expensive for them, so it'll be really interesting to see what happens as the baby boomer generation ages, if people will move out to single family homes...? I live in a co-op, which has 96 voting entities, but some people own more units and rent them out, so it has a few hundred units. And its over by the Swedish Institute, and it's a 1929 building. It's been a co-op forever and a day. So on floor 3 of 6 and I'm happy with that. I pay a fee and they come in and take care of things if something breaks, they plow the drive and mow the grass, so why would I live in a house when I can live in this very civilised building!

1:07:10

E: (talking about Cedar Riverside) So maybe there might be the development pressure to go back, I don't know. And I don't know enough about the owner's business plan. I don't think the building makes them money. I think the building loses them money. Even though part of the upgrading the systems was energy efficiency to save money, but its still a gigantic reinforced concrete, uninsulated building relatively speaking...

C: So they didn't do anything with insulation?

E: No, and part of that had to do with tax credits. I'm sure the interior walls are insulated, but they didn't do a complete gut, so...

C: So they don't really know what's in the walls?
E: Yeah. I think that partition walls are insulated but I don't think that perimeter walls are.

C: And the tax credit wouldn't cover that?

E: It would, but you'd have to be careful and to do that, they couldn't afford to.

C: And the 28 day turnaround

E: Yeah, 28 days. Could you imagine! It still impresses me how they did that. They essentially moved maybe 4500 people in this weird phase plan over the course of 2 years. So, I don't know, for him, having it be a tax liability might be a benefit to his business, so it might make sense to him to have affordable housing. I also think, he is a businessman, and he is there to make a profit, but I honestly think that he does try to do well for people, to have respectable living conditions, and so, in some ways, this meets a very important housing need in this city. You wouldn't find a politician who wasn't in support of it, because it really is a point of affordable housing, which the city lacks. We did another rehab over on Hennepin & 8th St. There's like a building with terracotta, it's called City Place Lofts. There's a restaurant across the way called Union I think. And there's a new hotel going up on 1st, so it's actually on the same block as 1st Avenue, the club. It's on the opposite corner, kitty-corner, and it's a tall 1920s office building, and its work force housing, which is essentially affordable housing. 80 units. It was almost fully leased before they finished construction. It has no parking, and it’s basically all young people in their 20s who work downtown. It has a workout room, a bike storage room, they're sort of loft style apartments with bedrooms but an open plan living area. And they got the certificate of occupancy Dec 31; they started moving people in in early January. I had to go over there, because the construction guys could not keep delivering the floors fast enough for the leasing. And people moving in the dead of winter here, and last winter was really hard, lots of snow and really cold, it still was fully leased by February and moved into, which is unheard of. But that's because it was affordable and right in the heart of downtown. I mean, and the city couldn't be thankful enough for it because there just isn't enough affordable housing. I guess for now, we see Cedar Square remaining affordable because it meets a need, and the market pressure is just not there yet probably [for it to be otherwise]

1:11:30

C: And the current demographic is still mostly East African right?

E: Predominantly, although there are Hispanics, Asians, I've seen white people there, but yes its still predominantly East African. It's still called Little Mogadishu, because it has the highest concentration of Somalis outside of Somalia. And actually, as part of the rehab, they now have a police substation there, and they actually have a special police officer there who is trying to build bridges between the communities, because of the conflict in Somalia, many people distrust authority and police forces, so they're trying to encourage a connection so that people will report crimes and not just keep things quiet. And the FBI, after the whole scandal with young men going to Somalia, the FBI has given grants to... I don't know all the details, but there are groups of young people who are, groups in the community who are trying to get young people together, to try to educate them, to help build a sense of community, inclusion not exclusion

C: So that's community initiated?

E: Exactly, with money from the FBI to try to keep people in the community. Stay here, don't go back. Or go back and do something good. Some people have left here and gone back to become members of parliament. There was a gentleman, I can't remember what he did, but he went back and became a minister of something in their government. So they've taken the stability and education and things that they've learned here and they've gone back to try to rebuild the country, which is inspiring and also scary for them, because it's so unstable. But yes, predominantly East African and Somalian.
C: And I'll look up the Star Tribune archives and see what's there. And I think there was a report about Jonathan, Minnesota, and how that's like a New Town Out of Town. I was just wondering how the perception by the public differs between the two places?

E: I think people love Jonathan! Now, I haven't been out there, and it's bad of me, but I haven't met anybody who didn't like it.

C: And that would have been planned as an idyllic suburb?

E: Yeah, it's supposed to be pedestrian friendly and communal in some ways. It's west of here. I'm not sure exactly, but I think its over by Shakopee and Minnetonka.

C: And was that designed by Rapson?

E: I don't think so. I hate to say it, but I don't know that much about it.

C: (going through list of questions...) So there won't be any further restoration works in the near futures?

E: Yeah, they really tried to cover everything with what they did [in this project], and the tax credits, the combined federal and state, brought in $29 million dollars worth of financing, which was huge. It was probably the largest tax credit project to date in Minnesota, for the state. There were other ones in the past that were just Federal that were huge, but yeah, that was a really big deal, so they did try to cover everything that was necessary, and I haven't heard of anything... after the accident with the little boy, we let them know to call us if they needed to do anything with the railings, but they had another solution which was handling locks on the doors and public awareness. Because the irony is that the new doors are really light and easy to open.

C: Right. So kids can open them.

E: Yeah, so maybe the door was already open or maybe it was cracked and he was able to push it open, whereas the old heavy door... Luckily he lived. They were calling him the miracle baby. Part of it had to do with that he fell onto soft ground, and that he's young... yeah.
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C: Since I missed your presentation, could you tell me what your talk was about? [at the APT 2013 conference in Manhattan]

A: Walking around the city, I've notice that there is an amazing array of post-war schools in New York. The city really spent a great deal of money building schools in the post-war period, especially in poorer neighbourhoods that had very poor quality schools, but elsewhere too, and that nobody was studying them. Docomomo was surveying everything but they seemed to survey everything in Manhattan except the schools, so for a few years I've been wanting to do a survey of schools in New York and I finally decided to do a studio class. So the first year preservation
students in their second semester work on studio projects in small groups, so I had 7. The challenge I gave them was that we wanted to make a case for these schools. We wanted to see if they were worthwhile, and I initially suggested a part of Manhattan and they surveyed lower Manhattan and the lower east side, and they said 'no we can't do that, we have to the whole island'. So they surveyed all schools. It was a kind of pilot project and they did a lot of research on the history of schools in the post-war period and on the expansion of the school system in Manhattan, and they looked at some of the conservation issues that the schools are having and they published a little report.

C: Is that online?

A: It will be online soon. I have it and I have to give it to Charlotte...so it should be online in a week.

C: Is that on the GSAPP website?

A: Yes, you go to the GSAPP website, programs, and Historic Preservation and you'll see there are studio projects. They identified about 85 schools. Unfortunately, we tried to have a good relationship with the school construction authority that actually maintains the schools, but they were very wary of what we were doing and they were not very...giving, shall I say, and they have actually just given me, unofficially, a list of all the schools in New York. I have to compare it with the list that the students came up with because there wasn't a list, so we had to find them, and I think we probably missed a few. We think it's complete, but I think we're going to learn that there may be 2 or 3 others... It is by borough so... here's Brooklyn, then it gets into Manhattan schools, and everything has a date.

03:23

C: And you're looking at 1945 though?

A: 1945 to 75 basically. So the students thought that about 60 of the schools were significant. Some schools they just thought the designs were not very interesting, and it's true, there are some that are really dull. And there are some that have been heavily altered over the years. There were 8 that they thought were the very best and that they should be landmarked.

C: Is there sort of an A list, a B list, and C list?

A: Yes, and the other thing they proposed was a thematic nomination for the National Register. They talked about doing it, which is fine, I knew they wouldn't. It's a huge project to do a National Register nomination like that.

C: And this was all done over 3 months?

A: Yeah, this was basically end of January to... the final review was May 1st. They worked really really hard and I was very pleased with it. We discovered that it is a really worthwhile topic and that it is something the city should be very proud of, that it is unrecognised and that it deserves more recognition, and that the first thing is that we need to do a city-wide survey, so I'm going to look for some funding... because I can't do another class with it because they've already kind of done it.

C: And you'll have the same students?

A: No, no. I don't want to do another class because a studio is supposed to be original each time, so what I would like to do is get some funding and maybe hire a couple of students or recent graduates to work on doing the survey. And then I think it would be great to publish something, not the in-depth academic study of the school system, but a summary of everything and a list of all the buildings with pictures and who designed them... one thing I had noticed, even before we
started, which proved to be correct, and I didn't understand the balance of it is that some schools were designed by the architect that was working for the school system, but more than half of them were designed by outside architects that they brought in, which in hindsight is a nightmare because every one is different and every one used a different construction system... but they wanted new ideas, and that was the idea, they thought they'd get new ideas. They thought they'd get architects from all over the country to do it. There's a spectacular Perkins & Will school. There's a school by this African American architect, Paul Williams, who did mostly movie star houses in Los Angeles, and they brought him in to do one. There's a couple of schools by a firm in New Orleans, and then really leading architects - Harrison and Erbromowitz [...] did one right after they finished the United Nations, Edward Durrell Stone did a spectacular school... so there's a lot of really important buildings out there.

C: I think that's a really great idea, especially if you pair it with a map. That's something that, through Docomomo, it could be put out there and people would use it as a walking map, I mean, I know I would.

06:47

A: Well I've talked to Docomomo and, especially if I apply for a grant, to have it go through them, because if it goes through Columbia, Columbia takes a big chunk of it.

C: But Docomomo cannot profit...

A: Docomomo doesn't want the money; they're not out to make a profit. So if they take a little money to maintain the bank account, that's fine, but they would want to do it because they think it's a good project.

C: Right. Is Docomomo government funded?

A: No. Not in the US.

C: Docomomo UK got a little start-up funding, but that's all.

A: Well in the UK, because the Twentieth Century Society is so active, Docomomo UK almost seems superfluous.

C: They each play their own role. A lot of people are members of both, but Docomomo UK, their membership is more architects, engineers, where the Twentieth Century Society attracts more academics, people with a general interest.

A: Yeah, I'm a member of the Twentieth Century Society.

08:20

A: Yeah so, there is no local interest in these schools and the school construction authority has done a lot of work on them - sometimes they destroy the schools, sometimes they restore them really beautifully, a lot has to do with... they are a state agency so they have to report to the state office of historic preservation. The state office has been great, but the state office has been pampered by the fact that the federal law says that a building has to be 50 years old, so and the state says, 'show us everything that is 45 years old'. But still, 10 years ago, when the school construction authority was doing the first wave of work, or 15 years ago, many of these buildings did not meet that criteria and the state never reviewed them. Sometimes the school construction authority would hire a really good architect that cared, and they just restore it because they cared. There is this fantastic school that is just up the block - if you go out and you walk up Amsterdam Ave north to about 123 St, you'll see Morningside Dr curves in, and the school is actually built in Morningside Park, which is very controversial. It’s this concrete frame building that literally grows out of the rocks of the park, and it has four pods on different levels. The state either didn't
review it or said it was ineligible, which is completely wrong. It was in horrendous shape. The concrete hadn't been poured very well, some of the rebars were sticking out it was so thin. So this firm has completely redone the concrete, but they really wanted to get the wood forms right...

C: So they re-face it with wood forming again?

A: Yeah, it looks fantastic, except they then coated it with something to try to protect it, and at the moment it looks a little shiny. They tell me that the shine will wear off. But it looks great. They did a great job because the firm cared about it. But if it hadn't been for the state, I think we would have lost a lot more of them.

C: So when you say the 'state' is that the Landmark Commission?

A: No, the Landmarks Commission is a city agency and then the State Historic Preservation Office, and the way all these US laws run is that the government doesn't have to follow its own rules and certainly the state doesn't have to follow any of the city rules, so the school construction authority is a state agency, so they don't have to follow any of the city's landmark rules. In fact, that school, ironically, it is a landmark because Morningside Park is a landmark, and they drew the boundary around the original park but they never went to Landmarks to review that school. There's a school in Greenwich Village in a very old historic district that's been completely altered and nobody went to Landmarks, they just altered it. They just completely changed the facade. It’s in the PowerPoint, a before and after.

12:00

C: So if you alter a building that has been Landmarked, is there any repercussion or fines?

A: No, not if the government does it. The state can do whatever it wants. As a citizen, then yes there is. You can be fined; your building can be frozen so that you can never get any permits to do anything until you fix the alteration.

C: Well with the schools, if you were to propose the top 8 for listing, you would propose them to the state?

A: No actually, we were proposing them to the city in the hopes that the city could reach an agreement with the school construction authority. With older schools, with 19th and early 20th c schools, there are a lot of them that are city landmarked. Now the school construction authority works with the city landmarks commission but they don't think of it with the modern schools so, my idea is to get... and that adds another level of assurance that they're not going to do anything terrible with the building. And also the other fear is that last year there was an announcement that the city was going to sell two of the schools near Lincoln Center, including the Edward Durrell Stone school, to developers of luxury apartment buildings, and they would build a new school in the basement. There was an outcry, and the parents in particular, one [child] in the school has well-connected, affluent parents, and there was an outcry and the city, I think the city sort of announced this to see what the reaction would be, and they had to step back. But this is not going to go away. These are really valuable pieces of land, and they're 3 storeys, and the amount of money you could make from a luxury apartment house developer is astronomical, so this is going to be back so the buildings need to be protected before, so that nobody comes and says the Edward Durrell Stone school should be demolished, even though its on a valuable, very valuable site.

14:05

C: Have you seen that study done by English Heritage done on schools? .... (thematic studies on post-war buildings by EH and HS...)
A: Well that's what the state would love us to do. The state historic preservation office, they react, the school construction authorities here in NEW YORK... sends them material but they have no way to judge them in context.

C: Also, there is the Pimlico School in London, that was demolished and that sparked a whole debate on 'fit for purpose'. It's another sort of element of the listing system that one of the Ministers wanted to implement when judging post-war buildings or buildings of recent construction. The Pimlico School was ruled as not being fit for purpose, therefore it was demolished, it wasn't listed because they argued that the requirements for schools now were different, but requirements for schools seem to change every 10 years - bigger classrooms, smaller classrooms, more light, less light... so its not a very valid argument in my opinion.

A: For the old schools, it is very easy to reuse them. They have big rooms, they convert very well into residences, they have very high ceilings, but the only thing we could think of that could go into these modern schools is some other sort of social service use. The one school that has been decommissioned in Manhattan is now a social service agency, but if these get decommissioned... we've been lucky in New York, the population is growing, but these modern schools are being abandoned all over the country and what do you use them for? The adaptive reuse of these is, especially in declining cities and suburbs, is really tough.

C: So there isn't a shortage of students in New York, it's just that they want to demolish and build new?

A: Yeah, I mean, here it was all about real-estate development. Here the threat is more to inappropriate alteration than it is to abandonment. We're not closing schools, I mean, just this year, you'll see it in my report, Philadelphia has closed 23 schools and Chicago closed 34 schools, including modern schools and older schools.

C: Are people moving out or having less children...?

A: People are moving out, neighbourhoods are changing, Philadelphia is being depopulated, and cities are merging schools because they don't have any money...

C: Do you have anything else published on it?

A: Just the work the students have done

C: Anything else you can tell me about post-war conservation you can tell me?

A: Well, post-war is a tough sell in the US. Its a very tough sell, but in some ways, it's a tough sell in the UK as well, especially the concrete stuff. I went to Birmingham to see the library because I wanted to see the library before it disappeared.

C: I think that one is going to be regretted.

A: Yeah I think it will. The exterior I thought was really spectacular and beautiful. The interior is a little... shabby, well no it wasn't so much that it was shabby, the spaces were kind of mean, like very low ceilings. It wasn't... a lot of these concrete buildings, you walk into them and there are great spaces with light pouring in, it wasn't like that. But in New York, I remember some years ago, the Landmarks Commission designated a modern bank in Queens, and in the City, the Landmarks Commission designates a building and the City Council has to approve it or disapprove it, or do nothing, but the City Council turned back this bank and one of the council members said, 'Bring us buildings that look like landmarks.' It was a modern building. It had no ornament. It didn't look like a landmark to this council member. It didn't look 'special', but it was a very neat building.
C: I think that is a problem everywhere that council members aren't necessarily educated in architectural significance or heritage. Interestingly, Historic Scotland is handing over responsibility to the larger councils - Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, etc - and letting them deal with the local and regional heritage, not the national heritage, no Grade A's, but Grade B and C alteration plans go to the council for approval. But Scotland is a small country, 5 million people.

A: That's smaller than NYC!

C: So if it is landmarked, the council can turn it down?

A: Once something is designated, the City Council has by law a certain number of days in which they can act or not. It is immediately a landmark - as soon as the landmarks Commission votes it, it is a landmark, and if the city council does nothing, it remains a landmark. Usually they take a vote, usually they approve it. Occasionally they turn things back, usually when there is pressure from the owner or real-estate interest to do so, but a lot depends on the support of the local representative.

C: So it just depends on who is in office?

A: Yeah. So the City has designated most of the super A+ buildings, Seagram and Lever House, things like that, are landmarks, but they have really made much in roads to the next level of really good modern buildings that aren't the iconic masterpieces.

C: Do you know how many modern buildings are listed in New York?

A: I don't know. Not a lot. Seagram, Lever, Chase... They just did the Gordon Bunshaft building with the Negucci cube [??] on it that's next to the Chase, they did the Manufacturers Hanover Bank and its interior, TWA, the Guggenheim, and I'm sure I'm missing some others. I would say not more than 10 or 15.

C: Recently, four more post-war buildings have been added to the list in England, making it around 690-700 listed post-war buildings.

A: That's a huge number!

C: Those are all post-1945. It doesn't mean that they're modern, but it is still only a tiny sliver of the whole of the stock of listed buildings in England.

23:00

A: When I was on sabbatical 2 springs ago, I went to London for 6 weeks and everybody that asked 'how political is listing?' I mean I was wondering about the Birmingham Library and the Southbank, but nobody wanted to answer that question. I never got a satisfactory answer.

C: It is political.

A: It is political! Of course it is! I mean it was so obvious to me that Birmingham was not being listed... it had nothing to do with the quality of the building

C: I feel like you reach a threshold with these more controversial buildings with each minister, some are more sympathetic than others, some aren't so worried about getting re-elected possibly, but yes, you can't list too many or you lose votes I think. Because English Heritage is one step away, a sort of quango, quasi-governmental agency, right now they have a good minister who is willing to listen and his mother is a member of the Twentieth Century Society so he has to answer to her maybe, but he has listed a number [of post-war buildings], but the thing is, the post for the minister of DCMS... is 5 years, but I was talking to Elain Harwood about this and she can't
remember the last time a minister stayed in the post for the full duration because it is a lower level post.

A: So next week someone is coming to speak about the Southbank project

C: I saw that! I was there a few months ago and I don't know, the Queen Elizabeth Hall is looking pretty dreary...

A: It is looking pretty dreary, but it could look spectacular. Every time you see it, it looks worse and worse on the outside because paint inappropriate colours and all kinds of stuff, and I have to say, I've only been there once, but I was sitting this next to this woman and she said 'Isn't this the most uncomfortable theatre you've ever been in?' And it is! [conversation continues some...]

A: I love and hate the fact that the twentieth Century Society is allying itself with the skateboarders. I think that is the bleakest space I have seen.

C: See I think, if that is lost, then a large portion of the community input and the community connection with the place will be lost as well.

A: Yeah, they're going to put in shops like they did to the Royal Festival Hall. That was very dreary. That was a change that actually made the place...

C: Worse?

A: No, better! Yeah, all the restaurants in there gave it life. It was just old graffitied space. It was really dreary. And I think they did it pretty sensitively. I don't think they did too much damage to the Hall.