

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
18 January 1966

AM

10:15 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting:

Executive Session: 15 February 1966, 10:15 a.m.
Open Session: 16 February 1966, 9:30 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 1965 Meeting

III. REVIEWS-SUBMISSIONS

1. Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue

Proposed Design of National Square

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Labor Department Building - Revised Design

b. Aquarium - Revised Design

c. Selection of Sculptor for Post Office & FOB, Independence,
Mo.

d. Bust of President John F. Kennedy

3. National Institutes of Health

Emergency Virus Isolation Facility - Proposed Design

4. Department of the Navy

Service Club, Bolling AFB - Proposed Design

5. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Highways and Traffic

Proposed Landscaping for Virginia Avenue

b. Department of Buildings and Grounds

(1) Blow Pierce Elementary School - Revised Design

- (2) Seaton Elementary School - Revised Design
- (3) Woodson Senior High School - Revised Design

c. Department of Licenses and Inspections

Shipstead-Luce Act

- (1) Building Applications, Appendix 1
- (2) Four story addition to existing building at 1st and C Sts., for Capitol Hill Club
- (3) Proposed Speaker Martin Building, 4 story office building on 1st St. between C and D Sts.
- (4) Proposed 5-story Reserve Officers Association Bldg, 109-113 1st St., N.E.

Old Georgetown Act

- (1) Building Applications - Appendix 2
- (2) Georgetown University Master Plan

6. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park - Development Plan

IV. INSPECTIONS

12:00 Labor Department and Tax Court Sites

V. INTERVIEWS

11:45 1. National Capital Transportation Agency

Progress Report
(Mr. John Rannells, Director, Office of Architecture, NCTA)

3:00 2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Aquarium - Revised Design

(Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, PBS; Mr. Weldon Beckett, architect)

3:30 b. Labor Department Building - Revised Design

(Mr. Snyder; Mr. Llewelyn Pitts, architect)

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 January 1966

INDEX

	PAGE
INTERVIEWS	
1. <u>Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue</u> <u>Proposed Design of National Square</u>	1-2
2. <u>D.C. Government, Dept. of Highways and Traffic</u> <u>Proposed Landscaping of Virginia Avenue</u>	2
3. <u>D.C. Govt., Dept. of Licenses and Inspections</u> <u>Proposed 5 story Reserve Officers Assn. Bldg.</u>	2
4. <u>National Institutes of Health</u> <u>Emergency Virus Isolation Facility - Proposed Design</u>	2-3
5. <u>Department of the Navy</u> <u>Service Club, Bolling Afb - Proposed Design</u>	3
6. <u>National Park Service, National Capital Region</u> <u>West Rawlins Park - Development Plan</u>	3
7. <u>D.C. Govt., Department of Buildings and Grounds</u> a. Blow-Pierce School	3-4
b. Seaton Elementary School	4
c. Woodson Senior High School	4
d. Emery School - Playground Area	4
8. <u>D.C. Govt., Dept. of Licenses and Inspections</u> <u>Georgetown University Master Plan and Design of Library</u>	4-5

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The second session of the regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in the office of the Interior Department Building on 19 January 1966, at 9:30 a.m., with Chairman William Walton presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Burnham Kelly
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secy
Nancee Black, Legislative Asst.
Myra Younker, Editor

NCPC: Arnall Connell

Recorder: Leone M. Vialpando

II. INTERVIEWS

1. Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue

Proposed Design of National Square

Mr. Nathaniel Owings and Mr. John Woodbridge, Chairman and member of Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Woodbridge explained the drawings depicting several schemes for National Square, stating the differences based on area and property involved. Boundaries and circulation for both pedestrians and vehicles were discussed. Considering the Square as the terminus essential to the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan, Mr. Woodbridge stated that it should be designed differently from any other square in the City. He commented that Scheme A, in the original Plan, was difficult to realize and that a solution to a design for a National Square should be found in Schemes B to D, having a smaller area with 14th Street as the eastern boundary.

The members agreed with Mr. Owings and Mr. Woodbridge that the National Square should be the major termination point at the western end of the Pennsylvania Avenue Plan; that Scheme A was too large and not feasible. The alternate Scheme - D1, a smaller area with Fourteenth Street as the eastern boundary and the fountain nearer the Treasury, was preferred. The National Press Building would be retained if this design is adopted. The Commission approved the general concept of Scheme D1 which still contains numerous

unsolved problems.

The Secretary prepared a letter for the Chairman's signature to the Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue expressing the members' views.

Exhibit A

2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Highways and Traffic
Proposed Landscaping of Virginia Avenue

Mr. G. I. Sawyer, Department of Highways and Traffic, and Mr. Dan Kiley, landscape architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Considering the Avenue as unarchitectural, Mr. Kiley stated that he attempted to bring continuity and unity to the area, and to develop a strong line out of the Avenue. The basic idea was to get as many trees - honey locust or the plane tree - as possible along the Avenue with closer spacing of them near the edges and corners to eliminate the restlessness of so many small corners and areas. The screening of the freeway and expressway was essential. The western terminus would be an area of Potomac Park where a large fountain was planned. Another fountain would be at New Hampshire Avenue crossing. Changes in the existing small parks were indicated. Black rectangular Hastings blocks with granite curbs and strips would replace the concrete walks. Separate lighting standards were planned for pedestrians and traffic.

Commenting for the Commission, Mr. Sasaki remarked that the basic idea of dense trees to define the Avenue and hide the traffic was excellent, but overdone. In the small park areas, the regularity of the rows should be softened and integrated with existing trees in these areas. He commented on the need for more attractive light standards and for coordinating the design for them throughout the city.

3. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections
Proposed 5-Story Reserve Officers Association Bldg, 109-113 1st St., N.E. (Cancelled)

4. National Institutes of Health

Emergency Virus Isolation Facility - Proposed Design

Mr. Connolly, National Institutes of Health, and Mr. Bixler, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Commenting on the design, Mr. ^{*Bickel*}~~Bixler~~ stated that he developed a plan compatible to the National Library of Medicine. Precast concrete panels retaining a vertical pattern - repeated to some extent the design of the Library.

While the buildings in the core of the campus would be brick, this building, the Library and future buildings to be located on the periphery of the campus would be white.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Kelly requested that the solution of the site be explained. Previous master plans showed no development in this area adjacent to a proposed major parkway. No indication of an approach to the building was planned from the parkway. No attempt was made to have NIH present an attractive new front to this highway. He commented that a master landscape plan showing overall parking areas, circulation patterns, and sites of existing and proposed buildings was required before a thorough review could be made of a proposed design. Detailed plans for sections of the master plan should be presented when a building is proposed for a specific section.

5. Department of the Navy

Service Club, Bolling AFB - Proposed Design

Cdr. Miller, Public Works Office, and Mr. ^{Wolff}~~Bisler~~, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Warnecke commended the architect on the general character of the building and incorporating the materials indicated the master plan. He stressed the need to treat both sides of the site harmoniously and to plan future buildings, adjacent to this Club in a similar vein.

6. National Park Service, National Capital Region

West Rawlins Park - Development Plan

Mr. Horn and Mr. Turello, National Park Service, National Capital Region were present during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Sasaki expressed the Commission's views by stating that the arrangement of Rawlins Park - open center area - should be repeated in West Rawlins Park. Details of the design need not be repeated but the open center should be continued. The area in front of the E Street Expressway tunnel should be planted with trees to help contain the park. Sculpture at the western end would terminate the park area. He suggested that the design be restudied.

7. District of Columbia Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds

A. Blow-Pierce School - Revised Design

Mr. G. A. Purcell, Department of Buildings and Grounds, and Mr. Ramos, architect, attended the meeting during the discussion of this

project.

Mr. Warnecke expressed the members' views stating that the architect had developed a functional plan by designing a school having an inner court area to be used for educational or study purposes. He requested that the fenestration be restudied. He commended the architect on the improvement of the design for this school on a small site.

b. Seaton Elementary School - Revised Design

Mr. Purcell and Mr. Cassell, architect, attended the discussion of this project.

Mr. Warnecke, speaking for the Commission, commended the architect on the improvement of the design, the organization of the site, and on his condensing the plan into three elements. He stated that better classroom space could be obtained by making the kindergarten element a simple rectilinear form or a plain circle. He suggested that there be some variation to the windows and further articulation and modulation of panels to express the basic structure.

c. Woodson Senior High School - Revised Design

Mr. Purcell and representatives of McLeod, Ferrara and Ensign, architectural firm, attended the meeting during the discussion of this project.

Mr. Warnecke continued speaking for the Commission. He expressed the members' approval in general of the design and suggested that the ramps be located at appropriate places, leading directly to the entrances of the building. This would eliminate confusion on entering this new type of school complex and be functional as well as architectural. Details of designing several exits from the base element required further study.

d. Emery School - Playground Area (Added to Order of Business)

Mr. Purcell requested the Commission's assistance in requiring the D.C. Recreational Department to submit plans for areas adjacent to school sites. Coordination of plans with those for schools should be required.

The members agreed that plans developed by the D.C. Recreational Department should be submitted for the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

7. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Georgetown University Master Plan and Design of Library

(Mr. Warnecke withdrew from meeting during the discussion of this project)

Father Collins and officials of the University explained the selection of this site for the Library. In response to the Commission's proposal that the Library be erected on land east of the campus, Father Collins commented that time did not permit solving numerous problems involved in the site proposed.

Mr. Rider, architect, explained the program stating the responsibility to design a library for a million volumes, relating it to Healy Hall and new buildings, respecting Georgetown community, the City of Washington and the skyline of the Palisades. He discussed the plans indicating future expansion on the lower floors.

The Commission, sympathetic to the University's problem and recognizing its responsibility established in Public Law 808, took the matter under advisement.

Exhibits B, C, D

The meeting adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



C. H. Atherton
Secretary

19 January 1966

Dear Nat:

This note merely confirms the informal advice that the Commission of Fine Arts gave you on January 18th, when you presented several rough sketches for the proposed National Square at the end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

You found us in substantial agreement that Sketch D1 conformed most closely to our wishes and I am sure that you are in agreement that many design elements have not been solved and therefore we are only talking about conceptions.

With best wishes,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Nathaniel Owings
Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania
Avenue
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit A

NEWS RELEASE

Commission of Fine Arts
7000 Interior Department Building
Washington, D.C. 20240
Telephone 343-5324

FOR RELEASE NO SOONER THAN SUNDAY
MORNING PAPERS

WASHINGTON: 30 January 1966:

The Commission of Fine Arts today announced its recommendation to Georgetown University that no further expansion of its formal campus eastward be contemplated. Instead the Commission recommended that future construction respect the existing street pattern and thus integrate the University and the town rather than erect barriers between them. The Commission's stand was taken in response to a request from the University for approval of a new Library which has been designed by John Carl Warnecke and Associates. The Commission's views were communicated to Reverend T. Byron Collins, Vice President for Planning and Physical Plant, Georgetown University, in the following letter:

Exhibit B

27 January 1966

Dear Father Collins:

After detailed study of Georgetown University's campus plan, the Commission of Fine Arts has concluded that the long range interests of both the University and the City of Washington would best be served by locating the proposed Library on a different site.

Our decision has not been reached hastily and I would like to discuss it at some length, because of the bearing this structure will have on all future development of your campus. As you know, proposals to expand the Georgetown campus eastward have engendered deep hostility from many townspeople. This situation is reproduced in many American cities where Universities are forced by an expanding population to infringe on nearby populated areas. But Universities must expand, we know, to meet their widening role and the Commission is deeply understanding of the problems involved. But the Commission, because of the Old Georgetown Act, has a peculiar and special responsibility for the Georgetown area of Washington, to protect its character and to preserve the ambiance that made it worthy of a special Federal statute. To this end, the Commission believes that the present boundaries of the formal campus should be maintained and that future development eastward should respect the existing street patterns. Such a method of development has worked happily in other cities, for example, Cambridge, Massachusetts, where the Harvard Yard remains as it has been for centuries but the University has spread over many surrounding blocks.

The Commission suggests that a suitable Library site would be the block bounded by 37th and 36th Streets and O and N Streets. A building erected on this site would relate nicely to Healy Hall and at some future time another building on the block just north would add an enclosed feeling to the campus. Your architects have produced such an imaginative and sensitive design for the Palisades site that I

Epitit C

feel certain they would create something equally beautiful for the site we propose.

Our reasons for disapproving the Palisades site are numerous, one of the more important being the effect such a building would have on the Washington landscape. The existing buildings massed above the river create one of the most agreeable views in our Capital, and to fill in this hilltop with more masonry would violate the landscape. Your campus itself will be more pleasing with the southern exposure left open toward the river.

The Commission's aim is to help the University solve its expansion problems and at the same time assure the Georgetown area that its proper character will be maintained. To this end, we hold ourselves in readiness to work with you at any time.

With best wishes,

William Walton
Chairman

The Reverend T. Byron Collins, S.J.
Vice President for Planning and
Physical Plant
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C. 20007

We'll be very happy to.

MR. PURCELL: I would appreciate it. This is right on the corner. I know they are going to cuss me out about it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I'm glad you called our attention to it; we'll send a quick letter.

MR. PURCELL: Thank you.

- - -

(Georgetown U. Library)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now, our relations to this problem are different from those with any other institutional thing in Washington because of the Old Georgetown Act, of which we are the official protectors of Georgetown as a special federal area, and it is the protection of the ambience of Georgetown in a sense -- that is about all the Act provides. It is not specific about style or period. On any other kind of large site we wouldn't particularly be empowered to discuss expansion of the site, but in a way we are in this particular area. It comes to us through request for approval of a library on one specific site, and approval of that building in that site then presupposes expansion of the campus. Without presupposition of expansion of the campus we could not justify putting the building in that spot, and also it is a highly debatable spot still from the public point of view. It is a major view back from Virginia, and so forth.

Exhibit D

You can see it well on those profiles of the buildings over there (pointing to sketches on the wall).

MR. KELLY; It is a crucial question. You can't keep Georgetown University from buying property and operating property in Georgetown. They now have a perfectly natural campus boundary along the street here and what they are clearly intending to do is after they've bought the property, bring the campus treatment over so that you now change the edge of the campus and the question really is whether they should do that or do it as it's done in Harvard Square, which also goes out in the town but leaves the campus where it was and has its extensions into the town on town area.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mixed use.

MR. KELLY; This is the really crucial question. If you do this once, will Georgetown then be content? Do you try to hold the campus line with walkways, trees, and open space and say Georgetown has not moved into the town; it can do what it wishes as long as it adopts the character of the town? I'm not sure which way I'd prefer.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No but I think that defines the issues.

MR. WARNECKE: I'll leave when Father Collins comes in.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What do you feel, Hideo?

MR. SASAKI: I think Burnham stated the question very well. It is a difficult one to answer. I think institutions inevitably have to grow because the population grows, so it seems to me somehow this encroachment into the adjacent communal areas is inevitable because of the fixed investment in here. The real stickler is when you run into historic entities like this, and then when you want to add something here, then I think there is always a temptation -- if we'd have our "druthers," we'd rather not have it there. I think this (indicating something on the design) was a real boner, a mistake.

I don't know where else this should go. I'd rather have it elsewhere; that would be my first choice. But if it had to go there inevitably and so forth, then I think it is a question that it ought to be designed well and in harmony and that would be a question to discuss when we get to the building design.

I am quite sure Jack tried to design it in harmony. I think each of us will have our own opinions about that. Maybe it would be proper to discuss it with Jack not here. But anyway, that's posing a problem it seems to me. So if the site can be moved, then I think this would be the first desire. Secondly, if it simply cannot, then we have to judge it on the basis of design.

MR. KELLY: May I make one more observation. You will see that this block right here (indicating) is labeled "village." They have very tightly organized plans for this. One wonders whether it could be moved from here to here (indicating) and they could adopt the principle starting now as they move to the town to have town scale.

MR. SASAKI: You mean move this elsewhere and leaving this area -- this is the area of strong unity.

MR. KELLY: That's right; then this would be the first step of Georgetown University taking on the coloration of Georgetown Town.

CHAIRMAN WALTON; I agree with Burnham in that this may be the proper moment for us to make a statement of our position on campus expansion that we do approve.

MR. KELLY: The difficulty from their point of view is that you can see on this one crucial block; they have quite a number of properties, and the information is some of those properties were purchased for the specific purpose of keeping them.

MR. SASAKI: Working with a number of institutions, occasionally you've got to make very difficult choices in locating building sites and so forth. Invariably there are alternate sites.

MR. WARNECKE: We ought to try to explore that.

MR. SASAKI: Each alternative choice would have certain advantages and certain disadvantages. Now in this case where it's of such historic and visual import, then maybe some of the functional and other considerations have to give way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You shouldn't be here, Paul. I forgot. This whole conversation is off the record.

(Paul Richards withdrew from the Conference Room.)

MR. WARNECKE: I think you ought to penetrate the Visitation thing and find out as much as you can about that.

MR. KELLY; There's no doubt this particular building will cast the die.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think we've discussed it enough now among ourselves, and I do think, Jack, it would be best if you absent yourself.

Farewell! Farewell!.

(Mr. Warnecke withdrew from the Conference Room.)

MR. ROSZAK: Bill, would you clarify the importance of the Georgetown Act in the light of all these things we are talking about? It seems to me at one time there was very little one could do about it because of this Act, because of the federal area, because of the ambience and now there is a strong possibility at this historic moment in the expansion of Georgetown University, this may be the right thing to do.

How does that relate?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't know exactly what you mean, but the Georgetown Act does not freeze Georgetown exactly as it is.

MR. ROSZAK: I see; that's what I wanted to get clear.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: It's of great flexibility. Maybe our predecessors would interpret it as meaning there would be no change of any kind in that area. I don't think we would.

MR. ROSZAK: Well, that changes the question a great deal.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: But there are very strict regulations about height of buildings that they'll have to operate within.

MR. ROSZAK: Yes, but that is zoning, that's something else.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: And it's zoning and this is a great protection against any violation of it.

(Father Collins and others entered the
Conference Room.)

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good morning, Father Collins.
Nice to see you.

We found your charts and so forth very beautifully prepared and very educational to us, which we needed. It is

a complex subject.

If you have any preliminary statement you want to make, we would be happy to hear it.

FATHER COLLINS: Fine. It's a pleasure, Mr. Walton, and other Commission members. We do have a program and I'd like to just review where I see that I stand, and it is this: that in the evolution of Georgetown -- it's 176 years -- we have the whole history that dictates to us our growth pattern, both in student body, professors, and the physical plant necessary to house them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: May I interrupt for one moment on something else? Is there any reason the press should be excluded from this discussion? Do you have any feeling about it?

FATHER COLLINS: It's up to your discretion.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: What does the Commission feel? It is a public issue we are discussing.

I think it's appropriate for the press to be here if they want unless you have any objection.

FATHER COLLINS: No, none at all.

At our last brief meeting I indicated that there are two facets with which I am charged. I am Vice President of Planning and we'll present this morning very briefly a four-faceted program. Mine will be introduction; Mr. Robinson,

Assistant Vice President for Planning, will give a brief exposition of the dictates that have evolved into our present position. Then Mr. Joe Jeffs, who is the University Librarian, will present the site -- first the program for the library, then the sites that were available to us. Unfortunately Mr. Keyes Metcalf whom we had scheduled for yesterday I had understood we would present this yesterday -- flew down from Canada but had to go to Boston, so was unable to stay.

Implementation of the program will be handled by Mr. Alan Rider on behalf of Mr. Warnecke. He will present the general thoughts given to him by the program.

Then Mr. Art Soklow will review the zoning envelope that controls the location and the specific elements of the site, and Mr. Rider will present the actual plans.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Now, Father, you have outlined a seminar that would keep us here until three o'clock.

FATHER COLLINS: Three minutes a piece.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right. You must remember we spent a great deal of time already on these plans. You are not presenting them to a board of trustees unaware of the problems involved.

FATHER COLLINS: All right. My task is to concern myself with a larger problem which is Visitation

property, Archbold estate, and the blocks that are out front in reference to land use as proposed to the National Capital Planning Commission.

In review with our staff as to the site location that is here, I was asked three questions: Does the present site in our present use pattern present a logical approach? In the future growth of the university, is it still logical, given two or three contingencies? The questions of the National Capital Planning Commission were specific. Use we have of buildings that are out here now are by right; by request we are asking for extended use of land. If this request for some reason is deferred, would it affect the site and the answer is no. We are committed to 50 percent of our students and professors in this area, so the answer would be no. We'd still build it on this site.

If, then, the acquisition of Visitation property were to become a part of Georgetown University, would this change or influence the site? The answer again is no. Georgetown Visitation is a separate corporation with its own integrity and its own power, its own land use, its own imminent domain as opposed to eminent domain, and would become perhaps at a future date a college or university, a women's college. This is problematical and dependent upon an authority over which Georgetown has no control.

Would the acquisition of the property for the Archbold Estate affect it? The answer is no, our program of development here for Archbold is in reference to the medical school. This is the onus of my presentation.

Mr. Robinson.

MR. ROBINSON: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'll go very quickly to an old picture which perhaps gives a little history but which shows the development forced upon us.

This is the Healy Building and the old Quadrangle (indicating photograph). This is circa 1928. The old stream bed which is down through there -- this is the front -- and this is the site we are now proposing.

As you can see from this picture, this elevation is 140; down here (indicating) we are dealing with 40, so we have about 100-foot grade. This deep ravine which tended in the years to come to force the university for economic and other reasons to develop here, we didn't actually own that land down there.

Then taking another picture here (aerial photo), which is 1934, you'll note that this location and this location (indicating) developed two new buildings. This is a classroom building, this a dormitory (indicating). Now these old buildings out in front here are in a pretty bad

state of repair, not owned by the university. In fact, the university built a wall here because this was such a slum that it was a very poor impression to be on this campus which is rather nice, and have to look over at people sitting on back and front porches in their shirtsleeves and other disrepair.

You can see the place. The university still had and operated the hospital which is down in this area (indicating). This then led us to an examination more recently -- the Healy Building here (indicating), our main campus. They call this East Campus. We have four schools there: the Institute of about 750 people, graduate school, 1400 people; School of Business with about 560 people; and our Foreign Service School which has about 700 people all centered here, and the deans' offices -- this is one of the principal series.

The old College of Arts and Sciences served by these two buildings (indicating) is here. That's about 1500. This comprises our general university. You can see the problem with fill in here.

We then went into analysis --

MR. KELLY; May I ask one question about fill? There seems to be an indication of a deep fill in this first block. That looks to us as though it were occupied a long time. Is that an old, old fill?

MR. ROBINSON: This fill we have not occupied; it's across the street. But this block has been occupied quite a long time. Most of these buildings are early 1900 buildings.

MR. KELLY: So that's not a current fill problem for you?

MR. ROBINSON: No, this gives us no problem here. This is the library site here, sir (indicating). This is 80 feet on up to the white area, showing natural conditions. We moved the hospital from here in 1947 to this site up here (indicating), to be proximate to the med-dent school. Then this pattern up here grew up. The architect who developed this plan for us -- three firms worked on it -- we wound up with an academic complex system through here. We are committed pretty much to that.

This was the 1965 existing land use plan (indicating) This more or less dictates. Our present library is right here in the original square which we have outgrown (indicating) So based on this and analyzing where we're going to go, we developed more or less that we couldn't abandon very definite facilities which we had for financial and other reasons, and we developed this pattern here. This cusp which goes around here is pretty much in the science field, which is related to both medical and to the normal arts and sciences, so that's why this long-range future here.

The living areas are here (indicating), academic areas in this area (indicating), which again brings us into an ideal general library location there.

These other charts, if you so desire, I'll explain them.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, we have been over them.

MR. ROBINSON: Then with that I'd like to let Mr. Jeffs explain very briefly why we narrowed it down to more or less this site. Obviously we didn't want to build on a mall; this didn't make sense. We had zoning problems because of height and lack of certain ownership out here which precluded us from going outside the gate out here. This is land next to Healy, as you can see, right here (indicating) which offered no great problems of building and satisfied other requirements.

Mr. Jeffs.

MR. JEFFS? Very briefly, I will review our program requirements and then touch on the site. Our planning began three years ago, our hard core planning started two years ago, when we formed a University Library Planning Committee consisting of 14 members of the University community faculty, students, administration; and the job of the committee was to formulate a written program to serve as a guide and sort of instructions for the architect as to our

specific needs, and this program called for a building, after a year of intensive work, came out with requirements for a building to house a million volumes of books, journals; to seat 1500 students and faculty, and which would provide other adequate space necessary to service a library of this magnitude.

Now also we asked that this would be a very flexible building as far as the internal arrangement plan, so we could meet any existing changes in library operations, philosophy in years ahead.

We also requested the building give us potential for horizontal expansivity, and we specified the internal arrangement of the building should be such that it would allow us to operate efficiently an open-stack library, one which is dedicated principally that faculty and students should have free access to all library materials, and we also specified the main public service function should, if possible, be on the main floor as you entered on grade with heavily used sections on floors directly above and below, and ideally have a library of five floors with the main service on the center floor.

We also specified for economy of operation that this building be capable of giving us centralized control, one exit and one entrance; and we realized we were going to have some space available, and because of our desperate need

for classrooms, we indicated we would like him to plan a building which would allow on a lower floor preferably with its own separate entrance, an area which would allow us to have interim use for classrooms and finally, we indicated to him in this 28-page written program, all the desirable relationships which we'd like to see among the various public and technical services, and actually gave him specific space recommendations for the various facilities and offices. Our calculations amounted to a building of about 177,000 square feet, and I must say that our architect has almost hit it on the button in fulfilling this program.

Now, as far as the site is concerned, we had seven requirements we outlined to him in choice of the site. The main one was the building should be located so it was as convenient as possible to the maximum number of students and faculties, and this would take into consideration the faculty offices, classrooms and student dormitories, and ideally it should be at some midway point between these various facilities on the main student-faculty stream of traffic, and this follows the best library principles in operating a university library to the convenience of your patrons, and I think convenience in this case necessarily implies a central or near central location to these facilities.

Now the site we specified should also be related to the master campus plan, as Mr. Robinson indicated, and it should take cognizance of any possible future shifting in this dormitory-classroom relationship, and we also specified that the site must offer adequate horizontal expansion space, as I previously mentioned, to take care of future needs because the building is being designed for a rate of acquisition to last somewhere about 20 or 25 years, and we'll need this expansivity at that time.

Also according to the principles that we were following in library design, if possible the site should allow a design of a building which had a generally rectangular shape with a long north and south axis, and short east and west walls, and this we felt would minimize the objectionable rays of the western sun, the effects of the rays of the western sun.

Then most of the outside reading areas could be placed on the north and on the south side.

Also we felt that the site, if possible, should be a sloping one which would allow us to put the main entrance to the building on a grade which would be in direct relationship to this main student-faculty stream of traffic, and given such a sloped site, it must be possible to place the main entrance in

this place, and it so worked out that this site was ideal for this purpose.

We also indicated that we wanted a site that was not too unduly expensive in terms of excavation to develop.

Finally we asked him to relate the site to our parking needs. Either it should be fairly close to parking or be capable of providing parking on the site itself.

Now throughout this program and working with the architect and up to this preliminary plan stage, we've been guided by the foremost library building consultant in the world, as Father Collins mentioned, Mr. Keyes Metcalf, former librarian of Harvard University. I met with him just yesterday to go over the latest plans and review the requirements, and he indicated his enthusiasm for the library plans themselves and spoke in terms of the site, felt that it was not only an ideal site but as far as he could see was the only site available for the university library building at this time or in the immediate future.

FATHER COLLINS: Mr. Rider will present, then, the architectural program.

MR. RIDER: The first thing we did when commissioned by the university was to review with them their background of the proposed building in terms both of the program which Mr. Jeffs just described, which was a result of a great deal of

time and effort over a period of years, and also the planning that had preceded over a long period of years. We spent a great deal of time walking around the site, Mr. W rnecke and myself, Father Collins, others who are involved; and it was our impression that the background for it was logical and we would agree that that was the satisfactory and excellent choice for the conditions that have to be met.

Now we realized at the same time that given that site and that program, that we had in effect three responsibilities: In the first place, we had responsibility to meet the needs of the program for this university library to accommodate a given number of volumes. We also had to do that within of course the budget that had been established, and we realized also we had a responsibility to the university in terms of relating this new building to their existing buildings, and to the historic building that is Healy Hall, and then to the newer buildings which were built in the thirties, so we realized we had both the responsibilities and a challenge in that sense.

We recognized we had a third responsibility which is to the community, and to the city of Washington, that being on this general location we had to respect the skyline of the Palisades, so our approach to these various problems was on the first one, we were very ably aided by the Library

Building Committee in working out our program, working out the building in terms of the program and the budget.

On the second point, the relationship to the existing campus, we spent a little time walking around up on this area here (indicating on model), walking through this public space here which is enclosed, partially, by the Healy Building and then these buildings (indicating) were built in the thirties and we recognized here the challenge was given the site, to make this building relate properly to existing buildings, to enclose this public square in the same sense that Harvard University Square is, so there was that kind of opportunity inherent in the problem.

We also had the third consideration which was the view of the campus from across the river from Key Bridge. In this sense we analyzed the distant view, and several conclusions came to mind. One is that the skyline is very heavily dependent upon the towers here of Healy Hall. If the towers were not there, the situation would be different, so that was one of the factors.

Also driving along we felt we could learn something from the example of this building here (indicating on model), the long brick building that is seen from across the river.

Three things there seem significant to us. One, it was a long

unbroken expanse of wall, which is in contrast to the undulations and rather small-scale development of the previous buildings; secondly, we determined that there were no trees in front of the building; it's on the edge of a precipice here, and there is no place to have trees. There are no trees in front of it. Third, the choice of brick was not altogether a happy one. There was a contrast with the rather dark color of the previous buildings, and contrast also with the dark color in the trees and facade, so with these three things in mind, the philosophy of the building was that we would, as it developed, we would have undulation in the building itself, rather than blocks. Secondly, we had the opportunity, given the fact we are not going to be affecting any trees on the lower part of the hillside here, we had ample area (indicating on model) to have trees around the building; and third, that we could in the development of the library make an effort to relate more to the color value of the trees and to the Healy Building, so that it would blend into the whole composition.

Over here by Mr. Roszak is a sample of a precast concrete which indicates the direction that we are studying for material from which the building is to be built.

I think we're going in the direction of attempting to find material which will blend with the Healy Building, which

will blend with the value of the trees.

Now, as we got into the development of the building there were very specific program requirements which Mr. Jeffs outlined to you. I'd like to explain that we also are affected by the zoning requirements for this particular site, and I'd like to ask Mr. Soklow of our office to review those briefly for you.

MR. SOKLOW: Very briefly, there are no zoning problems under the Act of 1910 of the Zoning Regulations as they are today. Under the Act of 1910 we are limited to a height of 60 feet, because 37th Street on the east side of the building is a (inaudible) foot street. However, if we take advantage of a device known as a building restriction line, 30-foot building restriction line placed on 37th Street, we can go to the height of 10 feet less than the apparent extreme. We can also take advantage of a 5-foot terrace under the regulations -- I'm sure you are all familiar with this -- therefore, by taking advantage of the higher height on 37th Street and locating a 30-foot restriction line on this street, taking the center of the building, measuring from a 5-foot terrace, we're allowed a legal height of 80 feet, which brings us up to a point somewhere in the penthouse area here, putting our entire building in that zoning envelope, and by maintaining one-third coverage, only, of the penthouse on the roof, we

eliminate this as a legal story, again falling within the Zoning Regulations. That would be it.

MR. RIDER: Yes, I'll just very briefly explain the workings of the building. There is a very strong desire to have the building organized with the main floor which has the card catalog and various things in the center, adjacent to the main entrance. This we related to the main existing campus level of the university; then in the main level we have two levels above and two levels below which are devoted to the actual book stacks and reading areas associated with them.

There was further a requirement for a parking area underneath the building, also on the exterior and this lower parking area would also function as a possible sort of emergency expansion area for the library in the future.

Now to explain the functioning of various floors, the main floor, a person coming in to use the library comes in through a vestibule and if he knows where he wants to go, he is immediately going into the elevators or stairs that go up or down; if he doesn't know where he wants to go, he goes right into the building and he has the reference librarian to assist him. Then he either goes, if he wants to research, into the reference room; if he wants to look up a book, he goes immediately here (indicating) to the card catalog. He may be returning a book in which case he goes here (indicat

which is the reserve reading room of the lower classes. Books are kept on reserve here.

On the back of that floor are what are known as technical services. These are acquisitions. The Cataloging Department, which processes the books when they come in. Then it's necessary for these to be very closely associated with these functions here.

Now the typical library floor represented by this one (indicating on sketch) -- this is the floor either immediately above or below the main floor and this is a very simple great open space, virtually unencumbered by vertical elements.

These are the stacks; the books are kept on the open-stack principle. A person comes in, selects his book, either goes down and checks it out or goes to one of several types of reading facilities that are available to him and there are essentially four types. One of these elements is a faculty study assigned to a faculty member. He has the key. It represents a study area for him. These appear on every floor and a faculty member would be assigned to one related to his field.

There's a second type of combination which is known as the closed corral used by graduate students.

The third type is an open corral where the student comes, finds his book --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: May I interrupt a moment? It is a fascinating presentation but we would like to go back a few stages to bring up some of the questions we're going to be bringing up before we get into the details of the building, if you will forgive me. I'd like to ask Mr. Sasaki to discuss the site and the alternate sites.

MR. SASAKI: In listening to your locational criteria of which you had six or seven, I think I can add another one, and I think anyone else can add additional ones, because there are many criteria which come into play to select a site.

One of the terribly important criteria for site selection is this building, the Healy Building. Now let's just say that if this site were not possible, then can you select a site that would be, say, not as ideal as this but the second alternative?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I would call it a site for a library, not necessarily a multipurpose building as this one is.

MR. SASAKI: In other words, in establishing your criteria, maybe your criteria are certainly parochial from your view. Maybe from our view, if we were setting up criteria, we'd also be equally parochial and our concern is I think the fact that this building has in this foreground considerations which are twofold: one is in relation to the

Healy Building but also in relation to this space, because if you look at this campus, I think you can see it here (indicating on aerial photograph). This opens out into a sort of open "U" and since you are anticipating building here now to put a building here, one could say in twice this central mall, so I think one could make a good case of that as not a criteria. In other words, I could set up a location of criteria to demonstrate this were impossible or unacceptable. Now if this were so, can you select an alternate which would work and let me answer this for you. I think you can because as I say, in different sort of choices, you know, one certainly is better than the other, but you can live with, say, more than just one choice and if you look at your campus pattern here, this is your so-called educational facility, this generally is the living with the administration in here (indicating).

I think that any place along here would be equally as valid as in here, considering the fact that, let us say, I just stated this one assumption basically that this was not acceptable.

Then I think you would begin to look in here because this would again be equally related to the functional uses of the land in here (indicating)

I think if we back up one more step, too, put this

kind of remark into context, I think you will begin to understand certain things. One thing is we see this kind of thing happening all over the country where institutions are expanding and they need to have new facilities, so it is inevitable they will expand and they tend to do expansion in two ways: one is to expand within their own campus structure, so while originally it may have started out rather loosely, then as they begin to fill in. The second method of expansion is into adjacent communal areas.

Now you make your choice as to which type of expansion you want on the values that are inherent.

Now certainly the community - - I say nearly every instance of campus we have worked on, the community always resists and opposes an expansion, so they say, "Why don't you expand on your own campus?" Well, I think again you have to look upon certain values that you destroy. I think this building here, very frankly, (indicating on site plan) was a mistake and I'm a little worried if there should be alternate sites available that this not be a mistake. If this building were as skillfully designed and as conscientiously thought out in any other of these places, I think we would readily accept it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: I'd like to add a little bit to the

reason we are taking so much trouble at this point, which I think must be obvious to all of you that we are. We not only have an unusual confrontation of an institution growing into a town but are in this particular case charged with the responsibility for that town in a rather unusual way, and we are very much concerned that Georgetown will grow not only until 1985, but will grow a considerable number of years beyond that. At this very moment, Georgetown is making a decision as to whether its expansion in this direction is going to be in effect an extension of the open campus type it has had so far, or whether it's going to draw a line to the open campus type and expand more or less in the pattern of Georgetown. The analogy would be, say, Harvard Yard, the way it is, and let the other buildings wander off in pattern of Cambridge.

The line that is drawn here in the 1985 plan clearly indicates at least one bite into Georgetown has been made in the type of a typical campus as existed in 1965, and one wonders -- one bit, another bite, what is the intention of the university or does the time come right now when one would say, "Hold the campus to the line that it has had and have the extension be in the pattern, in the character of the own that surrounds it"? This doesn't mean, I rush to point out that anybody believes that one could or should contain a

university from expanding, but it's a crucial issue at just this point which I think is why we're taking so much time and trouble.

FATHER COLLINS: Well, I believe I can answer Mr. Sasaki's question. Mr. Keyes Metcalf -- we tried to probe the depth of our own souls and asked those same questions and there is a site, given the criteria which I would not feel free to change, for us, because they've gone through such a tortuous evolution, each word in it, each phrase has seen blood behind it -- we considered Site No. 8 here (indicating on drawing). Our problem lies that in 1969 our accreditation hangs on the presence or absence of this building. By 1969, it is impossible for us -- this is our best advice from our zoning council -- and myself, having worked in the writing of the zoning laws for the last five years -- for universities in the Washington area -- we could not get permission to have the site there. This is a judgment arrived at after a long time, and Mr. Metcalf sat in on it. This was ruled out to meet the purpose of our existence within the time, so therefore it did lead to this.

MR. KELLY; May I ask what the character of the change you'd have to make is? I take it you do not have a serious problem with the ownership of the two lots there. The question was largely a height and bulk question, was it?

FATHER COLLINS: Yes, and permission to use. We have to get permission. I gave up a right, Georgetown had since 1789 to the National Planning Commission, right of use, and subjected the university for right of use. That's the reason I'm here, after a long search with our own council, as a compromise with the District authorities allowing them to control us. We would not have come here had I not given it up, except as a preliminary thing. Now the Commission has the right of refusal on this site. Before they did not. We gave it up, so now I have to go to them; I've had to go to them for any use outside.

Now I have to go to them for all and having dealt with the Zoning Commission for seven years, you reflect but an inch of the year of opposition that I get from them in terms of going outside of our gate, so we are confronted with a time problem on this and we have analyzed, we didn't take any square foot, we tried to see if it would make sense for us to try to place it somewhere else. Over the years we developed a pattern of growth this way and this way (indicating). I have studies started long before me, 1930, and it was a concern of the Jesuits at that time, and the location of this building -- and this building is evidenced there.

So I think then to answer the question, unless you would see some other logical solution within the present time

reference that we really have no choice, I don't think.

MR. KELLY: I hope that you do not sense that what we are reflecting is opposition.

FATHER COLLINS: No, I'm appreciative.

MR. KELLY: What we are reflecting is deep concern.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Nor are we trying to keep you within the university gates. This is not our position at all.

MR. SASAKI: Whenever a university moves out, it meets community resistance, and there is a conflict between community and university relationship, but still you hear many voices say universities should be prohibited from expanding into the community. As a matter of fact, certain parts of Boston this trend is coming about because it is tax exempt and that sort of thing.

Well, I think all of us here are sympathetic with the need for institutions to expand but because of this prejudiced view given to the institution so far, we think institutions also owe an obligation to the community, especially here in Georgetown University where perhaps part of your difficulty is having built so well, so finely in the past. Had you built poorly, maybe you would not be confronted with this problem, but you're on a very prominent sort of thing, so in a way you're part of the total Georgetown complex, so we represent the view of the larger community interest. This is our charge. So we'd like as much to say, have you considered

an area such as this (indicating on aerial photograph), which would be much less destructive? In two ways: one, as I said, in terms of bulk competing with this (indicating) but not only that, since that building is rather skillfully done, but also in the open space there.

FATHER COLLINS: Well, I tried to say that practically speaking for us in the time --

MR. SASAKI: Would it be worth an exploration?

FATHER COLLINS: We have already explored it with the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it might be of some help if we were supporting your request. It is possible. Maybe not but maybe yes.

MR. ROBINSON: One point, very briefly, in regard to expansion out here, the Georgetown people have -- and we've respected their wishes -- asked us to try to stay somewhat in relationship to the more historical buildings. There are too many out there but there are some which go back. Most of them are 1910 or thereabouts. The architects' concept of this expansion in here was to try to keep these in a reasonably federalistic or somewhat historical profile.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're not necessarily in agreement nothis at all.

MR. ROBINSON: No, this was his concept.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We're not in favor of erection of fake federal buildings in Georgetown to make it absolutely clear to you.

MR. ROBINSON: No, this was just a concept and he felt that to take advantage of this pattern that he'd like to -- well, let me put it this way: something that is more compatible because of its very definite proximity.

MR. KLLEY: You have two members here who are from institutions with these same problems, and you have deep sympathy, believe me.

FATHER COLLINS: Well, I think Mr. Walton's request, could we consider another site, I don't believe within the time that we can. I've been with this particular application. It's gone before the Board of Zoning Adjustment. Then it was referred to the National Capital Planning Commission, which forms an ancillary function of the Board of Zoning Adjustment. I went before their particular subcommittee under Mr. Louchheim, the Zoning Subcommittee of the National Capital Planning, and if we were to propose out here without active legislation, I don't think it would work -- I've been through this for tortuous years, and in reviewing it with staff members of the Zoning, we can't even get permission to use a house out front for a temporary use, so to try and say we'll place a building out here, I believe it's impossible by 1970.

I think if we can happily achieve, in view of Mr. Warnecke's institutional experience, which was one of the criteria among twenty-two architects -- was to have a happy solution here architecturally of an extremely complex problem -- that's why we're here. So I don't believe in a practical -- I'd be happy to try.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, do you have any more questions, Mr. Sasaki, Mr. Kelly, or anyone?

MR. KELLY: I have one small question about the general plans for the library. The building doesn't here show it, but there were plans for considerable expansion to the east or to the west --

MR. RIDER: Yes, this shows a little better the proposals that expansion would occur only on the lower floors, so that we would avoid as much as possible --

MR. KELLY: This expansion isn't contemplated within the next few years?

MR. RIDER: No. Contemplated in twenty or twenty-five years.

MR. SASAKI: I'd like to ask some questions. One is in the presentation you said you did not destroy any trees. Is that correct? In the perimeter area in here?

MR. RIDER: I said we of course did not in any way

deal with trees here which are far beyond our property (indicating on aerial photograph), and there are essentially no trees on this site.

MR. SASAKI: Secondly, have you got the building as low as you possibly can?

MR. RIDER: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: Your garage is at the lower grade level. Can you put that under ground and therefore drop it down?

MR. RIDER: Well, provision of that space was a program requirement. We also have soil borings which indicate we are just about at the rock strata here. Equally important I think with that is the fact this main entrance which is one of the guiding criteria should be related at this 140-foot level (indicating). We found going down two floors we could keep it to a reasonably economical structural situation. We did have space here between the lowest floor and rock strata for a space to be used for parking and expansion of storage. We are studying now, as this little model here indicates, some of our studies are on just what the termination up here should be, given the fact that you need a fairly substantial mechanical penthouse. This building has very heavy humidity and temperature controls.

MR. SASAKI: Yes.

MR. RIDER: We're now studying the actual treatment of that. I'll show you on the model, three possible ways to --

MR. SASAKI: That's all right.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: No, this is the final questioning.

Father Collins, we want you to know we're deeply sympathetic to your problem and you have helped us to an understanding of the depth and complexity of it.

FATHER COLLINS: If you do see another solution I can get, I'm very open to it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: The Commission will take the matter under advisement and we have devoted some time to it and we'll devote some more time to it. We thank you for your very enlightening presentation by all your assistants as well.

(Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m. the meeting was adjourned.)

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 January 1966

AM

9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. INTERVIEWS

- 9:35 1. Temporary Committee on Pennsylvania Avenue
Proposed Design of National Square
(Mr. Nathaniel Owings, architect)
- 10:00 2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Highways and Traffic
Proposed Landscaping of Virginia Avenue
(Mr. G.I. Sawyer, Director, Bureau of Design, Engineering and Research, Department of Highways and Traffic; Mr. Dan Kiley, Landscape Architect)
- 10:30 3. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections
NIH Proposed 5-story Reserve Officers Association Bldg., 109-113 1st St., N.E.
(Representatives of Mills, Petticord & Mills)
- 10:45 4. Department of the Navy
Service Club, Bolling AFB - Proposed Design
(Representatives of Public Works Office)
- 11:00 5. National Park Service, National Capital Region
West Rawlins Park - Development Plan
- 11:15 6. D.C. Government, Department of Buildings and Grounds
a. Blow Pierce School - Revised Design
(Mr. G.A. Purcell, Dept. of Bldgs. & Gds; Mr. Ramos, architect of Clas, Riggs, Owens and Ramos)
b. Seaton Elementary School - Revised Design
(Mr. Purcell; representative of Cassell, Gray & Sulton)

c. Woodson Senior High School - Revised Design

(Mr. Purcell; representative of McLeod, Ferrara & Ensign)

11:45

7. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

Georgetown University Master Plan and Design of Library

(Representatives of John Carl Warnecke & Associates)

