To begin with I come from an area where to look ahead is almost blasphemous, while to look behind is akin to receiving not only the blessings of God, but also a plaque from the Old Santa Fe Association. I might add that I have never received a plaque from the Old Santa Fe Association! I began not receiving the Association's praise as far back as 1954 when Conron and Lent, Architects, designed and built a store-front in downtown Santa Fe. Onto a pleasant, but undistinguished, 1910 brick house with a high pitched roof and a small wood columned front porch, a glass front was added. It was praised by architectural historian, Bainbridge Bunting and then editor of Progressive Architecture, Thomas Creighton. It was condemned by some local architects with such comments as: "Why didn't you build it in Denver" and "Well it's nice, but I wouldn't want to see a whole street of them." The building was used as a fine example of why Santa Fe needed a Historic District Ordinance quickly. An ordinance was enacted early in 1957. The Santa Fe Ordinance is, as many of you know, a leader in the lets-look-like-we-were-built-in-a-yesteryear type of control ordinance. It sets out the parameters of details, architectural style and color to which all must conform. Although the present members of the Architectural Review Board are younger in both age and mind, the ordinance remains essentially as originally conceived.

As with other historic district legislation, the Santa Fe law deals with a specified area only; the rest of the city is left to its own design devises. Further, the stylistic requirements ignore the reality that the architectural history of Santa Fe included the last half of the 19th century. The Santa Fe syndrome, or ideal, to which the ordinance addresses itself, would have all architecture, new or remodeled, reflect the Pueblo/Spanish or Territorial periods. Even my little 1910 red brick house would need to be covered in

A recent neighborhood center in Santa Fe by Luna Associates.

an earth tone stucco and the roof flattened. Too much of historic Santa Fe has been lost, or buried through this process of early-up conformity. This process has occurred both inside and outside the Historic District, it began in 1910 when the Palace of the Governors was "restored" from its 19th century Victorian grandeur to what archeologists thought it should have looked like in the early days. The ordinance is merely the written manifestation of the attitude of the controlling citizenry. It is an attitude which affects most of the architectural projects undertaken since 1910, it continues to this day and has resulted in an attitude which tends to stifle creative and investigative architecture. It is an attitude based, I believe, upon the lack of education in our schools dealing with the history and development of the environment; thus the layman on any review board or building committee has little or no background from which to make architectural judgments. Further, he knows that much new architecture which he sees is plainly out of context with its surroundings and ranges from dull to awful. Therefore, it is safer to require a certain style of architecture, or to set guidelines for judgment based on harmony, scale, similar materials, etc., which too often leads to a thin mockery of the original. To be sure, Santa Fe gives a general sense of place and quiet charm. It is a comfortable place in which to live. But I cannot think of one really good new piece of architecture that has been built since before World War II, although a neighborhood center is one of the best of the recent works. Rather than promulgate rules dictating the specific appearance of buildings with well meaning but consequent constructing effects, I advocate and propose that review boards be directed by a city wide design plan and a general philosophy which preserves and maintains the historic legacy of the city through constructive direction, advice and education of all citizens, and which encourages excellence in new architecture. I urge that this philosophy include the principle that all proposed construction make a clear distinction between what is old and what is new. No legal barriers should be allowed to prevent planners, architects, landscape architects and other designers from experimenting, exploring and expressing new ideas. It is the vitality of architectural growth and development that gives historical continuity to our cities.

All of our cities are made up of a variety of historical architectural expression, generally each is designed of and for its time. Most, if not all, significant buildings have this distinguishing mark. It leads only to a dilution of the historic view when new construction is made to mock its earlier and honest neighbors. The integrity of historic buildings is respected and the historic buildings of the future are created when new architecture not only harmonizes with the old in sensibility, scale and proportion, but also expresses its own time, solves its own needs and relates to the place in which it sits. Slavish reproductions of the past will deprive us of the landmarks of the future.
"Old and New Architecture, its Design Relationship," begins with a recognition of the old structures and their relationship to the cityscape. The flavor of a community is largely set by the history of its social and cultural past, its architecture and the remnants of that history. Further, that flavor is spiced and enhanced by the way those remnants relate to the landscape—the street pattern and street trees, to the parks and plazas, open spaces and cemeteries. It is this combination of architecture and place that makes each community unique. While much historic architecture in Charlestown and Key West may be similar in style, detail and form, it is the uniqueness of place which distinguishes them from each other. Thus new architecture should, perhaps, relate as much to place as it does to style; it must be sympathetic to the adjacent facade lines and lot coverage, but it must also be cognizant of the city vistas and silhouettes, the natural hills and valleys that give additional form to a city. New highrise buildings should not dwarf and shadow the older lowrise neighbor. The hills of San Francisco should not disappear behind high-rise office buildings, as they are now doing.

Further, in such important historical cities as Savannah and Santa Fe we need to prevent the continued pollution of the areas beyond historic district edges where the cacophony of garish signs, cheap franchised motels, restaurants and gas stations scream for our attention, and violate our sensibilities. Long John Silver has tied his grey wood sided seaside pier to the arid sea of Santa Fe, and the Williamsburg Colonial Revival curse has spread to the adobe heritage of Santa Fe, with a typically poor Ramada Inn Motel. But maybe even worse is corporation compromise. In Taos, New Mexico the Colonel planned one of his red and white striped mansard roofed chicken huts. The citizens of the town rightly objected; corporate power pressured; a “compromise” was reached. Rather than red and white, the hut has been earth toned. Fake vigas (roof support beams) are pasted onto the bottom of the Mansard inspired roof.

Our respect for the historic fabric of a city must not only condition our consideration and review of new building plans, but must demand our consideration for the local streetscape and total cityscape. Accordingly, the design of the street itself becomes important. Texturing of the street surface and use of colored pavings can aid in the control of automobile speed and flow, and define pleasant walk ways. I don’t know about you, but I am bored with the basic black of asphalt paving. Furthermore, it would seem that the legendary Fuller Brush man and his super-sales capabilities has been replaced by the traffic light salesman and his evil allies: the local traffic engineer and the Bureau of Public Roads. The clutter of directional signs and overhead traffic lights at simple street intersections is ugly and completely unnecessary; when as we have all seen, they mix with the quaintness of new reproduction gas lights, the result is comic—if not tragic!

Thus it is apparent to me that cities must look...
beyond the usual architectural review of bounded districts, and the usual limitations to consider only "publicly visible facades." The city must set broader design goals for both the inside and outside of historic districts. To the prevalent habit of zoning for use, property set-backs and parking space requirements must be added the total character and shape that the city and its citizens see for themselves. Planning departments and design consultants must become more bold and creative. Also, they must, in a real sense, become departments of civic education and thereby point the way towards a dynamic three dimensional city.

A city-wide design plan would begin with the study of the existing three dimensional qualities which give distinction to the various parts of the community. As mentioned previously, certain special qualities and features already exist in all of our cities and they exert a strong influence on the viewer, the local citizen and the transient visitor as he or she moves throughout the city: the imposition of a grid-iron street pattern upon a naturally hilly terrain; a river, lake or bay which shapes city edges (and which, particularly in the United States, the city has most probably let become a cesspool and trash dump); the arrangement of lots and their buildings; the landscaping and space which separates buildings; the location of isolated or grouped highrise buildings, and the smooth rhythm or vibrant staccato which modulates street facades. The whole impression of this urban environment, as seen from the moving automobile, the walking pedestrian, or the porch sitting resident, forms the foundation upon which a design plan can be drawn and long range goals set.

The city planning department and its Review Board must be given the tools for the implementation of established goals. These tools must include the power to review not only for new construction, but also for the restoration and preservation of the historic structures. Except for varying degrees of procedures for obtaining or delaying a permit to demolish a building, most ordinances that I have seen do not address in any detail the philosophy nor the technology of preservation: for example, the importance that retention of historic fabric is preferable to replacement by like copy in fiberglass. Under present ordinances and existing property tax structures, it is possible that in time attrition by fire, willful neglect and demolition will leave only the approved look-a-like new construction along with the fibreglass and epoxy replacement of the older fabric.

New Mexico made a beginning in the direction of economic encouragement for preservation by the passage in 1969 of a property tax credit for the preservation of historic structures. It is working for us. The 1977 federal tax law is another long overdue but none the less welcome tool.

Now can we take the next step and use the property and income tax as encouragements for high quality, harmoniously compatible new construction? Why not reverse property taxes to encourage environmental design of high quality? The present system of property taxes are generally destructive; they too often invite neglect; they are in fact, licenses to destroy!

While taxes can become one beneficial tool for the encouragement of good architecture, a design philosophy will be the glue which welds the foundation of past history to the bricks of a continuing history. I have said that a philosophy, which incorporates a three dimensional understanding of the place along with a recognition of the time of new construction, is necessary for the creation of the contemporary and compatible new building. It is easier to say this than to do it. But I suggest that a philosophy that says: "yes, try it," is far more conducive to a quiet or exciting excellence than one that says: "conform." I personally prefer a failed attempt than a successful copy. A failed attempt will vanish in time, or just may eventually make the list of valued historic follies.

The new State Capitol in Santa Fe, commonly referred to as the Round-House, is an inept compromise of architectural cliché and conformity. The architect claims that the plan recalls the Zia Indian symbol: a circle (the sun with rays projecting from the four quadrants). It is a functional disaster! But more seriously, while it does display an applique of Territorial mode details, it fails to take advantage of its place. A distinctive New Mexico Indian and Spanish heritage is the defensive enclosure, the plaza and the placita: space and planting surrounded by a building or complex of buildings, not, as in the case of the Capitol, the other-way-around. A master-plan for the expanding needs of the State Capitol complex was prepared just prior to the planning and construction of the Round-House. Like too many master-plans, it was ignored. While it did not attempt to design new buildings, it did try to point a direction and set a design concept. It placed strong emphasis upon the enclosed garden placita heritage. The New Mexico
State Capitol is a folly, but I pray that it does not last long enough for it to become a historic folly worthy of preservation.

In contrast is the Taos County Court House. The architects have, I feel, achieved a most imaginative and successful new building. It is compatible with its heritage, the town of Taos, and the nearby Indian Pueblo of Taos; it speaks proudly of place. Furthermore, with forceful conviction, it addresses the needs and functions of the present time. Will it become a landmark of the future?

There is one more area of "Old and New Architecture, its Design Relationship" I would like to touch upon. I hasten to admit to a prejudice here, and I am willing to say that in some cases this may be the only way to preserve something of a historic structure. One room from the Adler and Sullivan Stock Exchange in Chicago has been reassembled in a museum, while the elaborate entrance arch stands rather tragically forlorn and out of context in a Chicago garden. Lasting monuments to former Mayor Richard Daley. These bits of historic cloth are saved, and that is good. Better a piece of the pie crust than no pie at all, but the building has been demolished. The Chicago story of necessity in the face of adversity brings me very nearly to the end of my presentation, with a case of partial preservation frosted onto new construction. I fear that the applause that has been given to this "preservation" may lead others to emulate this approach. However, I feel it is a good example to illustrate the paucity of architectural creativity when both client and architect are culturally unconscious. The leading department store in Salt Lake City needed a vast expansion of its floor space to better serve its customers. I don't for a minute doubt the reality of this need. But lost forever is the 19th century ZCMI building. Lost, also, is the opportunity to use the soaring interior spaces, cast-iron staircases and tall woodpost columns as a foreground for new floor space needs placed elsewhere on the same city block. We have lost the heart and soul of the ZCMI building; we have the empty eyes and open mouth of the original face staring blankly, but colorfully painted, from the solid mass of the new store just three feet behind. This is a sham of preservation.

I have shown you examples of what I believe to be the good, the poor, the mockery, the sad, the funny, and the shame of building the New into the context of the Old. Those which I feel are successful recognize not only the heritage of the past, but serve well in the framework of today.

And now to sum up my thesis and to close my presentation. We need not only to relate to the proportion of the old, but to create for our own time; not only to harmonize with the old, but also to allow for the occasional, sometimes needed, contrast. The new must be designed to fit into its historic neighborhood and also to fit within the parameters of the city as a whole. We must design the cityscape to enhance the preserved Old and proposed New. We must be imaginative and creative within our own time and place, solve our own needs and thereby leave behind us a heritage which in time will be worthy of preservation.

The communities and landmarks of today and tomorrow are in your hands. I ask you to be gentle with history, violent with its destroyers and enterprising with your builders. —JPC

What was once a lively building facade is now a blank-eyed mask of cast iron across the new ZCMI Store in Salt Lake City.