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ABSTRACT

Architecture is a dialogue. It is a communication between those who design and the society which they design in. The two are inseparable. The role of the designer, which I have chosen as an architect, is that of a communicator. A communicator participates in a design dialogue, which he may also initiate. He also responds and listens well to what society says. The success of the built environment comes through an improvement of this architectural dialogue.

This thesis addresses the process of a public dialogue of design by initially viewing the participants in the conversation. The architect in society is an examination of the changing role of the profession of architecture, leading to many of the issues regarding communication. Society in architecture is the larger world which influences design of all forms. Design is not an exclusive ability of the design professions, but rather an element of all society.

This dialogue is then studied in the context of Copley Square, located in Boston, Massachusetts. When looking at Copley Square, the physical forms are not the only reason for its success or failure, although they do play a significant part. In both designs resulting from the national competitions held in 1966 and 1983, the designers were of exceptional merit. Both designs met the objectives of their respective programs very well. What is notably different is the process which each solution was arrived at, the interchange between designer and society.

Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay Associates, designer in 1966, had relatively few guidelines and very little input from the community for which they were designing. Dean Abbott, of Clarke & Rapuano, designer in 1983, was responding to a clear set of guidelines reflecting community concerns. He then proceeded to work with the local community in a set process to further articulate the design of Copley Square.

Copley Square represents an example of what a design dialogue can achieve, both emotionally and physically. From this, all designers, whether professional or not, can learn.

Thesis Supervisor: Tunney F. Lee
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"Environmental images are the result of a two-way process between the observer and his environment. The environment suggests distinctions and relations, and the observer -- with great adaptability and in the light of his own purposes -- selects, organizes, and endows with meaning what he sees."¹

- Kevin Lynch, Image of the City
I visited the Boston Common with my 10 year old nephew. We were both excited to go, as the summer day was proving to be spectacular, full of warmth and sunshine. We had never gone to the Common together before, and I was kind of anxious to tell him about the place and the buildings around it, as he had never been there with an architect.

We looked at the State House from the edge of the Common. I began to explain who Charles Bulfinch was, and how Beacon Hill was later cut down. Tommy only said how he loved the shining dome, because he could see it from across the Common.

As we continued our walk, the squirrels in the trees were more of a fascination to my nephew than my description of what a New England Town Common was. When I got to the point about cows grazing on the open grass, however, Tommy asked me why they didn't raise cows the way his dad does in Wisconsin. I explained the differences between lifestyles in Boston in the 1600's and now.

Our talk was interrupted when Tommy's attention turned to the swan boats in the Public Garden. He wanted a ride, of course, and my personal feelings of kitsch would not persuade him otherwise. Yet the ride was enjoyable in an experiential sort of way. My nephew loved it, pointing out to me the variety of sounds and colors he sensed throughout the journey. Everyone was having such a good time, he told me, and I realized he was right.

I returned to the Boston Common a few weeks later, this time with George, a fellow architect I had gone to school with. Our conversation naturally gravitated to issues of design. Tremont-on-the-Common became our first object of debate. The apartment building was obviously too tall, we observed, and quite out of context with its neighbor buildings. We discussed the shadow it casts on the open space of the Common, and how the proposal to ease the height limits of future buildings would increase this effect.
Turning our attentions to the State House, I asked George to compare the procession leading to it with that of the Parthenon in Athens, his home town. The similarities were strained, at best, but after stumbling over a few tourists following the red line of the Freedom Trail, talk evolved into the theoretical concepts of power, dominion and their architectural manifestations within the two buildings. We left the area of the State House and began to walk through the Common again. I casually turned back to see the shining gold dome standing out from the distance, but said nothing to George of my nephew's comment.

We quickly bought sandwiches from a local vendor, and stopped in the middle of the park, at the point where we could look down the axis of Commonwealth Avenue. It was the handsomest example of the City Beautiful urban design movement in Boston. While we ate on the grass, I pulled out my small chess set to challenge George. Between moves, our discussions turned to Haussmann's Paris and L'Enfant's Washington D. C.

Our own experiences of urban spaces followed, spaces old and new, from Athens, Rome, London, Bath, Barcelona, and Siena. Images and descriptions of American cities such as New York, St. Louis, Minneapolis, Chicago, Madison, Los Angeles, and Tuscon, were all possible due to our similar studies as architects, and as travellers. Oblivious to our surroundings, we talked at length in a language few people other than architects could understand.

Towards the end of the summer I again visited the Common. My 86 year old grandmother, or Nana, came with me. A short walk on the meandering paths was enough before we looked for a bench to rest a while. Rising up to the sky in front of us was the steeple of the Park Street Church. While we sat, she told me about the church. From the choirs that sang there, to the many pastors she has known, the church was full of the praises of God. The steeple, too, she added, was to reach the heavens to get closer to Him. I, too, enjoyed the steeple. It's elegance, tapering in four steps, from red brick to its white spire. Nana told me how the white spire glows at night, especially on Christmas eve.
I asked Nana about what Boston was like when she was younger. She remembers when the church steeples were the majority of Boston's skyline. Each had their own character, and they helped you locate where you were in town. Only the State House compared in magnificence. Its grandeur made you feel proud to be from Boston. I then heard the story of how my uncle was honored by the Governor back in the 1940's. Every time she sees that dome it reminds her of that special day. Now, she says, the tall skyscrapers hide the State House and most of the church steeples, and the skyscrapers all look alike.

We walked some more in the Common, to the Frog Pond, where we sat down again. Nana loves to watch the children playing in the water, or chasing after some animal. The kids remind her of when her own children came to the Common. There were festivals and music, singers and dancers, picnics and games. I enjoyed talking with her, and I remember her asking me as we left the Common - "What kind of architect are you going to be?"
YOUR greatest worth is in an area where you can claim no ownership, and the part that you do that doesn't belong to you is the most precious. It is the kind of thing you can offer because it is a better part of you; it is a part of general commonality that belongs to everybody.\textsuperscript{1}

- Louis Kahn, Between Silence and Light
The architect in society is part of the dialogue between architects and society. It is how the architect is perceived in the world he helps create. Many times it is how he wishes to be perceived. In either circumstance, this effects the communication necessary for architects to work.

Present day images of the architect by the public are numerous. This variety is part of what makes being an architect appealing. There is a certain mystery behind the title "architect," a mystique that many architects promote rather than dispell. Much of this can be attributed to the fact that most people will never deal directly with an architect in their lifetime. Consequently, the images one forms about architects come from other sources. The most obvious example stems from the 1943 novel by Ayn Rand titled The Fountainhead.²

Howard Roarke, the hero and architect in the story, is the uncompromising designer who places individual achievement above anything else. The individual architect is all knowing and is responsible only to his building creations, not to the people he deals with in life and work. The novel and its film version in 1949 were, according to Andrew Saint, "an unsparing celebration of the architect as hero and genius."³

Another recent bestselling novel has portrayed a different view of the architect. In Tracy Kidder's House, real live architect Bill Rawn designs and observes the construction of a small house.⁴ The story is a quite personal view of the American Dream to have the home of your own built. While less dramatic than Roarke, Rawn is seen in a more realistic portrayal of an architect. He performs many tasks, from transforming client's ideas to tracing paper, to debating the construction adjustments required.

House is more than the architect Rawn, the owners Jonathan and Edith Souweine, and the Apple Corps construction team. It is really the relationships and dialogue between them. It is their individual values coming together in the physical form of a home. It is at times a romantic
interpretation of the characters, but this can often be the case in a single person architectural office.

Architects are generally depicted in society as individualists. This often gets interpreted as inaccessibility and impracticality. From Phillip Johnson's towering presence on the cover of Time magazine in 1979, to Robert Stern's recent "Pride of Place" series on PBS television, the image the public received of architects was less than enthusiastically endorsed by fellow architects. The benefits of such exposure is a continued fascination of the profession by the public, and a forum to explain and educate society about a portion of our architectural environment.

The architect's perception of his own role in society often varies from his public image. The professional role itself has been one of constant change. If one wants to give the title of architect to those who designed and built habitable shelter, then the history of the profession is as old as man himself. In Genesis 4:17 Cain, son of Adam, built the first city, naming it Enoch. Although this cannot prove architecture to be the world's oldest profession (tradition seems to have decided this), it does show the importance of those who create the built environment.

In Western society, it was not until the academies of architectural education were formed that architects sought to advance themselves to a social standing above the craftsman. The Accademia di San Luca in Rome, founded in 1593, and the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris were the most renown of these academies. The precedent begun by these architectural schools became the norm when formal architectural education came to America, with the School of Architecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, founded in 1865. The Beaux Arts approach openly advocated an architecture where artistic beauty was the major priority, and defied practicality and economy. While rejecting the style of the Beaux Arts, the Modern architecture movement of the Bauhus again aimed at reinstating the power of all design decisions to the architect. Similarly, elements in society, including technology, financial and construction industries, have eroded that control.
Omer Akin, associate professor of architecture at Carnegie - Mellon University states quite explicitly:

"The architect, by his insistence on a model of operation which anchors in pure design tasks only and only remotely controls other architectural tasks is on the verge of losing control over all tasks permanently."\(^9\)

This suggests that the emphasis of the Ecole des Beaux Arts and the Bauhaus on the supreme nature of design has done a disservice to the profession. Akin argues the benefits of redefining the architect's role to include more comprehensive services such as building maintenance and operation, office management, development, programming and construction management.\(^11\)

These roles, excluded in many small offices, are in fact present in numerous larger firms. The major factor needed to create these services, however, is specialization of individual tasks within a large firm. So while the professional architectural firm may be "redefining" its role, the role of the individual architect (or technician) within that office has been even more specialized.\(^12\)

Even if, as Akin suggests, architects immerse themselves in pure design tasks only, there are numerous other designers competing for the same tasks. Architects have lost (or perhaps never had) the sole market for design services. Designers abound, as even the AIA Handbook of Professional Practice reads:

"...architecture is no longer the sole domain of the Architect... careers in the environmental design professions may encompass the following:
- Architect - Architectural Computer Technologist - Architectural Educator - Architectural Historian - Architectural Technician - Construction Manager - Interior Designer - Landscape Architect - Profession Engineers (Civil, Mechanical, Electrical Structural) - Urban and Regional Planner."\(^13\)
This does not include designers of related fields in the arts, such as graphic design, fashion design, sculpture, music and on and on. There is certainly design in many fields outside of the immediate realm of the architect. Yet all are concerned, in a certain manner, with architecture. Louis Sauer, architectural professor and a Pittsburgh architect adds,

"Anybody who makes a decision concerning buildings or settings is, to me, an architect. The difference to me, between the small "a" architect and the big "A" architect that gets registered is in the ability to be predictive in problem solving."

Architects use this problem solving technique in many fields besides architecture. Roger K. Lewis writes that less than 50% of all incoming architectural students in universities across the country will become licensed architects. While this shows the attrition attributed to the standard architectural education, it also shows that an exposure to the techniques of design is being integrated into other professions. In Europe the numbers are even more convincing. Professor Gunter Behnisch of the Technische Hochschule in Darmstadt tells that over 50% of his graduating architectural students never plan on practicing architecture. They use their architecture degree as a liberal arts education.

Practicing architects occasionally leave the profession for positions in related fields, such as facilities management, development, etc. Roles in governmental agencies are common, including planning commissions and redevelopment authorities. Many of today's business corporations include in-house architects on their staffs to more efficiently maintain their building portfolios, or to act as liason in new corporate construction. It is clear that architects are using their unique sets of abilities in many nonconventional roles. This can only serve to help the built environment, as knowledgeable "designers" will ultimately assist in creating a better place to live.
"American architecture will mean, if it succeeds in meaning anything, American life."\textsuperscript{1}  

- Louis Sullivan, Kindergarten Chats
Society in Architecture is another portion of the dialogue necessary for meaningful architecture to be created. This is the element or quality within all of us which make our lives enjoyable, fulfilling, and rewarding. This could be called culture, I suppose, but that particular word has many previous explanations which I will undoubtedly omit. Context is a better word. Society in architecture is that which is inside both architects and non-architects. Yet, as Lou Sauer mentioned earlier, we are all architects in some way.

The architect’s dream is still alive today. Thousands of us are trying to design the masterpieces which will survive centuries. Thousands more of us are less concerned with the monuments, but with the everyday building which is the heart and soul of most architectural offices. We all know architecture is far too complex to be handled individually. Architecture cannot exist in a vacuum. It is intrinsically tied to a society which has thousands of variables, each effecting the profession we call architecture. Likewise, the profession has hundreds of variables which effect it internally and externally. The diversification of its members, its combination of art and science. Within this there are architects performing a multiplicity of tasks. Design is only one of these. When we consider the task (or art) of design it also cannot exist in a vacuum. It effects, and is effected by a constant barage of impulses from all around. We filter these impulses into a managable number which we both understand and agree with. These filters are formed, based upon life experiences, values, and knowledge.²

A design, consequently, is further adjusted throughout the process of creation. The physical form of architecture is a changing thing. The form it is today is a snapshot in time, because tomorrow will come and something will be different. Litter may have been thrown in the corner, or dust may have settled on the desktop. Tomorrow the sunlight will be different, or the wind will blow harder through the streets. Every person has changed since yesterday. A new pair of shoes feels the pavement, or someone points out the children playing in the street. Nothing is stagnant; both the built environment and society change. From concep-
tion to construction to occupation to aging, a built environment changes and grows and adjusts. In this sense it is an organic process — evolution of design. It is important to realize that the role of the "initial designer" is but a small segment of this. It is also a hard thing to acknowledge for many designers. The ever growing opinion within the profession is to design more effectively to suit this organic process. One of these procedures (or processes) is to encourage a more participatory role of those using the project in the initial design. Participation is an over-used catch-cliche lately, but it is critical to understand what the participation means. It does not mean design by committee as is the common claim of traditional architects. (Many architects do not need a committee to design camels.) What it includes is a communication of ideas from designer to society and society to designer to create the best outcome. Both are designers, and both are society.

Much has been written about these design methodologies. Without attempting to explain in detail the entire argument behind the works of John Zeisel, Donald Schon, and Thomas Hubka, each does deal with how a designer translates ideas. Zeisel's diagram of one cycle in the design-feedback process contains three major steps; image, present, and test. Imagery can be seen as the problem to be solved, whether qualitative or quantitative. Presentation is the formation of a solution, and testing is a
trial of that solution.\textsuperscript{5} As the diagram shows, a body of empirical knowledge is the basis for the feedback and creation of the process. This empirical knowledge should include not only the knowledge of the designer, but the participants as well.

The architect has the expertise in many areas, but must admit that his expertise is not in all areas. Accepting filters (advice, ideas) provided by others improves the quality. Likewise, most everyone has an interest in design issues. The architect must recognize this, educate himself and grasp the key points of input, and interpret them into the group design.

In his description of reflective designing, Schon, considers design to be "conversation with the materials of a situation."\textsuperscript{6} The methodology is one of constant exchange between the designer and the image represented. Due to the complexity of any real-life problem, many consequences occur which he had not intended, both good and bad. The situation's back-talk is Zeisel's bank of empirical knowledge. The adjustment of the design image to reflect this back-talk is the basis of reflective designing.\textsuperscript{7}

In more basic terms, what this suggests is that almost all design ideas, or imagery, is a result of experiences and information available to the designer.\textsuperscript{8} The more experiences an architect can draw from, the greater the possibility that the idea will be satisfactory. It only follows that a dialogue of design will add to these experiences.

It is these interactive principles which contribute to the success of an architect. Design skills are needed, but even being a good designer is not enough. In the process by which you design, the skills which you transfer to, and receive from others (laymen) in your design process, the communication dialogue is the key to greatness. Some architects could do it alone; most must work at it. In a good communication process a good architect can become great. Others share in the design experience, and the product produced is better. The product, then, has a life of its own, and can grow and adapt through time!
One should reflect, occasionally, on how we, as architects, view ourselves in the context of the society we live in. This becomes a highly personal and humbling analysis, because it requires a person to explicitly state their values. What is important to you? We are trained in the individual centered lifestyle of the architectural school. We are trained to view things on a conceptual level. Architecture often becomes an obsession to us, and one interprets the world with these viewpoints. Society is viewed from our separate perspective. We view society from outside its bounds, rather than from within its parameters. We must be able to view from both, yet not consider one more important than the other.

This can lead to what is known as the ivory tower concept. Architecture is above and beyond all else. This is architecture with a capital "A." The value system relating to this is architecture above all else -- family, friends, society, nature. Egocentricity in the manner of Howard Roarke. No compromise, no admission of less than perfection. What is created is a separation of the designer from the environment where the design takes place.

Prominent contemporary architect Hugh Newell Jacobsen agrees. He states:

"I see no sense in getting down to earth ever. That's what's wrong with most of our profession. I would like to see all of us get back to the ivory tower where we belong."

Another viewpoint is to see the society we live in from within its boundaries. In this case we are part of the society we view. What we do has an effect on our surroundings. Likewise, our environment effects us. This does not prevent us from evaluating our situation, but we must evaluate ourselves as well. It is similar to the physical body where all parts work in unison, yet no part is superior, no part is expendable. There is much more power and energy available by working within the system than without. An architect can tap resources already existing by involving others in an activity or cause they agree with. In the final
result, the task is accomplished by many, and all have felt the satisfaction of the result.

The formal design training which architects receive should, in fact, improve their skills and abilities within the design realm. A leadership role, or facilitating role, can guide the process along. Recognition of players and participants in the design process is critical, as all have contributed. The recent Massachusetts Governor's Design Awards Program was based upon this principle. Realizing that the design of our environment is the result of a multiplicity of talent, awards for design excellence were given to, among others, the architects, contractors, engineers, financiers, and owners of the award winning projects. Those awards reflected not only how good design has a profound effect on everyone, but also that good design is the work of many talents.

The values of the architect are so important, how he sees his role in the process of producing architecture. A design created by such a collaboration is organic in the sense that it will change from day to day, season to season, year to year. Additional transformations may occur, and they will be within the process established by the original design. Because the maintainers of the design are involved with the design, they have an understanding of its worth, beauty and meaning. The architect has communicated to them, and they have communicated to the architect. Portions of all personalities have been planted in the design.
"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think of them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion."\(^1\)

- Thomas Jefferson
Since the 1960's much has been written and documented concerning the process of design. Is it possible that, prior to this, architects themselves designed without understanding how they did it? A sort of big bang approach to creative design? No! Several architects have written about formal issues in designing, approach to materials, etc., using Wright, Corbu, Kahn, Sullivan, Mies, Gropius as examples. However, little was explained of the "magical" art of designing. This was part of being an architect -- its mystique.

Within the past 20 years social scientists and designers have collaborated to explore this process of designing, including Garrott, Schon, Moore, Lyndon, Hubka, Zeisel. If explained simply, one realizes more thoughtfully how a designer works. If explained complexly, the sociologists enjoy themselves. Architects are not sociologists, but rather designers of social spaces.

The contribution made by these analyses is not to explain and create a recipe for how to be an architect. What it contributed is a pattern of representation available to the architect to better understand the way he works. The creative talent, and artistic ability, long the "treasure" of most architects, remains the possession of the architect, unexplained.

What this tells us is how architects can best work within a public dialogue of design. Each person in society has creative talent waiting to be tapped. Contributions made by each person within the design process adds to the fulfillment of their design talent, their sense of creativity, and also the project as a whole. The architect, trained in design and understanding the methodologies of the design process, can utilize the experiential abilities of the other persons, without losing the guiding conceptual design he treasures.

Donlyn Lyndon, Professor of Architecture at the University of California - Berkeley, explains this process most eloquently:
"Most importantly, we must 'let in' the user, not as a hapless occupant filling a chair in the 'living room,' or 'giving scale' to the elevation, but as an active participant. He is the person who really defines what's 'in,' the person who uses the architects clues to establish a world for himself.

Architects must learn to understand the tension between actual possession and abstract possession. The architect abstracts the act of possession, clarifying it through the discipline of selected observations... It should be neither an arbitrary generality nor a glove-like translation of specific activity. The user must be allowed to participate, to reclaim through his acts that which has been abstracted for him."

The communicative dialogue assumes that all involved have a desire for a satisfactory solution. This does require creative ability by the architect. Participation in its own right will not result in a good solution if the architect has no talent. However, once a level of quality has been met by the architect, his ability for communicating and responding to other participants is the factor which creates good design.

The architect should understand and agree with this process, guiding a project along qualitative solutions to the issues. As a facilitator, and a professional, alternatives will no doubt be realized which he had not thought of. Paraphrasing Paul Rudolph, sometimes we must shoot our "little darlings" when we realize they are not appropriate to the design solution. As architects, we all carry around our own bag of tricks which we hold dear to us. Sometimes, we must let go and bury our pride enough to acknowledge alternatives suggested by others. A dialogue results; both sides grow.

A dialogue recognizes that people appreciate and understand their environment on a series of levels. This may be through simple experiences, all the way to the most sophisticated professional criticism. All are valid, and all can be shared. Appreciation is not intrinsically tied to aesthetic beauty. The proverbial phrase "beauty lies in the eyes of the beholder" is very appropriate. However, the social issues of enjoyment, safety, comfort, habitability, accessibility, adaptability, variety, and appropriateness are the keys to the success in an environment. Through a dialogue these can be met.
"Not only is the city an object which is perceived (and perhaps enjoyed) by millions of people of widely diverse class and character, but it is the product of many builders who are constantly modifying the structure for reasons of their own."¹

- Kevin Lynch, Image of the City
Copley Square holds a unique position in the history of Boston's development, both socially and architecturally. It has always been an area of contrasts: old and new, rich and poor, tall and short, open and closed. Its development reflects this, from the original land fill operations of the Back Bay in the 1860's until the unification of the square by the 1966 design competition. The interchange between the zeal of designers and the reality of societal needs was often equally diverse.

The area which now is known as Copley Square was once a muddy tidal flat. As a part of the great Charles River Basin, it was flooded with water as the tides rolled in, and was then a murky swamp at low tide. Nature seemed to have forecasted its position; that of being caught between opposing forces.

The filling in of the Back Bay removed the swamp, replacing it with an axial urban design fabric reminiscent of the grand schemes of Paris by Haussmann and Aşhand. The South End developed simultaneously. While not having the axial features of the Back Bay, it was similar in its linearity. Two urban grids were created, and approximately 30 degrees
differentiated their orientation. The collision of these two grids occurred in the area of present day Copley Square. It was a space of transition between two distinct districts.

The Back Bay was conceived as an extention of the Common and Public Garden. Its orientation was determined by the existing Mill Dam, which became Beacon Street. As land was being reclaimed by filling in the Charles River basin with gravel and topsoil from Dedham and Newton, a grandiose style of architecture developed. Living in close proximity to the Public Garden proved to be an asset socially. Housing formed a continuous fabric along the long axis of the Back Bay streets. The trees and width of Commonwealth Avenue provided a boulevard of green urban space sympathetic to the Common. The rapid development of the Back Bay in the period of 1850-1865 created a homogenous style of row housing, of lineal fashion. Boston's social elite found the Back Bay to be second only to Beacon Hill in respectability. Commonwealth Avenue became, along with the Boston Common/Public Garden, one of the two leading forces in determining the value of land with respect to location.

The South End was created on reclaimed land from the Charles River also. Its difference in orientation from the grid of the Back Bay is due to the railway lines of the Boston & Providence railroad. The South End grid paralleled these lines. A similar process of fill and build soon created a housing stock within this district also.

The fill and build process was one in which owners would build on land as soon as the land had been reclaimed from the Charles River basin. This linear development had many architectural characteristics. As the South End grew from the Northeast to the Southwest (and the Back Bay from East to West), the individual buildings were constructed in a similar linear fashion. Within any given block, the architectural style would have a consistency. That is not to say that they lacked variety. Designers, being designers, added a certain individuality to the structures, yet used the precedents of those structures built previously. Materials and scale provided the most unifying features.
The South End, while constructed at the same time as the Back Bay, never reached the social status of its neighbor. Its location with respect to the Common, and the economic recession of 1887 contributed to this. As a result, the South End became a district of reasonable housing for less socially accepted Bostonians, most notably immigrants of Irish, Greek, Jewish, Syrian, Chinese, Black and Hispanic descent.

The Copley Square area was juxtaposed between these two grid patterns, and yet was not a part of either. The fill and build development patterns of both the South End and Back Bay did not occur here. In this area the land had been filled in, and the boundaries formed by the street grids much earlier than any construction. It was, in a sense, left over space which was in little demand.

The relative underdevelopment of Copley Square was also due in part to the low property values of the land it was on. Doreve Nicholaeff gives three apparent reasons for this low value in 1860. The first was the large distance of Copley Square from the Public Garden, an area of high value. The second reason was the valuable improvements of the developments on the south side of Beacon Street. The emphasis there being to build between Commonwealth Avenue and the new edge of the Charles River. The third cause was the character of Boylston Street and the lands south of this street, which were much worse in contrast to Beacon Street.

The Copley area was essentially a Back Bay block with a diagonal street (Huntington Avenue) running through it. Boylston Street and St. James Avenue extend east to west, forming the north and south borders of Copley Square. Dartmouth Street and Clarendon Street extend north to south, thus providing the other boundaries of the "block." Trinity Place and Providence Street also bisected this block acting as alleyways. In all, these streets divided the area into six parts of a variety of wedge shapes and sizes.
Buildings in this area were to take a new form of development. Unlike the row houses, built almost one after another in linear fashion, these structures were built one by one on separate pieces of land. This resulted in larger, more object-like buildings.

The party most interested in the area was a group which called themselves "the Committee of Associated Institutions." This group consisted of business and professional men wanted to create a Conservatory of Arts and Sciences, somewhere in the Back Bay area. Their aim was to create permanent homes for societies devoted to Agriculture, Horticulture, Natural History, Mechanics, Manufacturers, Commerce, Fine Arts, and Education. This idea stems from a mid-Nineteenth century ideal that the public environment was incomplete without access to
museums and such societies that would make life more socially complete.\textsuperscript{14}

After several years of bargaining, the Copley area was chosen for this idea of a State Conservatory. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Museum of Natural History were chartered in 1861, and given land in the Boylston, Clarendon, Newbury and Berkeley block. This site was given to these institutions due to both its availability and also because the Conservatory would raise the value of the land in the nearby area. This block became known as Institute Square.\textsuperscript{15} Although the Conservatory was never fully realized, this initiative did create the stimulus for further civic and cultural institutions to locate themselves in the Copley area. Within the next twenty five years, Trinity Church, the Museum of Fine Arts, the New Old South Church, and Boston Public Library would all locate here.

Prior to these permanent structures, a large temporary pavilion, called the Peace Jubilee Coliseum, was built on the site of the future Museum of Fine Arts. This structure was created to host a gigantic concert. This concert, attended by President Grant, performed a featured piece from Il Trovatore, which was the anvil chorus lead by one thousand musicians, a ten thousand member chorus, church bells, drum corps, and a troupe of one hundred firemen beating upon anvils with sledge hammers. A later Jubilee of 1872 featured Johann Strauss conducting and performing his own music on a site just south of the 1869 Jubilee.\textsuperscript{16} Both cases represented an architecture which was demountable, similar to that of Paxton's Crystal Palace in England.

The Museum of Fine Arts was placed permanently on the corner of St. James Avenue and Dartmouth Street in 1870. Its facade faced Dartmouth Street, the main north south thoroughfare in the area. It was only in 1876 that the wing fronting on the square was completed. This led to the characterization of the open space as "Art Square."\textsuperscript{17}
Trinity Church, in 1872 became the first building within the Back Bay to occupy an entire parcel of land. The site for the national competition was actually a consolidation of two of the six parcels formed by the diagonal Huntington Avenue. By closing Providence Street for the church building a precedent was set, (repeated by the Boston Public Library in 1887) which disrupted the linear nature of a block. This placed great emphasis on both the church and the space in front of the church, "Art Square." The masterful, winning solution to the competition by Henry Hobson Richardson forever changed American architecture.

The spire of the New Old South Church occupied the northwest corner of Dartmouth and Boylston beginning in 1873. Further developments along Boylston Street, the Chauncy Hall School (1873) and the Second Church (1873) began to fill in the north side of Art Square.

Housing in the form of residences and hotels constituted the remainder of the immediate area. Several were even located on the site of the present BPL. The quality of Art Square was recognized by its description in the August 1878 American Architect and Building News:

"...the triangular space is made one of the architectural centers of the city by the continuity of Trinity Church, the Museum of Fine Arts, the New Old South Church, and other new buildings."

Thus the square had finally been realized as more than left over space!

The period of 1880-1885 was the turning point of the square. Within those five years, the City of Boston purchased the remaining four odd shaped lots within the area. The major reason for this was to provide an open urban space to preserve the views of Trinity Church and the Museum of Fine Arts. Trinity Church had been voted the best building in America by the American Institute of Architects in 1885.

The four pieces had had several proposals for buildings prior to this, including plans for a chemistry building for MIT (1872), a hotel (1878) and an apartment building (1884). Luckily, none came to fruition and the
city was able to act as a force in uniting the open space. Although far from being a grand civic space, the area was officially united in 1883 and named Copley Square, after the painter John Singleton Copley.\textsuperscript{24}

The western face of the square remained relatively open and free of structures. The Boston Public Library had purchased half of the block facing the square in 1880. In 1882, the city allowed the closing of the Providence Street alley, similar to what had been done for the Trinity Church site. The Boston Public Library then purchased the remainder of the block from the Harvard Medical School, and began plans for constructing a new building on the land.\textsuperscript{25}

The design for the new library was the work of the architects McKim, Mead, and White. Its design and construction was finished in 1892, thus completing the enclosure of Copley Square. The architectural significance of the library was great for a number of reasons. Its Neoclassic style was in strong contrast to the Romanesque style of Trinity Church. The church had added two towers and a porch to its Copley Square facade from 1894 to 1897, thus emphasizing its orientation to the square.\textsuperscript{26}

These two buildings, representing the best examples of their different styles and ideologies, placed Copley Square in the center of debate within the architectural world. As Nicholaeff notes:

"...the square provided the place for discussion about architectural fashion in 1900."\textsuperscript{27}

It is no coincidence that the first school of architecture in America was also located in Copley Square, that being MIT. The presence of Trinity Church and Boston Public Library reinforced the conflict or contrasting position Copley Square had maintained up to this point.

The library to many represented the new Imperial America, while the church was medieval and of a slower paced generation.\textsuperscript{28} While only
twenty years separated their designs, it did show the direction which American architecture was moving. It was ironic that one of the library's designers, Sanford White, was once a student of H. H. Richardson, designer of the church.

The importance of the space created a need for, and enforcement of building codes to preserve the character of the square. Height limits had forced the removal of four feet of cornice and two feet of the roof of Westminster Chambers, located directly east of the Museum of Fine Arts.29

While the structures around the square were gaining national recognition, the square itself still remained an open intersection of two city street grids. The four odd lots had been consolidated into two triangular shaped spaces, covered with "mangy lawn."30 The streets were wide and active with traffic of automobiles and trolley cars.

How to improve the quality of the design of the square itself was a frequent topic of debate. As early as the 1860's a park of some kind was proposed in the vicinity of the square. This green space was actually created, and was the site of the 1869 and 1872 Peace Jubilees, and later the Museum of Fine Arts. In 1892, prior to the completion of the Boston Public Library, the Boston Society of Architects (BSA) began to discuss the future of the Copley Square regularly.31 Coming out of these conversations were many schemes for the square, ranging from sunken gardens, statuary, fountains, ornamental plantings, to simply grass and trees.
Charles McKim, of the architectural firm who designed the Public Library, proposed a simple vision in 1890. He suggested a simple fountain, while removing the grassed areas.

Figure 4
Ralph Adams Cram, in 1895, depicted his Copley Square scheme in the monumental style of classical Rome. He described his design "as a central circle and a sort of Trojan's column in the center." This civic square removed all reference to the Huntington Avenue diagonal, except for the placement of the column at its terminal axis.\(^{33}\)

Figure 5
The demolition of the Museum of Fine Arts building, and construction of the classical Copley Plaza Hotel in its place in 1912, added more impetus for the square's design. Schemes by Frank Bourne in 1912, and Arthur Shurtleff in 1914 reflect this classical emphasis. Both ideas added trees, lighting and benches, addressing the desires that the square be more people oriented.

Figure 6
"I look forward to an America which will not be afraid of grace and beauty, which will protect the beauty of our natural environment, which will preserve the great old American houses and squares and parks of our national past, and which will build handsome and balanced cities for our future..."¹

- John F. Kennedy
While the unification of Copley Square in 1883 created an open urban space, its formation into an open urban square was not completed until the Copley Square design competition of 1966. This effort reflected the power which the government wielded in Boston's urban renewal movement of the 1960's and 1970's. The competition provided nationwide exposure to, and an award winning design for Copley Square. The motives, dialogues and subsequent transformations of the square are critical to the understanding of what has been called, by John Updike, "that cold slab in the heart of the Back Bay."\(^2\)

Figure 7
Urban renewal was a major force in the formation of present day Boston, both physically and politically. While one can argue the numerous negative results of this process, the same process produced a new Boston, and was indirectly responsible for the new Copley Square. Prior to this movement, there was little incentive, encouragement, or desire to change Boston's built environment.

John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston from 1950 - 1960, gradually changed public opinion of the city officials from corrupt to helpful.³ City officials, including the previous mayor James Michael Curley, were characterized as "super crooks" by Boston's business leaders. This contributed to the fact that Boston was forgotten by the postwar building boom which hit most American cities.⁴ Hynes' change was difficult, and realistically he planted seeds which blossomed in the 1960's administration of John Collins. John Hynes and his "New Boston Committee" formed of traditional old-money Boston Brahmins and the new middle class forces of the Irish, Italian and Jewish communities helped solidify a need to uniformly address the future of Boston's downtown. Thomas O'Connor, in Bibles, Brahmins and Bosses writes:

"Undoubtedly, his (Hynes') most valuable contribution to Boston's history lay in his vision of a transformed and modernized city as well as his conception of the means by which this multi-million dollar dream could actually be accomplished"⁵

It was Hynes who laid the groundwork for the first of Boston's major developments, that being The Prudential Center. The official announcement came in 1955 of the future $200 million dollar project just down Boylston Street from Copley Square.⁶ It took several court battles and law changes to finally realize the project, which was constructed in the early 1960's.

John Hynes also established the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) in 1957, which accomplished two major projects.⁷ The formation of the Government Center Commission prepared the way for the demolition of Scollay Square and its replacement by the new complex of
government buildings built in the 1960's. The BRA also created the West End Development Plan, a clearance of blocks deemed "dilapidated and impoverished" by professionals. These blocks were replaced by housing towers catering to a new group of wealthier tenants. The highly publicized failure of the West End renewal project set the stage for the arrival, in 1960, of a new mayor, John Collins, and his development mastermind Ed Logue.

In his own words, "Boston was a sad community" recalls Mayor Collins, "People had given up on Boston." As a new mayor without a series of campaign debts or political obligations which had always characterized the mayoral position, Collins was able to cultivate the businessmen, academics, politicians, and bankers in a spirit of optimism which Hynes had initially started. He quickly brought in Ed Logue to be the development administrator of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. Logue was an experienced city planner from New Haven, where he had learned the process of how to accomplish major development efforts. As Logue put it, "John Collins provided the confidence and I created the delivery system." His delivery system included a federal government which was committed to urban spending during the early 1960's. It was no coincidence that both the Speaker of the House of Representatives John W. McCormack, and President John F. Kennedy were from Massachusetts, and were willing to help Boston. The "Great Society" of J.F.K., L.B.J., and the BRA were to pump millions of dollars into urban renewal projects in Government Center, Washington Park, the Waterfront, Charlestown, the South End, the Fenway, and the Back Bay including Copley Square.

Ed Logue wrote in his 1967 report titled "Seven Years of Progress" that:

"The Back Bay is one of the most important and interesting residential, commercial, and institutional areas of the city. Its architecture sets the tone and character of Boston in the mind of the traveler."
Copley Square was to be a new focus of activity within the Back Bay. Logue adds that it had long been the goal of the city to make it a real square (rather than an intersection). This was reflected in the 1965 Master Plan for the City of Boston, which proposed the closing of Huntington Avenue from Clarendon to Dartmouth Streets. This would unify the area in front of Trinity Church into one parcel. The idea for a competition to design the square came not from Logue, but Jack Halley, City Engineer, within the city Department of Public Works.\textsuperscript{13}

The nature of a competition was a politically advantageous one for Mayor Collins. As with the City Hall competition, the Copley Square competition would remove the selection of an architect (and any potential political blame) from the Mayor’s shoulders.\textsuperscript{14} Needless to say, any credit from the success of the competition would be Collins’ also. In the long run, he would receive both.

Mayor Collins introduced the 1966 National Competition program as follows:

"The beautification of Copley Square has been a long-sought objective in Boston. Planners, architects, and civic-minded citizens have urged for many decades that Copley Square be redesigned and restored to its architectural prominence as one of the world’s great urban spaces. We are hopeful through this competition that the nation’s most talented architects and landscape architects will offer many outstanding design solutions. I am confident that the winning design will serve not only as a guide for the restoration of Copley Square, but will represent a model for the beautification of other cities throughout the nation."\textsuperscript{15}

His goals were large and he expected a transformation of Copley Square rivaling other cities. The jury for the one stage competition was filled with noted design professionals and area executives. They included Pietro Belluschi, Dean emeritus of MIT’s School of Architecture and Planning; Jose Luis Sert, Dean at Harvard’s Graduate School of Design; Sidney Schurcliff, President of the International Federation of Landscape Architects; Hugh Stubbins, Vice-President of the American Institute of Architects; Wilhelm Viggo von Moltke, Director of Urban Design at
Harvard's Graduate School of Design; H. Russell Beatty, President of Wentworth Institute; Roger C. Damon, President of First National Bank of Boston; Asa S. Knowles, President of Northeastern University; and Bryan E. Smith, Chairman of the Board at Liberty Mutual Insurance Company. Charles Hilgenhurst, AIA, and Director of the Boston Redevelopment Authority's design review board acted as professional advisor to the competition.16

The area residents seemed overlooked in the decision making process. The BRA acted as client and advisor to the process. This reflects the strength of the governmental organization typical of 1966. They were concerned with results. They also felt they could represent the interests of the area best. The issues pertaining to the design objectives of the new square were minimal. Of the 32 page competition document, only a single page dealt with the design objectives. Two pages gave design requirements, and the remainder consisted of neatly packaged information promoting Boston.17

The competition was an ideas competition, with few mandatory requirements except a $500,000 budget constraint, no allowance for buildings and commercial activity of any kind, and a need for paving in front of Trinity Church. The idea was to make the square a visible feature of change in Boston, again reflecting the desires of the city. The nationwide exposure was important for realization of the "New Boston" campaign. Locally, or nationally, there was not a methodology to the design of large urban spaces. William H. (Holly) Whyte had yet to study the social aspects of urban places. While Kevin Lynch had published The Image of the City in 1960, it already determined Copley Square to be a strong elemental node in Boston.18 The majority of the strength of the design would come from the designer, as historically was the case.
The result was a monumental plaza designed by Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay Associates of Watertown, Massachusetts. Their scheme was influenced by the sense that the density of the Back Bay (and the High Spine concept) would require a large, open piazza for relief. The image of the great Piazza Navonna in Rome was a reference. The design was quite straightforward. The sunken plaza focused on a fountain which was asymmetrically positioned with respect to Trinity Church. Patches of green landscape and trees line the edges of the square, with the remainder of the surface being paved. The firm's design statement read:

"The proposed plaza design recognizes the need for each building (around the square) to have its own setting, yet relate to the Square. The symmetrical facades of the Library and the Hotel are acknowledged and brought into the composition. The new Old South Church is emphasized and made part of the space by the strong visual tie afforded by the corner directional walls. The offset location of
Trinity Church is countered by the gently fanning stairs and the sunken pool and fountain. Diagonal pedestrian movement is encouraged; the cascading steps gently entice the pedestrian visually and actually into the Square. While views from all sides into the plaza are unimpeded, once inside the space, a sense of enclosure is provided by the strong evergreen edge and low walls surrounding the sunken area.20

Figure 9

The Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay scheme was praised immediately by the City. In articles such as "Elysian Oasis: The Triumphant Transformation of Copley Square," both the Square and the efforts of the City to enhance the area are cited as "particularly vital to the atmosphere of Copley Square."21 This article also addressed the attitude prevalent at the time that the new high modern office towers included in Boston's High Spine idea were necessary and pleasing when contrasted to the "inadaquently scaled, run-down buildings" on the north side of Boylston Street. The bigger and better attitude was an asset. The new square followed this, turning its back on the Boylston pedestrian street by means of a wall, and providing a bold, big space. In all respects, the designers were very successful in addressing the desires of the BRA and the competition program.
What was lacking was an interchange, or dialogue with the Back Bay community during the predesign and design development stages. Stuart Dawson, of Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay, recalls no public discussion of the desires of the community prior to the competition.\textsuperscript{22} During the development and construction of the design from 1966 to 1968 Dawson says the neighborhood associations (Back Bay Council and the Back Bay Planning and Development Corporation) played a very little role in the project. Dan Ahern, Executive Director of the BBCDC, was involved in the efforts to raise money for the Square. According to Dawson, Ahern was concerned with the lack of green in the design, but otherwise was supportive. Even Trinity Church, which became incorporated into the new space, had little conversation with the designers. While the competition program calls for Trinity Church to follow the design intent on their property, Dawson never remembers them as being a willing participant.\textsuperscript{23} The communicative process was solely between the designers and the BRA.

Despite the BRA acting as client, the City paid very little of the cost of the new Square. Of the proposed $500,000 budget, half came from an urban beautification grant from the Federal government.\textsuperscript{24} The remainder was to be raised by local contributions of civic and business organizations, and some city funds for areas like sidewalks. The typical design nightmare is the budget, and Copley Square was no exception.

The first place recommendation of the jury was actually turned down because it exceeded the budget by over twice the cost, according to Ed Logue, director of the BRA at the time.\textsuperscript{25} The Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay scheme met the budget allowance, although the jury in its report expressed a hope that the budget could be increased in order to upgrade the quality of the materials.\textsuperscript{26}

This never occurred, and delays caused by strikes, and city bureaucratic decision making actually caused a reduction in the quality of materials used.\textsuperscript{27} The budget estimated for a completion date of late 1967 was required to build a plaza completed in July, 1971. Hideo Sasaki,
in a 1971 reaction to the materials used, compares the cost per square foot of similar plazas done by his firm:

"...the Constitution Plaza project in Hartford which we completed in 1964, cost approximately $13.00 per square foot; the Plaza Bonaventure in Montreal, done in 1967, cost nearly $20.00 per square foot; and our most recent project completed this year in New York City, cost $225.00 per square foot. Copley Square was built at a construction cost of $6.85 per square foot." 

Despite the cost factor analysis, the changes which were occurring, and still occurring to this day in the area play a more significant role in the reaction to the Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay design.

Within the design community, the most significant factor was the work of William (Holly) Whyte, an urban space planner from New York City. As director of the Street Life Project in New York City beginning in 1971, Holly Whyte researched the how's and why's of successful and unsuccessful urban spaces. Much of his work was published in 1980 in the widely acclaimed book, The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces. Whyte stated in his introduction:

"This book is about city spaces, why some work for people, and some do not, and what the practical lessons may be....As this manual will detail, it is far easier, simpler to create spaces that work for people than those that do not--and a tremendous difference it can make to the life of a city."

Both Stu Dawson and Dean Abbott, designer of the winning entry to the 1983 Copley Square competition, cite Whyte as being a major influence on their work since the early 1970's.

Holly Whyte's book is almost a checklist for what a designer should do (or facilitate) to create a social space. It also points out the major physical flaws of the 1966 design for Copley Square, when viewed twenty years later. To Sasaki, Dawson, DeMay's (now Sasaki Associates) credit, one of the most highly successful spaces studied by Whyte was Greenacre Park, designed by Sasaki.
The physical neighborhood of Copley Square also has changed, and effected the plaza. Most noticeably, the John Hancock Tower (I.M. Pei, 1975) now looms over it. While quietly reflecting Trinity Church with its blue glazing, the gale winds and morning shadows make the Square almost uninhabitable at times. While Sasaki knew the design for a tower was forthcoming, they could not predict its micro-climactic change on the area. The addition to the Boston Public Library (Phillip Johnson, 1972) was less noticable in appearance than in the fact that it moved the entrance of the Library from Copley Square to the mid block of Boylston Street. It would be another eleven years until a concerned group of citizens called the Copley Square Centennial Committee would convince the Library to re-open the entrance. A revival of retail shopping changed and enlivened the first floor shops on Boylston Street, north of the Square. This same shopping experience created Copley Place at the southeast corner of the Square. Not only did Copley Place seal off the urban hole created by the demolition of the S.S. Pierce building in 1958, but it also proved the benefits of a public/private process of citizen review.

The process that the City of Boston had to go through in order to build went through a series of changes following the Copley Square Competition. Almost as Mayor John Collins left office in 1967, Federal funding of urban renewal projects decreased substantially. The war in Vietnam shifted Federal dollars from domestic programs to the military. L.B.J. left the White House, and his "Great Society" went with him. Ed Logue left the BRA, and after an unsuccessful campaign for mayor of Boston, left for New York City. The BRA did not lose its strength, it only lost its Federal renewal funding. By this time, however, the BRA was a major landowner in the city, by the acquisition process of eminent domain. Funding for projects came more from the private sector, or in cooperation with public projects. Hynes and Collins had succeeded in creating a spirit of optimism in the minds of developers in Boston. The City and the BRA continued to create attractive packages to encourage growth, but not on the scale as previously done.
Reaction against the policy which the City of Boston created development took several forms. Herbert J. Gans wrote the story of the West End Redevelopment project from a socio-cultural viewpoint in his book, *Urban Villagers.*[^35] The impact, although too late to save many larger scale clearances, did cause designers to re-evaluate total demolition of "blighted" areas. A process of selective demolition and construction was to become the more common practice of the BRA in the late 1970's.

The late 1960's and early 1970's was a period of citizen activists in Boston and across America. Boston, being a center of education with MIT, Harvard, Boston University and Boston College, among others, was fully supplied with students and intellectuals concerned with issues from stopping the Vietnam War to promoting civil rights. Citizen groups also fought urban renewal projects in many neighborhoods. As urban renewal declined, these groups sought to maintain a control or influence on development in their area. The formation of Community Development Corporations (CDC's) provided this. Federal legislation in 1975 created guidelines for the CDC's.[^36] These non-profit corporations helped to create development projects on a more local scale. Through the use of Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), a federal program of incentives for smaller neighborhoods, the CDC's carried on projects which were of local concern.

This neighborhood concern reflected the attempt by new Mayor Kevin White to placate the city during his first term beginning in 1967. Boston remained a hot bed of racial tension between the black community and the traditional ethnic white communities. As White was just becoming able to alleviate this tension, a 1974 Supreme Court decision forced Boston into mandatory busing in its school system.[^37] Long overdue, it caused vile protests in many communities, especially Charlestown and South Boston. This helps illustrate again the tension placed on a space like Copley Square, the link between Boston's somewhat neglected ethnic South End and more affluent white Back Bay.
The ability of the City of Boston to maintain its public open space was devastated by the economic recession of the early 1970's. Due to the oil embargo, among other factors, the City and nation fell on difficult financial times. City services were cut, most visibly in the form of park maintenance, police patrols, etc. Many argued that this was a political mechanism in which to convince residents that tax increases were needed. Whether this was true or not is not important, but rather that the litter, graffiti, lighting, and general maintenance of Boston's open space suffered. Included in this area were the Common, Public Garden, and Copley Square. In many cases, concerned residents rallied to preserve the spaces, forming groups such as "The Friends of the Public Garden," which helped maintain that space. In Copley Square, however, that did not occur.

The City, which had been the major client in the design in 1966, now chose to neglect its role as owner. The neighborhood groups, such as the Back Bay Council, were hardly in a position to step in to maintain the space. Even Trinity Church, with its prominent position on the Square, had never dreamed it would be required to subsidize its maintenance.

Sasaki Associates was well aware of the condition in which the Square was becoming. Correspondence shows their willingness to modify the design to accommodate the changing needs and desires of the area residents and merchants. Plans and recommendations to improve the quality of the Square were given to the Boston Parks Department in 1977. Those included more trees, more seating, more flowers, fountain improvements, and better lighting. Few of them were carried out. One can speculate that this was due to lack of money or desire on the part of the City of Boston, or perhaps the general inflexibility of the original design.
"Communities should -- and do -- have a right to participate in the planning of their future." — Andrea O. Dean, AIA Journal
The desire for a redesign of Copley Square came from local citizens of the area, who for a variety of reasons, felt the present square did not satisfy their needs as well as it possibly could. This private initiative to transform a public urban space resulted in another national competition for Copley Square in 1983. The process of creating the competition and its current development is one of translating community concerns about the character of the space into guidelines and, ultimately physical form through a public dialogue. This process is a result of changes within the community of Copley Square and also the architectural design community. The result illustrates the possibility and benefits of such a participation in design.

The stagnant condition and inflexibility of the Sasaki design of 1966 had caused both businessmen and residents to look at Copley Square with regret. Activities occurring on the Square, and its unsightly appearance were a detriment to business, and it was their ingenuity that created the possibility to revitalize Copley Square. Businesses in the area were enjoying a time of prosperity in the early 1980's. Sam Bass Warner, Historian at Boston University, described it as follows:

"Boylston Street offers a fine indicator of the health of the entire district. When it is lively and prospering it is a sign that the comfortable town dwellers are home."²

Plans for Copley Place, the new Prudential Center development, and active storefronts on Boylston bear this out. The area was indeed lively, yet an under-utilized Copley Square was located right in the middle of this. In a similar situation over 100 years earlier, a group called "The Committee of Associated Institutions" sought ways to improve the area. In 1983, an organization was formed called the Copley Square Centennial Committee (CSCC), to acknowledge the 100th anniversary of the Square and deal with its condition.³
The CSCC was the brain-child of Kenneth Himmel, who represented Urban Investment and Development Corporation (UIDC), developer of Copley Place. Copley Place was the 3.7 million square foot mixed use project located at the corner of Huntington Avenue and St. James Avenue. It represented the largest and most expensive project of its type built in Boston.\textsuperscript{4} In order to be built, the developers worked in a public/private partnership with State, City and citizen groups. The process of early discussion of issues related to the public realm was implemented. Previously, issues such as height, bulk, massing, traffic, pedestrian access, etc., were discussed in a knee-jerk reactionary position, after the majority of the planning and decision making had been done. In Copley Place, the input of the public, or "society element" was early in the process. While critics are still determining the overall merits of the project, this early public dialogue improved the design. As Bernard Cohen wrote in Boston Magazine:

"...it is very hard to avoid the conclusion that Boston got a vastly better project through community input. In that regard, Copley Place was a pioneer."

Ken Himmel especially realized this. Incorporating public participation had not only improved the design of Copley Place, it was influential in achieving it, since much of the State's backing hinged on this process.

A major force behind the citizen organizations was Tunney Lee, Professor of Architecture and Urban Studies at MIT. Himmel and Lee
realized that a similar involvement in the future of Copley Square would be required to accomplish anything.\textsuperscript{6} MIT, once an original resident of Copley Square, before moving to Cambridge in 1916, returned in another capacity. The MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning (LAP) would associate with the Copley Square Centennial Committee to initiate a design process, involving individuals and organizations concerned with the Square, to improve its condition.

The Copley Square Centennial Committee is a public/private partnership, chaired by Ken Himmel, and composed of a variety of corporations, institutions, public agencies, and individuals (see Appendix C). Each member represents an interest (or interests) which collectively are able to address comprehensive issues which individually they could not. Emotionally, each has, to varying degrees, a tie to the urban space itself. This is the societal element of the space, where one works, lives, worships, etc.

The public process which the CSCC proposed contained three phases. The first was a study of the existing conditions and review of the Square as it stood in 1982. This would include public workshops and public awareness to the Square, and what was needed. Phase two would be the selection of a design, designer, and construction of a new Square. Phase 3 would be a provision for continued maintenance and supervision of the new space for the future.\textsuperscript{7}

While all three phases were important to the eventual success of Copley Square, phase 1 (programming) and phase 3 (maintenance) were especially critical. These were acknowledged as the principle flaws of the Sasaki/BRA scheme of 1966. There was, in fact, very little programming done for the earlier competition. By programming, I mean clear, qualitative descriptions of what was desired by the client for the activities and use of the space. As mentioned previously, the guidelines for the 1966 design were minimal and somewhat undecisive. Tom Piper, of the MIT group who assisted in writing the 1983 guidelines, deemed the earlier guidelines "faulty."\textsuperscript{8}
The maintenance phase of the Sasaki scheme was non-existent. The City of Boston, through its Parks and Recreation Department, was to maintain the Square upon its completion. As previously described, the financial ability of the City to provide the required maintenance was lost, which compounded the deteriorating condition of Copley Square. In both issues, programming and maintenance, those flaws were hoped to be averted when Copley Square was redesigned.

The major players involved in the redesign process are important to recognize, as many different (often hidden) agendas were working simultaneously. These included the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), the Copley Square Centennial Committee (CSCC), the MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, and Dean Abbott of Clake & Rapuano.

The BRA is the public agency representing the City of Boston, owner of the Square. The BRA acts as overall coordinator of the redesign effort. They are staffed with planners, architects, landscape architects, and administrators which are aware of the technical and political aspects of development in Boston. Dean Abbott refers to the BRA as the "contract client," while he describes the CSCC as the "user client." 9

The CSCC is the large non-profit organization composed of both public and private groups. Its membership constantly grows, from just over 50 in May 1983, to 97 in February 1987. 10 Within the membership is every major institution, business, and neighborhood group in the Copley Square area, as well as many city-wide design and presentation groups. Of special significance are representatives from John Hancock, New England Life, Liberty Mutual, UIDC, and Prudential. These were often referred to as the "Big 5," which provided much of the initial and subsequent private capital to fund the project. 11

The "Big 5" are the major commercial groups bordering Copley Square. They are a sign of the true economic strength of the area. Each group realized that the redesign of the Square would have an impact on their business, yet each group was using the Square as a "good deed" to
gain leverage with the City in other development projects. John Hancock had originally agreed to demolish its 1921 tower, and build a plaza in order to obtain permission to build its present 60 story tower. New England Life is presently negotiating with the BRA for approval of its new two tower development behind Trinity Church. UIDC is contemplating adding to its Copley Place project. Prudential is also redeveloping their property, and need several variances with the BRA. The point is, that these organizations, as well as most commercial groups, have more than the good will of their hearts motivating them.

The MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning was to provide technical assistance to the CSCC in the research and programatic issues leading up to the selection of a designer for the renovation of the Square. MIT was to develop and act as facilitator of the public participation process. Due to the nature of its position as an institution of learning, MIT gave long term perspective to the process, and also provided the project (and Boston) with a record, or memory, of the process.13

Dean Abbott was the winning designer of the competition. He represents Clarke & Rapuano, an urban and landscape design firm in New York City. Abbott entered the process after the guidelines had been written, and most of the procedural processes established for the design dialogue which continued. He was no stranger to Copley Square, however. He had entered the 1966 competition just two years after graduating with a Master of Landscape Architecture degree from Harvard. While considering himself an artist first, who prefers not to compromise his design ideas, he also spent seven years involved in the participatory design workshops in the New York offices of Lawrence Halprin.14

To achieve a new Square, MIT and the CSCC contacted the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) for a grant to help finance the process. The grant application, titled "An urban design demonstration involving private, public and professional interests in the redesign of Copley Square in Boston," proposed the three aims of the effort.
1. Activities: the choice of activities should be made with respect to a clear understanding of the nature and significance of Copley Square.

2. Management: the creation of the system of permanent financing and management that perpetuates its intended purpose, including adequate maintenance and a method of governance and regulation.

3. Design: to improve the physical environment of the square and finally achieve the promise of the site.

To realize these aims, the CSCC created subcommittees in each of the areas, as well as funding and public information committees. Each committee was composed of members from the CSCC representing a cross section of ideas, interests, and expertise from government, neighborhood, historic preservation, design, and planning professions.

The intent of the committees established was to discuss and achieve a true consensus among the citizens of Boston of what a redesigned Copley Square should be. The result would be a set of guidelines, both qualitative and quantitative, which the professional design community would use as a basis for proposing a new physical design for the Square. The original MIT grant proposal called for three possible formats of accomplishing the design task: a designer selection process; a limited competition; or an open competition. This decision was to be made at a later date. Regretably, this decision was never made by consensus. The MIT grant was rejected by the NEA. However, a grant application submitted by the BRA, calling for an open competition following guidelines developed by the process created through MIT and the CSCC, was accepted by the NEA in May 1983. This will be discussed in greater detail later, but it caused a link in continuity to be broken in what was an established dialogue of designer and society.

The five CSCC subcommittees, with MIT as facilitator, confronted the issues of Copley Square through analysis and broad citizen input. Paralleling the meetings of the subcommittees, information on the technical aspects of the existing square, including micro climate condi-
tions, traffic, pedestrian use, was provided by MIT. Historical research, including the requirements and design of the 1966 design, were likewise completed.18

Understanding the opinions and desires of the general public led to four major symposia held at the Boston Public Library from July 7 to September 27, 1983. These symposia addressed the major issues of the future Square: "Great Public Spaces" brought an overview of the history of Copley Square and objectives for a new urban space. "Copley Square: Its Best Uses?" concerned the activities which should occur in the Square. "Taking Care of Copley Square," was directed at the management issues of a revitalized Square. "Copley Square: Alternative Futures," gave three possible scenarios for what a new Copley Square could be. Each symposium acted as a forum for discussion, and active audience participation resulted. Questionnaires given to the more than 1,200 people who attended the forums asked for ideas on how to improve, change and redesign a new Copley Square. The majority of the attendees were design professionals and citizens activists concerned with the Square's future.

The symposia grew out of the need to provide a larger public dialogue than simply the Centennial Committee itself. The first, "Great Public Spaces" brought Holly Whyte and Sam Bass Warner to set the stage for discussing the overall objectives of the urban space called Copley Square. Whyte, in the words of Dean Abbott, "has done the most to influence urban design in the past 20 years. He has quantifiably proven ideas which common sense says is correct."19 Whyte brought many ideas about the successes and failures of public space in general, and also about Copley Square.

"I think the great problem of Copley Square is its divorcement from the street."20

About modifying the present design;

"...I may be wrong on this, I think you've got to bite the bullet. I think you've got to de-sink that plaza."21
GREAT PUBLIC PLACES
the first of four Public Symposia in honor of
THE CENTENNIAL OF COLEY SQUARE.
July 27, 1983

Presentations will be given by
WILLIAM H. WHYTE
Author and Observer of Urban Life
'Why Public Places Fail and Work'
and
SAM BASS WARNER, JR.
Professor of History, Boston University
'A Perspective of Copley Square'

MODERATED BY KATHARINE D. KANE, DEPUTY MAYOR, CITY OF BOSTON.

6 P.M.
RABB AUDITORIUM
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
FREE ADMITTANCE
PUBLIC COMMENT AND
PARTICIPATION IS ENCOURAGED.

The Symposia are being sponsored in part by a Cable to Promote Copley Square by the
Copley Square Centennial Commission, Inc., John Hancock Tower, 200 Clarendon Street, Boston, MA 02116.
For more information, call 536-3375.

OTHER SYMPOSIA ARE SCHEDULED AS FOLLOWS:
August 17, September 29, and October.

TAKING CARE OF COLEY SQUARE
a public symposium
in honor of
THE CENTENNIAL OF COLEY SQUARE
Discussion focusing on the management
and maintenance of Copley Square
September 14, 1983

DANIEL BIEDERMAN
Executive Director of the Bryant Park Restoration Corporation, New York
"Long Term Maintenance and Management of Open Public Spaces"

Panel members are:
BETHANY KENDALL
Executive Vice President,
Downtown Crossing Association
ROBERT R. McCOY
Commissioner, Parks and Recreation Department
of the City of Boston
REVEREND SPENCER M. RICE
Rector, Trinity Church

MODERATED BY LAWRENCE T. PERERA, ESQ. OF HEMENWAY & BARNES AND CHAIRMAN OF THE
COLEY SQUARE CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE'S MANAGEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE.

6 P.M.
RABB AUDITORIUM
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
FREE ADMITTANCE
PUBLIC COMMENT AND
PARTICIPATION IS ENCOURAGED.
COPLEY SQUARE: ITS BEST USES?

a public symposium

in honor of

THE CENTENNIAL OF COPLEY SQUARE

Discussion will focus upon the existing and potential activities for a revitalized Copley Square

August 17, 1983

HENRY GELDZAHLER
Former Commissioner of Cultural Affairs of New York City
"Perspectives on Programming Public Places in the Nation"

Panel members are:

PHYLIS ANDERSEN
Landscape Architect

LOWRY BURGESS
Environmental Artist

HARRON ELLENSON
Activities Programmer, City of Boston

MARGIE SEGAL
Special Events and Cultural Affairs Coordinator for the City of Philadelphia

MODERATED BY TUNNEY LEE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, DIVISION OF CAPITAL PLANNING AND OPERATIONS, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

6 P.M.
FREE ADMITTANCE.

RABB AUDITORIUM
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

PUBLIC COMMENT AND PARTICIPATION IS ENCOURAGED.

COPLEY SQUARE:

ALTERNATIVE FUTURES

a public symposium

in honor of

THE CENTENNIAL OF COPLEY SQUARE

Discussion focusing on three design scenarios for the revitalization of Copley Square

September 27, 1983

"PASTORAL OASIS"
Kevin Lynch, Professor Emeritus, M.I.T. School of Architecture
Principal, Carr Lynch Associates, Cambridge, Environmental Design

"FLEXIBLE STAGE SET"
Laurie Olin, Chairman, Dept. of Landscape Architecture, Harvard University
Principal, Hanna/Olin, Ltd., Philadelphia, Environmental Design and Planning

"MULTI-USE CENTRUM"
Paul Friedberg, Fellow, American Society of Landscape Architects
 Principal, M. Paul Friedberg & Partners, New York, Landscape Architecture

MODERATED BY ROBERT CAMPBELL, ARCHITECTURE CRITIC, BOSTON GLOBE

6 P.M.
RABB AUDITORIUM
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

FREE ADMITTANCE.
PUBLIC COMMENT AND PARTICIPATION IS ENCOURAGED.

Figure 12
He mentioned most of the major topics of social urban space written about in his books. Slides accompanied his description of social/physical spaces. Whyte also addressed the relationship which the client should take with respect to its chosen designer.

"...a much better job will be done if you ride herd on the architects. But I don't mean to try and design it yourself. But be a very, very demanding client on these things because every park that has had a big infusion of interest on the part of the citizens has almost invariably been a better park."22

And also a designer's view of societal needs, in this case concerning trees;

"I've been rather distressed to see the number of designs in which some designers look on trees and grass as hopelessly conventional and square. Well, maybe so. But people love grass and trees and people are right to like grass and trees and grass and trees can sometimes be a lot cheaper than some expensive granite."23

Sam Warner viewed Copley Square more historically. He saw the space as;

"...an edge, not a center. It is something which things happen to, it is not a place which makes things happen to others."24

Warner reiterated the fact that Copley Square was a juxtaposition of opposing forces, both physically and culturally. His historical presentation set the stage for the three forthcoming forums, which, like Holly Whyte, were to deal with a new Square.

The second public symposium, titled "Copley Square: Its Best Uses?", grew out of the CSCC subcommittee concerning activities and programming for the future Square. This area was deemed most critical for the future of Copley Square. Programming is the basis for designing, so knowing the types of activities wanted is the foundation for everything else. Committee members included Katherine Kane of the City of Boston, Kevin Cartwright of the Back Bay Association, Russell Gaudreau of the Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay, Bernard Pucker of the
Newbury Street Art Galleries, Alan Tremain of the Copley Plaza Hotel, and Reverend Spencer Rice of Trinity Church. Unlike 1966, this group represented the major neighborhood interests of the area, and would eventually determine the content of the competition program. As in any CSCC committee meeting, it was open to others, and guests were encouraged to attend and express views. The level and type of activity which the future Square would be designed for was the major concern.

The activities symposium was on August 17, 1983. Henry Geldzahler, the former Commissioner of Cultural Affairs in New York City, gave a talk about programming public spaces, followed by a panel and audience discussion. He commented about the change since he left Harvard's Fogg Museum in 1960;

"Brave New Boston is what it is all about. Boston has picked itself up, its matronly self and discoed into the '80's in a remarkable way." While he gave the corporations credit for much of the success of the area, he also added;

"Eternal vigilance is necessary because the corporations are not, at heart, full of consciousness and conscience, especially in this age of mergers and conglomerates and all that...the needs of the public who work, shop and live in the area have to be taken into account, and so do the tourists."

A caution, based on experience in NYC, and obvious from Copley Square, was that change over time must be allowed in any solution.

"Since change in programming and design philosophy is inevitable, one this is certain: Today's solution is to today's problem, and today's esthetic will be out of sync 20 years from now."

Growth and adaptability over time is what has made the Boston Common and Public Garden the successful spaces they are. The problem which the activities committee and the CSCC and Dean Abbott all had to accommodate was the possibility for some large events to take place without
making the space feel empty when no one was present. After the public forum and subsequent committee meetings, a list of recommendations titled "Musts, Must Nots, and To Be Encouraged" was created for formulating the competition guidelines.  

The third symposium, titled "Taking Care of Copley Square" dealt with the management and maintenance of Copley Square. Daniel Biederman, Executive Director of New York City's Bryant Park Restoration Committee, opened the forum describing maintenance of open public spaces. This issue was critical to the success of any space. Panel members representing Boston's Downtown Crossing Association, the Parks and Recreation Department, and Trinity Church all participated with the audience in the dialogue.  

The management subcommittee of the CSCC hoped to set up an endowment fund, the interest from which would help offset the costs of maintaining the Square. Additional revenue would come from licenses of any street vendors, a portion of profits from a more permanent food enterprise, and some traditional City money. Decisions about the actual form of the maintenance group was a complicated issue, and is still being worked out.

Bea Bast of the CSCC says that the legal contract is being drafted now, which would include a full time manager for the Square, with part time staff hired for the summer months. She expects the CSCC will "lead the way" the first few years, in order to set an example for a smaller, independent group to carry on afterwards.

Similarly, activities occurring on the square would be managed, whether spontaneous or scheduled. The difficulty of this subcommittee was that it had to deal in a more exacting entity of a management/maintenance budget and organization without the knowledge of both design and future costs.
The final symposium, "Copley Square: Alternative Futures" discussed three design scenarios for a new Square. The schemes were not designs in the physical sense as much as they were representations of three levels of activity which Copley Square could be designed for. From the "Pastoral Oasis," presented by Kevin Lynch, to the "Multi-Use Centrum," the theater stage set idea presented by Paul Freidberg, the range was given.

The presentations were based on the work of the design subcommittee of the CSCC. The group consisted of designers and those closely associated with the design professions. They included Anthony Casendino, of ASLA; Rosalind Gorin, developer; Tunney Lee, of DCPO; Shirley Muirhead of the BRA; Ann Nemrow of the NABB; Bernard Pucker of the Newbury Street Art Galleries; Anthony Tappe of the BSA; Stella Trafford of the Friends of the Public Garden; and Joan Wood of the South End. The common remark that two designers in the same room is dangerous may be true, but place nine on a committee and see what happens. It was very necessary for the committee to realize that its purpose was not to design the Square themselves, that would be the winning designer's job. In general, the design committee was able to realize physical manifestations of activity uses, and pass judgment based on this. While its role was important, it had more effect as support to the management and activity committees. Its list of "Musts, Must Nots, and Choices" reflected this.

Two other CSCC subcommittees were very active, although no public forum was held to discuss their needs. The fundraising committee was to raise the money for the entire process. This included the construction and maintenance costs, the costs of community outreach and the costs of the research and design of the Square. To the day of this writing, the fundraising efforts have been ongoing. An initial construction budget was established in 1983 at approximately $3 million. An additional $1.5 million endowment for the maintenance of the Square was set as a goal. The figure of $4.5 million was targeted prior to any designs or fundraising efforts. A December 1986 CSCC update revealed the actual
cost of the new Square to be $6.2 million, including the $1.5 million endowment. At that time nearly $4.9 million had already been raised.34

The fifth subcommittee, Public Information and Outreach, worked with all the other committees. This committee's work is what the majority of the general public sees, from the newspaper articles, to integrating the four symposia and a new Square into the minds and hearts of the Boston community. It is far more than a public relations campaign, which suggests a one-way dissemination of information. It is a two-way process of communication, where feedback, reaction, and new ideas are encouraged. The Centennial Committee offices, located in the ground floor of the John Hancock Building, are open and available to everyone.

An element of the public symposia to acquire some concerns of those attending was a questionnaire distributed at the workshops. While a questionnaire may not have been the most accurate manner to achieve a consensus of public opinion, it provided an avenue for those individuals who responded to be heard. The results reflected the beliefs of the Centennial Committee members, and reinforced the process that the CSCC was developing guidelines which were in accord with public opinion.35 For example, 84 percent of those responding favored rebuilding the Square, while five percent opposed this change. With regard to the level of activity that a new Square should have, 80 percent favored a Square for quiet enjoyment. Increasing the level of programmed activities brought a 62 percent favorable response, and 38 percent would favor greatly increasing the level of programmed activity in the Square.36

The public symposia, committee meetings, questionnaires, research, and general discussions of Copley Square lead to a set of guidelines for the design and management of a new Square. The guidelines were incorporated into the competition program document. Those guidelines reflected the concerns of the Management, Design, and Activities committee, along with the citizenry of the area. Since those same committees would be active in the development of the future design, the guidelines were not viewed as final, but rather as a foundation to build
upon. They reflected a strong sense that the Square was to be an activity generator rather than require activity to be staged. It was to be a four season Square, with plantings and accomodations to reflect this change. It was to be softer, greener, and offer more variety than the existing design. It was to embrace and complement the immediate physical and social neighborhood, rather than compete with it.  

In addition to the more qualitative guidelines, many quantitative requirements were set, again reflecting the wishes of the CSCC. Definite amounts of fixed and flexible seating were to be created. Food service requirements, in the character of markets, vending, and a de-mountable structure were defined. Storage, parking and especially budget guidelines were established. (Appendix B has complete program.)

The decision to stage an open, national competition, using these guidelines, was not unanimous, nor necessarily the best way to redesign the Square. The original process submitted in the proposal by MIT for the redesign of the Square suggested three possible ways of selecting a designer. Each had their merits, advantages and disadvantages. The first, a designer selection process, would by similar to an interview process. A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) would be drafted by the CSCC, and interested firms would respond. Then, based on interviews with a number of qualified designers, one would be chosen for the project. The benefits of this process were that the Centennial Committee would know exactly who they were hiring, their personalities and ability. The detriment was, of course, the interview process could not tell how the designer would design the Square.

The second option, a limited competition, would ask a selected number of design firms (based on an RFQ process) to submit designs for a new Square. In this manner the Centennial Committee would have the benefit of knowing the designers beforehand, and also have a concrete example of a design idea for Copley Square from each. The drawbacks were that all of the designs might be unsatisfactory, or that some highly
talented, yet obscure, designer could be overlooked in the initial selection process.

The third option, an open competition, would allow for anyone to participate, provide for an unlimited number of possible solutions to be selected from, and would create a tremendous amount of exposure. This process placed a great deal of pressure on the jury, and also removed the possibility of the Centennial Committee from knowing who the designers were beforehand. This was critical in the case of Copley Square, where participation was a fundamental attitude of the redesign.

What resulted was a two-stage open national competition. One major reason was that to receive the National Endowment grant for $100,000, an open competition was required. Within the CSCC, artists and non-traditional designers favored this approach, as it allowed for greater participation, according to Anthony Casendino chair of the design subcommittee. Casendino personally did not believe that an open competition was the best route, because the jury was blind to the personality and qualifications of the designers. However, the open style was less discriminating and probably best for the design community as a whole, since they would know that they had participated. Even Dean Abbott, the eventual winner of the competition, did not think that a competition was the best way to design the space. Aside from the fact that he won, Abbott felt that an urban space cannot be designed by a competition, unless that competition is set up extremely well, including having the client on the jury.

The two-stage competition jury did include four members of the Centennial Committee; Anthony Casendino, Katherine Kane, Joseph O'Connor, and Lawrence Perera. Of the four, only Casendino is a professional designer. The others represented equal views to the ultimate use of Copley Square, in the areas of management, use and activity, and neighborhood interests. The remainder of the nine member jury consisted of John Bella, an architect from New York City; William Johnson, a landscape architect from Ann Arbor, Michigan; Philippe Robert, an
architect from Paris; John Stilgoe, a landscape historian at Harvard University; and Holly Whyte, an urban open space planner from New York City. These members were selected by the BRA and the CSCC.

The two-stage process called for anonymity at the first stage, from which five finalists would be selected. These five would then visit the site on a tour conducted by the CSCC (excluding the four CSCC jury members), and then would prepare a more detailed second stage entry including complete cost estimates, eye level perspectives showing year round activity settings, night lighting, material and plant types, etc. Between these two stages, each finalist received the jury comments from stage one pertaining to the strengths and weaknesses of their particular scheme.

This process removed a portion of the "blind jury" quality, since each finalist was identified publicly, and each had the opportunity to meet with many members of the client group prior to submitting final designs. Casendino also pointed out that the role of the four members of the CSCC on the jury was to help eliminate the "blind jury" label. Unlike the jury of 1966, there were members on the jury who were intimately involved with all the issues to be addressed in the new design.

The five finalists were selected from 309 official entries to the competition in stage one. Casendino, in his presentation to the entire CSCC, explained what the jurors were looking for in stage one.

1. Design competence.
2. The germ of an idea; the essence of what could be done that would result in a reconstructed Square.
3. The ability to develop an idea which would become apparent in the required sketches.
4. An understanding of the problem with a sympathetic approach to the solution (e.g. no palm trees).
5. Consistency of entry on the two boards as opposed to a formal plan with professional renderings showing informal settings.
Casendino noted that the range of entries submitted was vast. Some were powerful design statements, which as concepts were fantastic, but totally unbuildable or acontextual (e.g. a full scale model of the Mayflower). These represented an ideas competition entry. The final five were to be varied solutions, according to Casendino. They fell into three categories. The first category was simplistic, yet diagramatic (such as the Harvard group's scheme). The second, contextual, as with Abbott's. The third was reminiscent of the European urban paved plazas, such as the Cooper, Eckstut scheme. Each held promise, and allowed for development before a final decision would be made in stage two.48

In the first stage jury comments, the guidelines were the significant factor to the production of the solutions. The jury stated:

"One reason they (the design solutions) were so responsive is the homework done by the Centennial Committees, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, and all those involved in the staff work of the competition. The guidelines were detailed and rigorous -- more so than for most competitions -- and they well represented the needs of the ultimate clients, the people of Boston."49

The five finalists submitted more detailed descriptions in stage two, again following guidelines developed by the CSCC.

Stage two submissions, included in Appendix D, included six boards per entry. Dean Abbott, of Clarke & Rapuano in New York City, was selected as the winning designer. Second place went to a Harvard University foursome of Krisan Osterby-Benson, Peter Schaudt, Michael R. Van Valkenburgh, and John Whitman. Third prize went to Cooper, Eckstut of New York City. The two finalists receiving commendations were Samuel Coplon and Harry Dodson of Cambridge, and The SWA Group of Boston.
The winning design by Dean Abbott was a reflection of the true spirit of the desires of the Centennial Committee, the BRA, and Boston's Parks and Recreation Department (the actual owners of the Square). Jury chair Holly Whyte calls the design:

"...the most responsive to the competition guidelines, in spirit as well as in details... It is a fine, clean design, with a nice balance between green and paving. The overall form is quiet, simple, and flat."

Jury member, Anthony Casendino felt that Abbott's scheme was a mixture of ideas and while not the strongest design statement, it was chosen because it could be adjusted most easily and still be good. In contrast, Casendino thought, the second place design was too strong of a central concept, focusing on itself, and would not have been as easy to reduce the impact. Whyte's opinions, according to Casendino, were very strong about this, the plaza was to act as a facilitator for meeting and not as a focus.

These opinions were not universal on the jury, however. Philippe Robert, the French architect, labeled the Abbott scheme as:

"...chaos, ambiguous, a compromise between the program requirements... in a place like Copley Square with composed facades, Neo-Romanesque and Classical, you need a strong, composed design."

Harvard professor John Stilgoe felt the Abbott design:

"...tries to do everything but fails to make Copley Square a distinctive place. The Square deserves something of more grace and style, of national and international interest."

These quite opposing viewpoints bring out several factors of the overall process by which Dean Abbott's design was selected as the winner. The first was the importance of the program document and guidelines, which unlike 1966, gave many concrete reasons to make judgments from. A second factor was the importance of the presence of CSCC members on
the jury. Casendino, a member of the CSCC, was going to have to deal with the winning design, and designer. Stilgoe would not have to do this. Taking nothing away from the brilliant solutions proposed by Osterby-Benson, Schaudt, Van Valkenburgh and Whitman, but it could very well have been the winning solution if no members of the client group had been on the jury. That situation occurred in 1966, where a winner was chosen, the jury left, and the City of Boston was given a Square it had to maintain.

Dean Abbott, as his design solution exhibited, thoroughly agreed with the intent and structure of the competition program. He calls it one of the best he has seen. To him, the guidelines not only "represented the emotions and feelings of the client," but also were very definite and gave him the direction to design from. This differed from 1966.

Abbott, describing his 1966 Copley Square solution as an:
"...admittingly simple design, a flat tabletop with no trees except for Boylston Street and Saint James Avenue. It was sort of Campo-ish, even with a drain."

The opportunity to do it again was a motive for entering, in addition to the usual motives of prestige and money. To Abbott, the program was great and lined up with his philosophical feelings for urban spaces. He felt the jury was good, representing both client and professional expertise. Abbott was not an unknown to the jury. William Johnson was a professor of Abbott's, and Competition Advisor Kenneth Paolini was a student of Abbott's at the University of Georgia.

The selection of Dean Abbott in May 1984 added the official designer to the process which had begun over 1½ years earlier. Abbott considers his design team as much more than himself. He quickly credits Charlie Gardner and Domenico Annese of Clarke & Rapuano, as well as the CSCC, BRA, and the people of the Back Bay as part of the design team. The new design, in Abbott's words:
"...is a living room for the community and a front yard for Trinity Church and the Boston Public Library."

The basin of the existing fountain was reused, transformed into a pool for a new water wall fountain, with adaptability into a performance stage when the water level is lowered. A food kiosk is placed along the active Boylston Street edge, and Farmer's Market stalls along the St. James and Dartmouth Street edges. The vision of "an abstraction of a New England village green with big grass panels" includes using the existing trees of the Square, adding sugar maples, benches, flower displays, and a rich textural carpet of patterned brick and granite pavers.

The process of developing the design from 1984 to the present has been slow but not drastically different from a "typical" public project in...
Boston, according to Anthony Casendino. This includes a list of several clients (the CSCC, BRA, and Boston Parks Department), the usual bureaucratic delays caused by the approval process, and changes required because of cost considerations. Yet, the fact that Casendino is involved is a reflection of a change in roles of the design process.

Casendino, and the entire design subcommittee of the CSCC, represent an enormous amount of expertise in design issues which a typical client does not have. They had already been involved for 1½ years prior to the addition of an actual physical design by Abbott. They were familiar with how a designer "creates" and how the CSCC operates. With Abbott, the design committee was able to deal on a level of sophistication regarding design form. An example was the food kiosk. Abbott's design for the kiosk was not felt to be satisfactory in the functional and detailing areas. The design committee, recognizing this, suggested that a separate food vendor design the kiosk in collaboration with Abbott. While this was not an action to remove the design from the conceptual designer (Abbott), it was a realization that for the betterment of the Square, Abbott would need assistance in the kiosk design.

The "design" talents of other members of the CSCC were also to work to improve the quality of Copley Square. The fountain, or water wall, created by Dean Abbott was quite elaborate and complexly detailed in granite. Legal council within the CSCC suggested that Abbott work directly with a granite company on the design of the fountain. The Centennial Committee would buy the fountain as a private piece, rather than having the fountain included in the public bid process. By doing this, the price of the fountain would be considerably less, thus saving money. A maneuver such as this was due to the broad diversity of knowledge held by the CSCC.
In a similar manner, the new trees to be included in the design were purchased and picked out from a New York nursery in early 1986. This allowed for "quality control" of the trees for over a year before they would be planted in Copley Square. Members of the Centennial Committee which, in Casendino's words, "don't have the burden of designing," are indeed designing.

The cycle of design and feedback included monthly meetings where Abbott, the BRA, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the design subcommittee of the CSCC met to update the progress by Clarke & Rapuano. The BRA and the Parks Department were invaluable in supplying the technical expertise needed in developing the design. Abbott considered them less emotionally tied to the project, and more of a moderator. The CSCC design subcommittee then reported the progress to the entire Centennial Committee, sometimes with Abbott present, sometimes without. Again, concerns and related issues effecting the physical
design would be voiced, and the feedback loop returned to Abbott and Clarke & Rapuano in New York.

This process takes time, more so than a simple architect-client project. Inevitably, the more players involved, the longer the process. In the case of Copley Square, the Centennial Committee, being composed of a majority of private business interests, is very action-oriented, especially the chairman Ken Himmel. It was their initiative at the start, and much of the credit for the continued movement of the project belongs to the CSCC.

Himmel's Copley Place, as well as several other CSCC business members, has a "front door" in Copley Square. The concept of ownership of the Square is important to realize. An improved "front door" would bring greater business opportunities to many area merchants. In the same manner, the Square could not become the plaza of a single entity, for that would change its entire character. For example, the plaza near the Christian Science Center, while public, does not have a true public feeling. The Christian Science Center dominates the space too much.

In the case of Copley Square, it was important to distribute the feeling of ownership. A major success in this area has been the work of the fundraising and public information subcommittees of the CSCC. By raising money publicly for the rejuvenation of Copley Square, more people have become involved both emotionally and financially. "Do a Good Deed" has become the slogan to raise money. By purchasing a tree, park bench, brick, pigeon, and even blades of grass, citizens of Boston are able to own a portion of the Square. Of course, the ownership is of a psychological nature; it will contribute to maintaining the beauty of the Square. It is hoped that by having a financial commitment, people will be less likely to deface the space.
The fundraising efforts will be an ongoing part of the management and maintenance of Copley Square. Monies from push-cart and vendor licenses, as well as a portion of the food concession sales, will be added to the money generated by the $1.5 million endowment fund. The Parks and Recreation Department will likewise contribute its yearly allocation to maintain the Square.67

The new Copley Square was conceived with long range goals in mind. The process established was to create a Copley Square "maintained in perpetuity to the highest standards," in the words of the CSCC.68 Thus, the role of the designer, Dean Abbott, was just a portion of the overall process set up for the design of Copley Square. Abbott, understanding these goals, was able to contribute his "magical act" of creative genius to satisfy both himself and the community of Copley Square.
"...an architecture that listens to and welcomes the wealth of experiences and aspirations of the people and cultures in our society and gives form to the meanings we share. This is not an architecture for another private interest, but an architecture in the public interest."¹

- Stefani Ledewitz, The Role of the Architect in Society
While Copley Square is, to many degrees, a unique case, many aspects of this process can be taken from here and applied to all architectural dialogues. 17 years, the time between the 1966 and 1983 designs, was enough time to learn some valuable lessons, and to realize some changes in the role of the architect. Even the opportunity to look back objectively is a significant factor, since it adds greater depth to our present dialogue. These dialogues represent an interchange between those who produce good architecture and those who seek it. The fact that these roles can often be reversed requires the need for clear communication.

Early feedback from many sources is required for an active dialogue. The sources are often varied in their motives and experiences. A variety of dialogues are necessary, and each have noteworthy results. Consider what is discussed among tourists to Copley Square, or between a tourist and an architect, or between two design professionals. Then think of a bureaucrat or a client and their needs. Each opinion is important and valid, providing an enriching process of designing. The ability to tap these opinions is what all designers should develop.

The complexity of the Copley Square redesign is very apparent, and produced dialogues of varying types and sophistication. From the drawing announcing the new design located on a sign in the Square, to the newspaper articles initiated by CSCC members, general public awareness created discussion among many typical residents of Boston. Dialogues became more active as one participated by "purchasing" a portion of the Square, or by responding to questionnaires addressing the future of the area. The four symposia provided definite issues of debate, and a forum to facilitate this dialogue. Membership on the Centennial Committee and its subcommittees, or attending their meetings, gave direct access to every step of the decision making process. These gave the opportunity to contribute and receive feedback on the entire project. With Dean Abbott and the BRA, matters from the highest technical nature to those concerning broad social issues could be discussed.
An advocacy role, where architects represent the interests of the client without designing the space themselves, is needed because the knowledge required to solve many of the aspects of a design problem can only be discussed among similar professionals. The levels of communication required are great, but there also is a need to converse on these various levels. In the case of a small project, such as a house, the one on one dialogue is satisfactory. This assumes that the architect has the skills to converse on all levels of an architectural problem. He must also accept design criticism as valid at these levels. In larger cases, such as Copley Square, it is neither practical or physically possible to have a one on one dialogue consistently.

This advocate role, is one area toward which the profession is heading. The complexities of the design process of architecture have advanced to a level where this is needed. This need to, in Holly Whyte's words, "ride herd on the architects," may take the form of a member within a design firm representing client interests only. Some corporate entities, such as IBM, have architects on their staff to provide this role. A separate organization like the design subcommittee of the CSCC served this purpose. Even a larger advisory panel, such as the Boston Civic Design Commission, grew out of this need for qualified, independent professionals to act as liaison between designers and clients. This provides an arena for architectural dialogue.

The change in attitude toward this dialogue can also be seen in the manner in which Copley Square was financed. In 1966, the Federal government was committed to spending money on urban programs. The money was given as a gift, more or less, and Boston went out and purchased a Square. The Square was a monument and was quite attractive at the time. But like a new piece of furniture, it was assumed that the neighborhood would eventually grow to enjoy it. Needless to say, the Square became worn out and battered because it was not accepted well.

The current design is financed jointly by businesses and private citizens, who rarely give money without an accounting of how it is used.
and managed. This is simply good business, or sound investing. What results is a more active role, or desire, to participate in its use. This also requires a business plan, or in this case, a design process establishing how the redesign would occur.

One of the most significant changes in the redesign of Copley Square was the understanding that the architect, as a designer, entered into a design process that was already firmly established. That process would continue through the time of the architect's involvement, and after the design and construction had taken place. A realization of this role may be a humbling experience to some, but it is important to the success of providing a lasting design.

The need for an ongoing organization to manage and maintain the end product is also apparent. If no such entity exists, there is more than a good chance of the space failing, of it evolving into a dinosaur incapable of providing living activity. As a profession this suggests again the possibility for expanded architectural services. A type of "service contract" could evolve, where each design is maintained, and adapted as it should be over a period of time. This requires, of course, that the original design accommodate changes.

Copley Square proved this idea, because the original (1966) scheme was very inflexible, causing much of the dissatisfaction and neglect which occurred. The new Square provides a management group which will play an active role in the day to day affairs of the Square. Dean Abbott, due to his design sensitivity to these concerns, will no doubt play some collaborative role in subsequent modifications. The dialogue will continue.

Another critical lesson to be learned from Copley Square is that guidelines, or definite programming, is not a constraint to creativity. Quite the contrary is true. More creative, and comprehensive solutions are produced when a context is provided to work with. Not only does the extensive programming stage benefit the creation of guidelines, it also
provides an opportunity for open communication between all parties involved. It is this very motive for understanding which sets up a dialogue process. This, invariably, produces a higher quality architecture. Short-changing this early dialogue phase, in order to begin designing physical form, is not in the best interest of society.

In new dialogues, architects on a project should take great care to assure that this early programming is accomplished. If it is not already present, they should work with the client to establish this before a design progresses. Design experiences provide a useful tool to creating guidelines, and they should be used to develop proper programming.

The qualities of this continuing dialogue are numerous, and are by no means limited to the ones found in the Copley Square example. From the study of Copley Square, however, some general qualities arise. The first is that all interests are represented in the decision making. This is as basic as the legacy of the Boston Tea Party (i.e. no representation). Another quality, mentioned previously, is that the dialogue is an ongoing process, from pre-design to post-occupancy. This process is then set up and followed. It is a process which is agreed upon, which will allow some flexibility, yet be strict enough to not be abandoned.

This kind of architecture acknowledges individual expertise in areas where participants are strong. It requires a respect for all parties involved, and an attitude of working for a mutual goal. This architecture is more than good aesthetic design, it also results in a successful social environment.

Strategies to set up this dialogue were a major part of the success of the redesign of Copley Square. The exchange of information was the most evident and probably the most important factor. The financing techniques mentioned earlier reflected this. This strategy was not coercive or enforceable by law, but rather worked off of the human desire to learn, to improve, to "do a good deed."
Another, more regulatory strategy is the requirement that there be citizen review in all projects. Citizen review is an ongoing process, not a one time presentation. Citizen Advisory Committees (CAC) are becoming more evident within the Boston community, which is good. They encourage willing and concerned residents and professionals to engage in the dialogue process.

It is from these strategies that the success of Copley Square, a public project, can also be used in private projects. Take, for example, the New England Life project located just to the east of Trinity Church. This is a building for a private company. Yet, when looking at the community as a whole, both the Back Bay and Boston proper, this new building does have a considerable amount of public significance. The Boston Redevelopment Authority, while it is a public agency, cannot and often does not represent the greater community. This was part of the failure of the 1966 Copley Square. Now, however, a mandatory CAC has been acting on behalf of the community interests in the design of New England Life, from early on in the design process. As a result, the design of the project has been considerably altered and improved. This process also contributed to the selection of a new architect.

A hierarchy can exist, and should exist in the design process, but should not be abused. The architect of the project, whether Phillip Johnson or Dean Abbott, has an established leadership role. As a facilitator, however, the architect should understand the holistic notions of the entire creation, and cultivate the seeds of creativity others add to the design process. Spreading ownership (or participation) is important in order to bring about a sense of contribution. This taps the human emotion of pride, which can be powerful, in both good and bad ways. Its positive effects are a feeling of fulfillment, and contribution to the success of an event, building, space, etc. Negative results of pride are obvious, one need only read the daily newspaper, or remember Howard Roarke.

From Copley Square, a dialogue process was set up holistically, with care taken to involve as many people as possible within an established
framework. It was a design dialogue. Designers helped to establish the process, worked to design within the process, and will eventually assist in its maintenance. A dialogue allows the architect to be integrated into the society he designs for, and with. Holly Whyte proved and promoted this concept, that is, understanding the "society" element within all our lives. We must design with this in mind.

A manner in which to understand the dialogue process is the realization of not only who the ultimate users of a place are, but also a realization of who an architect, or owner, or citizen is ultimately responsible to. Louis Sullivan, in his inspired writing to young American architects, wrote:

"Therefore, so stand before God, before Nature, before Man, before yourself and before your work, that your art shall be as truely living as the rose which blooms in the garden, and the love of the One which blooms in your heart."

APPENDIX A
Program for 1966 Copley Square Competition

Note: The nature of the original competition document prohibits clear reproductions.
John F. Collins
Mayor of the City of Boston
announces a national, one-stage competition for the design of historic Copley Square.

SPONSORS
Sponsors for the competition are: the City of Boston (Parks and Recreation Department and Department of Public Works), Boston Redevelopment Authority, Back Bay Council, Back Bay Planning and Development Corporation.

Professional advisor
Charles George Hilgenhurst, A.I.A.

Jury
The Jury for this competition consists of:
- PIETRO BELLUSCHI, F.A.I.A., Chairman of the Jury, Dean emeritus of the School of Architecture and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- DANIEL U. KILEY, Site and Landscape Architect, Wings Point, Charlotte, Vt.
- SIDNEY N. SHURCLIFF, F.A.S.L.A., President of International Federation of Landscape Architects.
- H. RUSSELL BEATTY, President, Wentworth Institute.
- ROGER C. DAMON, President, First National Bank of Boston.
- ASA S. KNOWLES, President, Northeastern University.

BRYAN E. SMITH, Chairman of the Boards.
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The immediate goal of this competition is the creation of a pedestrian-friendly environment and movement of people through the public square. This has been an almost impossible task due to the well-known characteristics of the square, including its size, lack of pedestrian facilities, and the need to accommodate various activities.

The competition organizers have proposed the following design solution to address these issues:

1. **Reduction of Traffic Flow:** The main thoroughfare through the square will be narrowed to accommodate pedestrian traffic more effectively. This will help in creating a safer and more pleasant environment for pedestrians.

2. **Enhanced Public Space:** The square will be re-designed to include more public seating areas, green spaces, and other pedestrian-friendly features. This will improve the overall aesthetics and function of the space.

3. **Integration of Public Art:** The redesign will incorporate public art installations to enhance the visual appeal of the square and provide additional interest points for visitors.

4. **Improved Accessibility:** The design will include improved access for people with disabilities, ensuring that the square is accessible to everyone.

5. **Sustainability:** The proposed design will focus on sustainability, incorporating features such as green roofs, rain gardens, and energy-efficient lighting to reduce the environmental impact of the square.

The design solution aims to create a vibrant, welcoming public space that serves as a focal point for the community. It will be a place where people can come together, relax, and enjoy the city's amenities.
Copley Square may take any form proposed by the competitor within the following requirements of the program: pools, walls, fountains, sculpture, lighting, trees, grass, planting and special landscaping effects are all permissible.

MANDATORY DESIGN REQUIREMENTS
1/ CONSTRUCTION COSTS
The sponsors feel that it is mandatory that the competitor's proposal fall within a construction budget of $500,000. To ensure this, each submission must contain, in addition to the required drawings, an outline specification of all proposed materials, including planting, along with the quantities of each, their unit cost and total cost. A format for this is included in the Appendix under Submission Requirements. The winning design will be reviewed by a professional cost estimator. The competitor's attention is called to Article 21 of the proposed contract between the Parks and Recreation Department and the winning competitor.

2/ BUILDINGS
The construction of any building within the competition area is neither desired nor permitted.

3/ CURBS
Curb elevations and locations along Dartmouth Street, Boylston Street, Clarendon Street and Trinity Place shown on the utility plan, cannot be changed. Competitors will note the large radius of curvature at the corner of Dartmouth and Boylston. This is provided in anticipation of a large volume of traffic turning eastward onto Boylston from Dartmouth. There is some question that this large radius is necessary, and studies are currently endeavoring to determine this requirement. Until further notification, the designers are required to treat this area with the geometry as shown on the plan. Competitors will also notice a dotted line along the St. James Avenue curb of the Square, titled "POSSIBLE future curb line." It is hoped that in the future, St. James Avenue can be rebuilt to this dimension, thus eliminating

enlarging the Square. For the present, however, the submissions must respect the solid line drawn for the curb.

4/ PARKING
No parking will be allowed in the Square nor on the side of the street next to the Square. No parking will be allowed on either side of Trinity Place if it is retained.

5/ TRINITY PLACE
Competitors will note that there is a street named Trinity Place, directly in front of the Church steps (see plans); they are instructed that for the present the 50-foot right-of-way must be respected and that within this area only paving is allowed. The Boston Redevelopment Authority has petitioned the Public Improvements Commission requesting that this road be closed to public traffic. If the petition is successful, this area will become parkland and vehicular access to the Church will be from St. James Avenue. The competitors will then be free to make other design proposals for this area. If the petition is not successful and the public right-of-way remains, the designers will be allowed to pave the 50-foot right-of-way with materials that are complementary to those proposed for other areas of the Square, thus effecting a unity of surface treatment while masking its function as a public street. All those registered for the competition will be notified as soon as a decision is reached. Whether or not the petition is successful, the ultimate design goal is to unify the Church with the Square, creating a continuous area.

NON-MANDATORY DESIGN REQUIREMENTS
1/ COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES
Commercial activities within the Square, such as restaurants, newsstands, etc., are not desired. Those activities are already established along the northern side of Boylston Street. Design elements that would foster temporary exhibitions and activities are permitted.
WINTER AND SUMMER USES

The competition is intended to create a design that will be as attractive as it is
functional during all seasons of the year. The isometric viewpoint is intended to
help visualize the proposed design in relation to existing structures.

The competition is open to architecture firms and individuals. Designs
should be presented in the form of a portfolio. The design should be
visually appealing and should provide for an inviting and comfortable
environment. The design should be suitable for the ages of the users and
should be able to accommodate a variety of activities.

The design should also consider the existing structures and
should be in harmony with the surrounding environment.

The design should be submitted in the following formats:

1. Draft board
2. Renderings
3. Plan drawings
4. Section drawings
5. Elevation drawings
6. Photographs

The design should also consider the following:

1. Accessibility
2. Safety
3. Material selection
4. Cost

The design should be reviewed by a panel of judges who will
consider the following criteria:

1. Visual appeal
2. Functionality
3. Sustainability
4. Innovation

The winning entry will be awarded a prize of $10,000. The
designer will be responsible for the cost of construction.

The design should be submitted by January 31, 2024, to

The competition is open to professionals and
students. The deadline for submission is
January 31, 2024.
APPENDIX

authority for entering into contract
The Boston Park Department was first created in 1875 and through the years it has undergone various mergers and title changes. The Parks and Recreation Department is operated by a Board known as the Parks and Recreation Commission consisting of five members. This Board acts under the chairmanship of William J. Devine, the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation, who has the exclusive power to contract on behalf of the City of Boston Parks and Recreation Department. Through this competition the Parks and Recreation Department intends to secure and be guided by professional advice but reserves to the Parks and Recreation Commission itself the right and responsibility for award of the contract for professional services subject to obtaining prior written authorization therefore from the Mayor of Boston pursuant to the applicable provisions of the City Charter.

financing of construction
The City's financial contribution to the Copley Square Competition will cover the street improvements and a minimum portion of the beautifications. The City of Boston has applied to the Federal Government for a beautification grant to cover 90% of the construction cost. If this is unsuccessful a fund-raising campaign will be launched to finance the remainder of the cost of carrying out the winning design.

type of competition
As defined by the American Institute of Architects this is a Primary Class A-1 competition and is open and anonymous as hereinafter described. It will be conducted in a single stage.

A.I.A. and A.S.L.A. approval
The text of this program has been approved by the American Institute of Architects by letter to the Professional Advisor from the Secretary of the Institute dated June 11, 1965.

Similarly the program has been approved by the American Society of Landscape Architects by telegram to the Professional Advisor from the Secretary of the Society dated June 11, 1965.

professiona1 advisor
The Sponsors have appointed Charles George Hilgenhurst, Director of Design Review of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, to prepare the program and conduct the competition. His address for all matters pertaining to the competition is:

Charles G. Hilgenhurst, A.I.A.
Professional Advisor,
Copley Square Competition
Boston Redevelopment Authority
10th Floor, City Hall Annex
Boston, Massachusetts 02106

eligibility
The competition is open to any individual who meets any one of the three criteria listed below. An association of individuals such as architects, landscape architects, city planners, civic and urban designers, engineers, and sculptors grouped together expressly for participation in this competition will be admitted provided that at least one member of such a group meets any one of the same criteria, as follows:

1/ An architect registered in the United States of America.

2/ A landscape architect registered in any of those States where registration is available.

3/ In any State or territory of the U.S.A. where landscape architect registration is not available, the landscape designer is required to prove the statement that he has served as a principal of a firm actively engaged in landscape design for a period of not less than three years, and provide letters of reference attesting to this from two professionals in the same field.

exceptions
No employee of the Boston Redevelopment Authority or any other public employee of the City of Boston is allowed to compete, nor members of the Jury, their partners, associates, or employees.
Communications requesting clarification of the program or requirements shall be directed to the Professional Advisor, be typewritten and without any identification of the sender. No such communications will be accepted after December 1, 1965.

A copy of questions received and answers thereto will be sent to all competitors at the earliest practicable date or dates. These and any other necessary communications from the Professional Advisor shall be considered official communications in the conduct and extension of this program. The Professional Advisor reserves the right to define questions whose answers would in his judgment clarify the program at the particular stage in which they are asked if necessary.

Competitors are not allowed to communicate directly or indirectly with the Sponsors, the Jury, or the Professional Advisor, nor are they permitted to communicate in writing in any manner to the competitors, except as provided for in the paragraph on Communications above.

Proof of any such breach, as determined by the Professional Advisor, will result in disqualification. Each competitor shall at all times adhere to the directions of the Jury and reports that any deviation thereof is improper and void any agreement resulting from the judgment. The Sponsors for their part undertake to conduct the competition in a fair manner so that the Jury and the Professional Advisor have no means of identifying the entries until the Jury decisions have been made. Unwitting breaches of rules will be performed by personnel other than the above.

The following procedure is recommended to competitors outside the Boston area using Railway (or Air) Express:

a/ Make arrangements with nearest Railway Express Agency Office.

b/ At time of dispatch, obtain from Railway Express Agency an extra copy of the label or Air Express receipt and have it stamped with the hour and date.

c/ Send this receipt by Registered Mail to the Professional Advisor as proof of submission before deadline.

d/ Dispatch entry to Professional Advisor.

Entries delivered by hand shall be brought to the 10th Floor Lobby of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, City Hall Annex, Court Street, Boston, before the deadline hour and date. No entries delivered by hand will be accepted after this deadline.

Return of Entries

Where desired by the competitor, entries will be returned promptly following termination of the judgement, with the exception of such entries as have been selected for exhibition and/or publication (which will be returned upon request at a later date).

In such cases, the competitor shall send a check, draft, or money order payable to the Professional Advisor in an amount sufficient to cover the shipping with instructions as to how the entry is to be returned. This shall be done by the competitor within 6 weeks after public announcement of the awards.

The Sponsors agree that the decision of the Jury and the Professional Advisor shall be final and binding, and that the decision shall be binding on the parties as have been selected for exhibition and/or publication.

Following delivery of the numbered drawings to the Professional Advisor, he shall examine them to determine whether they comply with the requirements of the program, reporting to the Jury any instances of non-compliance. The Jury, having satisfied itself as to the accuracy of such report, shall then dispose of the same in accordance with their judgment.
Under Massachusetts law, any competitor selected for the award of the contract must, unless already registered in Massachusetts, either become so registered as soon as practicable and prior to execution of the contract, or associate himself with an architect already registered, selected by him in consultation with the Jury and the Professional Advisor and acceptable to the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation. Massachusetts law also requires that a contract for architectural services with a joint venture, joint enterprise, partnership, or corporation must be executed on behalf of such organization by a member or officer thereof who is registered in Massachusetts as an architect and who will exercise professional and supervisory control over the services. There are certain exceptions for such organizations practicing architecture prior to 1957.

FORM OF ENTRIES

It is the desire of the Sponsors to encourage the participation of large numbers of responsible competitors. To this end the form of entry is intended to be simple but complete. Competitors shall provide all the required documents at the required scales and sizes. No other presentation material is permitted.

surroundings
Presentation shall be arranged to show as clearly and fully as possible the relationship between the design for Copley Square and the surrounding elements of the Square as described in the program. Buildings and other features at the edges of the open spaces shall be shown on the plans, sections, elevations, and perspective. Floor plans at or near ground levels shall show external features. Ground levels in sections and elevations shall extend to and include the face of buildings on the other side of the street.

media
All drawings shall be on stiff white boards 30" x 40". No color is permitted, but any non-smudging black, gray, or white medium may be used. Printed reproductions of drawings, lines, lettering or typescript may be mounted upon the boards, but must be black or gray or white. All explanatory notes and diagrams shall be placed on the boards. All boards must be organized with the 40" edge dimension horizontal.

Borders and the title "Copley Square Competition" shall not be used. Each drawing shall be identified (i.e., plan, section, elevation, detail, etc.) and specific areas within the drawings shall also be identified (i.e., sculpture, fountain, tree types, etc.). The number of the board shall appear in black, 1" high, at the lower right hand corner of each board. All presentation materials must be mounted flush with the boards; no raised material shall be allowed.

mandatory drawings
Three numbered 30" x 40" stiff white boards as follows:
Board 1:
A detailed site plan at 1" = 20' using the architectural plan as a guide — all buildings surrounding the Square should be shown in tone.
Board 2:
An aerial perspective showing the entire Square streets, and surrounding buildings. The perspective should be accurately drawn and rendered, using the drawing supplied as a base.

Board 3:
1) Two cross-sections, one north-south, the other east-west. Sections must include the roads and buildings contiguous to the Square. Elevations of visible buildings should be shown.
2) Any details the competitor may wish to show, i.e., sculpture, lights, benches, etc., should appear in plan, elevation or section. Scale indication should be attached; a 5' human figure should be shown in outline whenever consideration of scale requires a means of comparison.
3) Night lighting diagram — 1" = 40' of the entire competition area. This diagram is to be in the form of a plan showing the patterns of light developed on the Square's surface. Patterns of various sizes and shapes should be utilized depending upon the light and wattage and cut-off angle of the proposed luminaries. The plan should be presented in a form similar to a negative photostat with the lighted areas in white. This should be located on the lower left corner of the sheet.
4) Booklet of outline specifications (back of Board #3):
A list of proposed materials with a brief specification of each shown in tabulation form on 8½ x 11 sheets of paper in a black and white booklet should be securely attached to Board 3. This booklet should indicate: material, total quantity, unit cost, and total cost, (see sample). Total cost column should be added and identified.

Optional drawings:
The following options are allowed in the discretion of the individual competitor:
1) The competitors may desire to elaborate their design proposals by presenting the two remaining cross-section views of the Square as an alternative to all or most of the parts previously indicated on Board #3.
2) NO ADDITIONAL BOARDS WILL BE ACCEPTED AS A PART OF THE COMPETITION.
3) NO MODELS WILL BE ACCEPTED.
4) All exhibition and publication should be accurately drawn and rendered, using the drawing supplied as a base. The perspective should be accurately drawn and rendered, using the drawing supplied as a base.

SCHEDULE
October 15 Deadline for Registration and Release of Official Program
December 1 Final Date for Questions
February 15 Deadline for Completion of Competition
On about March 15 Announcement of Awards
APPENDIX B
Program for 1983 Copley Square Competition
Dear Competitor:

After years of debate over problems at Copley Square, representatives of the public and private sectors formed the non-profit, Copley Square Centennial Committee under the chairmanship of Kenneth A. Himmel, Senior Vice President of Urban Investment and Development Company, U.I.D.C., to address the question of redesigning the Square. Taking its name from the fact that the Square is now 100 years old, having been acquired by the City in 1883, the Centennial Committee's membership includes the City of Boston as well as Trinity Church, U.I.D.C., the insurance companies of John Hancock, New England Mutual Life, Prudential, and Liberty Mutual, The Boston Public Library, the Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay and the Back Bay Association and others. In over 30 committee meetings and four public workshops, the Centennial Committee gathered information and heard debate concerning critical issues that are to be addressed in the effort to redesign the Square. The preparation of the Competition program which forms the basis for this national competition was the product of this effort. The work of the Committee has been conducted through subcommittees, which have been staffed by the Laboratory of Architecture and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, (M.I.T.). Principal investigators for the Centennial Committee from M.I.T., are Gary Hack and Thomas Piper.

The Boston Redevelopment Authority, which is the managing organization for the Copley Square National Design Competition, is the City of Boston's planning and redevelopment agency. Mitchell L. Fischman, Senior Project Coordinator, will serve as overall project director for the Competition. Kenneth W. Paolini will serve as Competition Adviser and will administer the Competition.

To review and judge the work of the competitors, I have appointed a balanced and nationally composed design jury of nine members representing among others the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, law and real estate finance. There is local representation on this jury from the community-based Copley Square Centennial Committee as well as individuals having national and international design experience.
The Copley Square National Design Competition is a joint public and private effort. Grateful thanks must be made to all those who participated in this process, including those individuals who attended the numerous citizen workshops over the Summer, 1983, without whose efforts the development of the Competition Program would not have been possible.

In announcing the 1983 Design Competition for Copley Square, The City of Boston seeks to address major changes that now influence the use and design of the Square.

Over the past thirteen years substantial new development in the immediate vicinity of Copley Square has placed new demands on this historic open space. This Design Competition seeks to encourage exemplary design solutions which reflect these changes. More than seven million square feet of new retail, commercial, hotel and office space development have or will shortly impact the immediate area around the Square creating new user demands and needs.

It is with these factors in mind that the City of Boston, The National Endowment for the Arts, Design Arts Program, the Copley Square Centennial Committee, and the Boston Redevelopment Authority are pleased to jointly announce the National Design Competition for Copley Square.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Ryan
Director
COPLEY SQUARE DESIGN COMPETITION

RULES AND REGULATIONS

AND

COMPETITION PROGRAM

CITY OF BOSTON
Kevin H. White, Mayor

BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Robert J. Ryan, Director

COPLEY SQUARE CENTENNIAL COMMITTEE
Kenneth Himmel, Chairman

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS
Michael J. Pittas, Director,
Design Arts Program

December, 1983
The Copley Square Design Competition is funded in part by a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), Design Arts Program. It is jointly being sponsored by the City of Boston, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Copley Square Centennial Committee and the National Endowment for the Arts; Design Arts Program.

The Boston Redevelopment Authority, which is the managing organization for the Copley Square Design Competition, is the City of Boston's planning and redevelopment agency. Mitchell L. Fischman, Senior Project Coordinator, will serve as overall project director for the Competition. Kenneth W. Paolini will serve as Competition Adviser and will administer the Competition.

The Copley Square Centennial Committee is a non-profit corporation formed to advise the Boston Redevelopment Authority on the redesign of Copley Square, and has prepared the Competition Program. The Committee is comprised of a board of community representatives under the chairmanship of Kenneth Himmell, Senior Vice President, Urban Investment and Development Company. The work of the Committee is conducted through subcommittees, which have been staffed by the Laboratory of Architecture and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Principle investigators for the Centennial Committee from MIT are Gary Hack and Thomas Piper.

The Copley Square Design Competition is a joint public and private effort. Grateful thanks must be made to all those who participated in this process, including those individuals who attended the numerous citizen workshops over the Summer, 1983, without whose efforts the development of the Competition Program would not have been possible.

In announcing the 1983 National Design Competition for Copley Square, The City of Boston seeks to address major changes that now influence the use and design of the Square.

Over the past thirteen years substantial new development in the immediate vicinity of Copley Square has placed new demands on this historic open space. This National Design Competition seeks to encourage exemplary design solutions which reflect these changes. More than seven million square feet of new retail, commercial, hotel and office space development have or will shortly impact the immediate area around the Square creating new user demands and needs.

It is with these factors in mind that the City of Boston, The National Endowment for the Arts, Design Arts Program, the Copley Square Centennial Committee, and the Boston Redevelopment Authority are pleased to announce the National Design Competition for Copley Square.
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The area that in 1883 came to be known in Boston as Copley Square is located at the joining of the grid of the Back Bay and the grid of the South End sections of the City. Both grids, laid out on reclaimed land, were planned in the mid-nineteenth century. (See historical map, Appendix). The more important of these developments was the Back Bay which extended the land west of the Public Garden over the tidal flats of the Charles River Bay. Within this grid, land closest to the Garden, the River, and the main axis of the system, Commonwealth Avenue, had the highest value. The value of land decreased as it lay progressively farther away from these three poles. In 1860 the area that was later to become Copley Square was located far from any of these advantageous areas.

Like the rest of Boston's Back Bay, Copley Square was under water when Boston was founded in 1630. It was not until the 1860's when the City, feeling the demand for more space, filled in the marshy fens to form one of the first neighborhoods.

The area named Copley Square in 1883 began to stumble into shape when a group of business and professional men, and city planners started formulating ideas to enhance the market value and quality of the site for the benefit of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, who were part owners of this land. The first group formed an "Association of gentlemen" in 1859, calling themselves "the Committee of Associated Institutions" for the purpose of establishing a Conservatory of Arts and Sciences. The second group, the city designers, proposed to reserve land in the Copley Square area for use as a public park. The work of both groups helped structure the joining as a unique square in whose neighborhood cultural, educational and religious institutions, commercial enterprises and high density apartment houses came to be concentrated.

The development process at the Copley Square area differed from the building pattern of the Back Bay and South End grids. As soon as the land was laid within these reclaimed territories, each owner built on this property. Both grids continued their fill towards the west, and their structures followed closely behind. This sequential pattern of fill and build meant that within any block, buildings dated from approximately the same time, a circumstance that makes for architectural and stylistic consistency. At the Copley site, construction occurred only after all the land had been laid (filled) and structures were erected in piecemeal fashion so that they came to dot the boundaries of its area. The buildings that fronted the space later to be known as Copley Square appeared over a period of twenty-five years, a situation which resulted in stylistic and formal complexity.
In the decade and a half after its creation, Copley Square was held to be a prominent civic space. During the 1870's, Trinity Church and the original Museum of Fine Arts were constructed around the Copley Square site itself, but it was not until 1883 that the Square was purchased by the city. This description appears in the Record of Streets by the Boston Street Laying-out Department, 1910:

Copley Square, B., 1883; junction of Dartmouth Street, Boylston Street, Huntington Avenue, Trinity Place, and St. James Avenue; lot bounded by Huntington Avenue, Dartmouth and Boylston Streets, purchased for a public square named Copley Square, February 21, 1883. Trinity triangle, a triangular area bounded by Huntington Avenue, Trinity Place and St. James Avenue, included in Copley Square, April 21, 1885.

There is no record of an official inauguration of the Square as a park, although it is known that the site was named for John Singleton Copley (1735-1815), a favorite painter in colonial Boston in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Copley's specialty was portriature.

According to historical information compiled by the Boston Redevelopment Authority (1965), Copley Square rose to significance early because of the architecture and cultural activities that encompassed it. It was, and is, home of two of the acknowledged masterpieces of American architecture, Trinity Church (1872-77), designed by Henry Hobson Richardson, and the Boston Public Library (1888-95), by McKim, Mead, and White.

Trinity Church, under the nationally known ministry of Phillips Brooks, together with new Old South Church (1875) and the half dozen churches within several blocks, made Copley Square a notable center of religion in the late nineteenth century.

Copley Square also became the center of the city's cultural activities. Foremost among these was art, with the Museum of Fine Arts on the Square, art galleries, art clubs, and art schools on and in the immediate vicinity of the Square. Of all these various facilities, only the galleries and art supply shops on Newbury and Boylston Streets remain today.

Additionally, education was represented by a number of institutions, including Harvard Medical School (1883; located on the present site of the library extension), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1866-1939; on the site of the New England Mutual Life Insurance Company), the Boston Public Library, and the nearby Museum of Natural History (1863; present site of Bonwit Teller).

In 1869 and again in 1872, monumental coliseums were constructed near the present site of Copley Place for gigantic concerts. President U.S. Grant appeared at the first, dubbed the National Peace Jubilee of 1869. The featured performance was the Anvil Chorus from Il Trovatore by an orchestra of one-thousand musicians, a chorus of ten-thousand singers, supplemented by organ, drum corps, the ringing of church bells and the firing of cannon (electrically controlled from the platform), and one-hundred firemen beating rhythmically upon anvils with sledge hammers. At the 1872 Jubilee, Johann Strauss travelled to America to conduct his own music.
Despite these illustrious happenings and its historic architecture, the Square itself succumbed to the confusion of roads, trolley lines, carriages and automobiles almost from its beginning.

During the 20th century, two of the "cornerstones" of Copley Square, the S.S. Pierce Store and the Museum of Fine Arts, were demolished. The total composition of the Square was lost and, simultaneously, the city's topographic and social environment in the Back Bay changed.

The area's decline caused John F. Collins, Boston Mayor, to announce a national, one-stage competition for the redesign of Copley Square in September, 1965. Six-hundred and fifty registrations for the Competition were received, resulting in 183 entrants.

The chosen design selected by the Jury related to the needs of the time and addressed Copley Square in its setting of the mid and late sixties.

The present design, in existence since 1969, has been subjected to great change and the influences of a new built environment over the past thirteen years. Current community expectations have taken hold. The New Copley Square must address different needs, uses and concerns in the changing and varying conditions of its borders.
PROCEDURES OF THE DESIGN COMPETITION FOR COPELEY SQUARE, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

The sponsors for the Copley Square Design Competition are the City of Boston, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Copley Square Centennial Committee and the National Endowment for the Arts, Design Arts Program.

The following procedure will be followed for the registration of entrants, review of entrants', drawing and operation of the competition and the selection of award winners.

1.1 Authority

The Boston Redevelopment Authority is the managing organization for the Copley Square Design Competition. The Authority has appointed a Competition Adviser to administer the competition:

Mr. Kenneth W. Paolini
Competition Adviser
Copley Square Design Competition
Boston Redevelopment Authority
City Hall, 9th Floor
One City Hall Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02201

1.1.1 Dispute

In the event that disputes may arise in the Competition process, the Competition Adviser has been delegated the responsibility to attempt to resolve any and all disputes by arbitration and discussion with and for competitors and the sponsors.

1.2 Description of Site

Copley Square, Boston, Massachusetts. Approximately 2.46 acres located and bordered by Boylston Street, Dartmouth Street, St. James Avenue, and Clarendon Street. Exact location delineated on map of Boston contained in the registration kit.

1.3 Public Notification of Competition and Request for Participation

National advertisement will be conducted notifying the design community and the public of the competition. Submission requirements and rules and regulations are described in the registration kit, available by written request with payment of non-refundable fee of $65.00 (U.S.). Checks should be made payable to the "BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY" and sent to the Competition Adviser at the address listed above. Payment of this fee will constitute official registration. All registrants will be notified of changes in the program as they occur. All registrants will receive the registration kit.
1.1.3 Registration Kit Contents

Each registration kit shall contain the following:

- Sheet A: Base Map
- Sheet B: Existing Conditions Map
- Sheet C: Building Elevations
- Sheet D: Technical Information
- Sheet E: Technical Information
- Slides (10) of Copley Square
- Competition Program and Rules and Regulations
- Other Technical Supporting Data
- Competitor Identification Envelopes

1.4 Competition Stages

The Design Competition shall be conducted in two stages. ALL ENTRANTS OF THE FIRST STAGE SHALL REMAIN ANONYMOUS. Each entrant submission that meets the submission requirements of the first stage shall be reviewed by the Jury. Five selected entries will be chosen to participate in the second stage. A review of the qualifications of the five selected first stage entries will be conducted by the Boston Redevelopment Authority prior to the beginning of the second stage. In the event that the qualifications of the chosen selected competitors for the second stage do not meet criteria established by the Authority, a period of time will be given to those chosen competitors to align themselves with a qualified firm or designer and will then be allowed to continue to the second stage of the competition. (See Section 1.6 Qualifications for Second Stage Participation.)

1.5 Those Eligible to Compete, First Stage

Participation in the first stage of the competition is open to all persons, teams, or firms who have registered with the Competition Adviser on or before January 20, 1984. No entrant shall participate in more than one entry. No member or representative of the sponsors shall be eligible to enter the Competition.

1.6 Qualifications for Second Stage Participation

The Boston Redevelopment Authority will require that all chosen second stage finalists meet, at the least, by alignment with a qualified designer or firm, three requirements for participation in the second stage:

a. Must be a registered Landscape Architect or registered Architect.

b. Must have demonstrated technical ability in the design and development of site(s) similar to Copley Square in size and complexity.

c. Must have demonstrated (in ground) record of completed project(s) at a scale representing the size and complexity of Copley Square.

The Boston Redevelopment Authority will use its discretion in reviewing each of the five selected winners of the first stage in
their approval for second stage participation. Each of the five approved second stage participants will receive a participation fee of $5,000.00 for developing second stage drawings and requirements. All approved second stage participants will be required to sign a Participatory Agreement with the Boston Redevelopment Authority before beginning the second stage.

The Boston Redevelopment Authority reserves the right to change or alter the Competition Program for the second stage of the Competition.

1.7 Possible Commissions Arising From the Results of the Competition

The Competition results will be availed of in developing the project further. The Jury will recommend that the winner of the first prize --- or justifiably some other winner of a prize or award --- be given a commission to further develop the entry. Cash awards will be deducted from any negotiated commission.

1.8 Communication and Requests

For registrants desiring information of any kind regarding the competition, or the program, they shall ask for this information by written request to the Competition Adviser and in no other way. Any request and answer thereto will be sent simultaneously to each registrant as an addendum to these regulations. No questions received after January 12, 1984 will be answered. All answers will be sent to competitors on January 17, 1984.

1.9 Receipt of Submissions of the First Stage

Submissions must be received no later than February 3, 1984 (5:00 PM EST). The Boston Redevelopment Authority will receive and record upon delivery each submission and will make available to the Competition Adviser all entries for his review. The Competition Adviser will forward to the Jury all entries that meet the submission requirements. The Boston Redevelopment Authority disclaims responsibility for loss or damage of entries while in transit from the entrant. All submissions should be sent to the Competition Adviser at the address listed below.

Mr. Kenneth W. Paolini, Competition Adviser
Copley Square Design Competition
Boston Redevelopment Authority
City Hall, 9th Floor
One City Hall Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02201

1.10 Ownership of Submissions

Cash awards, commendations, and honorable mention entries will become the property of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. Entries that do not merit prizes, commendation or honorable mention will be available for retrieval from the Authority, in person, by competitors or their agents
for a period of 30 days after the second stage jury review. (June 25, 1984 deadline.) No provision will be made to mail or ship any entry back to competitors. All entries not claimed within that 30-day period will not be returned. The Boston Redevelopment Authority reserves the right to freely use any entries receiving honoraria, commendation, or cash awards in whole or in part without any compensation beyond that described in Section 1.19 and Section 1.11. In addition, FIRST STAGE entries may be selected for display, reproduced or used for publication. (See Section 1.18 Exhibition or Publication of Designs. FIRST STAGE and SECOND STAGE.)

1.11 Use of Features From Unsuccessful Designs

No feature from an unsuccessful submission will be incorporated into the final selected design without the permission of the author of the specific design feature. If the Authority desires to make use of any individual feature of an unsuccessful entry, the same may be obtained by adequate compensation to that competitor of an amount to be determined or negotiated by the Authority, the Competition Adviser, and the competitor. Nothing original in an unsuccessful design will be used without written consent of the author of the entry which it appears and without giving the competitor due credit.

1.12 General Principles to be Observed in the Design Review by the Jury

In adjudicating the entries, the Jury will take particular account of the following objectives:

a. the aesthetic, architectonic and landscape expression in the city setting.

b. the clarity and efficiency of the total solution.

c. the suitability of the entry to the program.

d. the economy of the solution in construction and in practice.

1.13 Approval of the Competition Program

The competition program was approved by the Boston Redevelopment Authority on December 6, 1983.
1.14 Jury and Judging

The Jury will comprise the following persons nominated by the Sponsors of the competition:

John Belle, AIA, RIBA, Architect, New York City, New York

Anthony B. Casendino, ASLA, Landscape Architect, Boston, Massachusetts

William J. Johnson, FASLA, Landscape Architect, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Katharine D. Kane, Deputy Mayor, Boston, Massachusetts

Joseph W. O'Connor, President, Copley Real Estate Advisors, Boston, Massachusetts

Lawrence T. Perera, Esquire, Partner, Hemenway and Barnes, Boston, Massachusetts

Philipppe P. Robert, Ordre des architectes, Architect, Paris, France

John R. Stilgoe, ASLA, Landscape Historian, Associate Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

William H. Whyte, Author, Urban Open Space Planner, New York, New York

Ex-Officio Representative of the Sponsors

The Jury shall make its selections and recommendations in conformity with the requirements of the program and award any cash prizes and honoraria. The decision on which entries will receive prizes, awards or honoraria shall be made at the sole discretion of the Jury and such decisions shall be binding on all parties.
1.15 Competition Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, December 8, 1983</td>
<td>Public announcement of the Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, January 12, 1984</td>
<td>Deadline for filing written questions (postmarked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, January 17, 1984</td>
<td>Answers sent to all registrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, January 20, 1984</td>
<td>Deadline for registration (postmarked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 3, 1984</td>
<td>First stage boards due (received by 5:00 PM EST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 9, &amp;</td>
<td>First Stage Jury Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 10, 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 21, 1984</td>
<td>Public announcement of second stage competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 21 to</td>
<td>Qualification review of selected competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 2, 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 5, 1984</td>
<td>Second stage begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, March 12, 1984</td>
<td>Site visit to Copley Square by second stage competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, April 26, 1984</td>
<td>Second stage boards due (received by 5:00 PM EST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 17 &amp;</td>
<td>Second Stage Jury Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, May 18, 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week of May 20, 1984</td>
<td>Public announcement of winners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.16 Examination of Entries, First Stage

The Competition Adviser will examine the entries to ascertain whether they comply with the mandatory requirements of the rules and regulations, and will report to the Jury any non-compliance with these mandatory requirements. The Jury will satisfy itself of the report of the Competition Adviser and may disqualify any non-complying entry.

1.16.1 The Jury will carefully study the program and any modifications thereof, which may have been made through “Communication and Questions” under Section 1.8 and will then consider the remaining entries, holding at least one session, and considering at this session all entries in the Competition. Selection of first stage finalists and awards will be by secret ballot and majority vote.
final selection for stage one of the Competition will be made before opening the envelopes which contain the names of the competitors. The ex-officio member of the Jury will cast a ballot to break any tie.

1.16.2 In making the selections, the Jury will thereby affirm that it has made no effort to learn the identity of any of the various competitors. The Jury will do everything possible to maintain the anonymity of the competitors until the end of the first stage selection process.

In the event that a juror inadvertently learns of the identity of a competitor, that juror will make this known to the Competition Adviser and will abstain from voting on that entry throughout the first stage jury process.

After the final selection by the Jury is complete, the Competition Adviser will open the Competitor Identification Envelopes and sign each winning entry on the back side of the boards declaring the awards and finalists of the first stage so granted. The Competition Adviser will then deliver the decision of the Jury to the Sponsors. The Boston Redevelopment Authority will then notify all registrants of the results of the Jury.

1.17 Report of the Jury, For First and Second Stages

The Jury will make a full report to the Boston Redevelopment Authority setting forth its reasons for the selection of the five first stage finalists and the second stage cash award winners. A copy of this report, prepared by the Chairman of the Jury will be available for public review at the Boston Redevelopment Authority. These reports will be due at the end of the first and second stages of the competition.

1.18 Exhibition or Publication of Designs, First Stage and Second Stage

Selected entries in the Competition may be exhibited in a local public place after Jury selection of stages one and two. The Boston Redevelopment Authority reserves the right to display, reproduce, and publish all entries.

1.19 Prizes, Commendations and Honoraria

The Selected Winners will receive prizes and awards from the Boston Redevelopment Authority. The breakdown of cash awards and honoraria will be made as follows:

- First Place $30,000.00
- Second Place $4,000.00
- Third Place $3,000.00
- Fourth Place Commendation for Design Excellence
- Fifth Place Commendation for Design Excellence
- Five Awards Honorable Mention (first stage only)

Winners will be announced at the end of each respective stage of the competition.
2.0 FIRST STAGE SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

2.1 Anonymity of Entries (First Stage Mandatory)

The first stage entries to be submitted should bear no name or mark which could serve as a means of identification, nor should any competitor directly or indirectly reveal the identity of his/her entry, nor communicate directly regarding the competition with representatives of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, any member of the Copley Square Centennial Committee or their representatives, any member of the Jury, nor the Competition Adviser except as provided under "Communication and Questions" described in Section 1.8. In submitting an entry, each competitor shall certify compliance with the foregoing provisions and agree that any violation may result in disqualification. Each board of each entry should include the Competitor Identification Envelope (provided in the registration kit) containing the name, address, and telephone number of the competitor. The Competitor identification Envelope shall be taped on the back, upper right hand corner of each board submitted for the First Stage.

2.2 General Instructions

Each entrant shall submit an original or copy of all material requested. Submittals become the property of the Boston Redevelopment Authority and will not be returned other than those described in Section 1.10 "Ownership of Submissions". Materials not specifically required are not to be included and will not be considered in the selection process.

2.3 General Drawing Requirements

Two boards each measuring 40" x 28" (forty inches by twenty eight inches - the long dimension must be horizontal) of rigid white board or stock.

a. All drawings must be drawn directly on the boards, or firmly mounted prints or copies of drawings can be attached to the boards.

b. Blackline, blueline, or sepia prints are acceptable and can be mounted directly on the boards.

c. No photographs will be permitted as substitutes for the drawings.

d. Nothing shall be mounted on the surface of the boards as to project beyond the boundaries of the boards.

e. No border lines may be permitted on the boards except those as designated on the SHEET A: BASE MAP.

f. Lettering may not exceed three inches in height.

g. An appropriate north arrow must be placed on the boards where necessary.
2.3.1 A typed narrative, on 8½ x 11" white paper should be prepared which explains the designer's concept of the scheme. It should also explain how the scheme relates to the site and its surroundings and how it fulfills the functional requirements of the design of the Square. The narrative shall be typed for clarity and ease of reading by the Jury. The narrative may not exceed one typewritten page and shall be mounted directly on board #2. There is no limit to the number of words on the page.

2.4 Submission Delivery of Drawings

The board drawings shall be addressed and delivered to:

Kenneth W. Paolini, Competition Adviser
Copley Square Design Competition
Boston Redevelopment Authority
City Hall, 9th Floor
One City Hall Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02201

The completed boards must arrive no later than Friday, February 3, 1984, 5:00 PM EST. If the board is sent by the post office (express mail) or express delivered by by a private company, it may be delivered to the post office or express company office not later than Thursday, February 2, 1984 and the post office or express company's paid receipt, bearing date and hour, shall be mailed immediately to the Competition Adviser as evidence of delivery. The Boston Redevelopment Authority recommends that competitors check with local postal officials regarding the mailing of boards by express mail service. In no event will boards be accepted that have not met the delivery requirements. (See Appendix).

2.5 Submission Wrapping

Double wrapping of entries shall be required: the outer wrapping shall carry address and transit stamps and shall be removed by an assistant; the inner wrapping of opaque paper shall bear no mark or identification of any kind and shall be opened by a representative of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. The Competitor Identification Envelope shall be securely attached to the back of each board in the upper right hand corner.

2.6 Submission Drawings, First Stage

All and only the following drawings will be allowed on the boards. No other drawings will be permitted. Please note the additional restrictions placed on the drawings in Section 2.3 "General Drawing Requirements". The two boards measuring 40" x 28" will be required as FIRST STAGE entry submissions.
3.0 REQUIRED BOARD DRAWINGS, FIRST STAGE

3.1 One Illustrated Master Plan of Design Impact Area (Board #1)

The master plan of the Design Impact Area @ 1" = 20' in color or black and white indicating all related design features shall be drawn on Board #1.

3.2 Two "Eye Level" Perspectives or Sketches (Scale Optional) (Board #2)

The perspectives or sketches, in black and white or color, showing different "eye level" views of the Square and its immediate surroundings and characteristics shall be drawn on Board #2.

3.3 One Cross Section (Board #2)

A cross section (location designated on the BASE MAP, SHEET A) at 1" = 20' showing all design features. A drawn outline of Trinity Church in the background is required.

3.4 Typed Narrative (Board #2) (One Page 8½" x 11"

A typed narrative, on 8½" x 11" white paper should be prepared which explains the designer's concept of the scheme. It should explain how the scheme relates to the site and its surroundings and how it fulfills the functional requirements of the design of the Square. The narrative shall be typed for clarity and ease of reading by the Jury. The narrative may not exceed one typewritten page and shall be mounted on Board #2. No means of identification should appear on the narrative.
4.0 PARTICIPATION OF PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

The Parks and Recreation Department of the City of Boston is operated by a board known as the Parks and Recreation Commission. This board acts under the Chairmanship of the Commissioner of Parks who has the exclusive power to contract for professional services and to issue permits for uses of public park land on behalf of the City of Boston Parks and Recreation Department.

Through participation in the competition to redesign Copley Square, the Commissioner of Parks intends to be guided by professional and community recommendations as to the appropriate changes necessary to revitalize Copley Square. The Commissioner of Parks sits as a member of the Copley Square Centennial Committee and has participated in the determination program recommendations and design guidelines competition. The Commissioner of Parks reserves the right to make final determination as to the use of the Square pursuant to the applicable provisions of the City Charter.
5.0 COMPETITION PROGRAM

5.1 Competition Boundaries

The competition area is comprised of two zones whose boundaries will be recognized by all competitors submitting design solutions. These zones have been established to insure harmony of scale, style and function in the development of design proposals.

5.1.1 Design Impact Area: This zone is defined as the area extending across all the bordering streets and sidewalks to the faces of adjacent buildings. Funds are not available to improve the entire area. However, design concepts should be submitted which address this area in anticipation of identifying future resources and should be consistent with an overall approach to creating a Copley Square design that unifies the district. (See Sheets D & E: Technical Information).

The Design Impact Area is also established to insure that competitors consider the quality and materials of surrounding buildings in developing a design concept and in establishing a character for the Square.

- Construction materials include the entire spectrum from Roxbury Pudding Stone to glass as well as pre-cast concrete, granite, brick and terra cotta.
- Paving materials at recent development sites consists of brick and granite.
- The size of surrounding buildings vary in the extreme and are consistent with Boston’s diversity of scale and use.

It is also necessary to consider pedestrian and vehicular circulation patterns in determining functional use of the Square.

5.1.2 Project Area: This area bounded by St. James Avenue and Boylston, Clarendon and Dartmouth Streets contains 156,000 square feet. Excluding the 51,000 square foot parcel owned by Trinity Episcopal Church, the project area is defined as the remaining 105,000 square foot parcel of public land. The maximum estimated construction cost for building initial improvements to Copley Square is three million dollars. This includes estimated fees. The budget is limited to construction within the project area. Designers are challenged to be innovative in their use of the budget amount and to consider re-use of existing site conditions, materials and trees. (See Sheets D & E: Technical Information). FIRST STAGE Competitions are asked to consider the Three Million Dollar budget as a guideline for reconstruction of the Square. SECOND STAGE competitions will be required to verify their designs to a given budget.
5.2 Character

Copley Square is located on a line separating a low-rise historical district from a zone of massive new construction. Its reality is one of contradictions:

- new/old
- small/big
- culture/commerce

5.2.1 A design for Copley Square should create a place of beauty which helps to bring into balance these physical and social conflicts. The new Copley Square should embody the idea of a city as a place of community and cultural meaning -- a place wherein the lives of city residents and workers are enriched.

a. The design should employ natural materials as well as high quality paving, employing trees and masonry materials to create a warmly human environment:

- The location of trees should define vistas, passages and activity areas. Other plant materials should be chosen to ensure a presence of seasonal color and green throughout the year.
- Paved areas should be comprised of varying patterns and textures, reflecting functional use and sensitivity to color and the pattern and style of the surfaces of the surrounding architecture.
- Flower beds should lend color to the space and reflect seasonal change.

b. The design for Copley Square should provide a public open space which is flexible, accommodating various uses which will alter with the changing seasons. It should avoid emphasis on the fashionable and provide a suitable setting for a range of activities, no matter the trend. There should be areas for quiet enjoyment and reflection as well as a place where a crowd can gather.

5.3 Functional Uses of the Square

5.3.1 Informal Use: The design should primarily promote informal use of the Square and reflect activities of a successful urban place:

- ease of access to surrounding streets
- multi-functional, flexible space
- public surveillance and control

Copley Square should function chiefly as a congenial setting for conversation and unplanned activities. Only secondarily should the Square be dependent for its animation on formally programmed...
events. There will be times, such as night, weekends, or during the winter and holidays when special events may be staged. The Square should be a place where passers-through will want to stop, eat, sit, read, observe city life, chat and relax. The elderly should be attracted to sit and chat; mothers should want to bring their children; the Public Library should see it as a place to hold its children's reading hour on a nice afternoon; shoppers should feel comfortable stopping to relax; workers should find a bench on which to eat their lunch. Thus the Square should be a pleasant, inviting and safe place for many different groups.

People should be offered seating of various types and scales, creating different types of places to sit and relax; places to sit alone or with a companion to watch city life, physically but not visually removed from the flow of pedestrian traffic; places to sit around tables. Other seating areas must be organized in ways that encourage social interaction and should provide a natural audience for street performers. Making the Square a place that greater numbers of people enjoy will help displace undesirable activities currently on the Square, such as drug dealing and petty crime, characteristic of desolate urban spaces. Experience has shown that the presence of people is the best deterrent of those who threaten security.

a. **Seating:** Overall, at least 1,000 persons should be able to find seating accommodation of various kinds:

   o **Fixed seating:** At least 1,050 linear feet of fixed seating should be provided in various spatial arrangements to accommodate up to 700 people.

   o **Flexible seating:** Movable chairs should be provided for 300 persons.

5.3.2 **Food Service:** The availability of food and beverage attracts people to any outdoor urban space. The provision of food and beverage should be accommodated on a seasonal basis from a temporary arbor-like pavilion structure. This structure should be demountable, sturdy and wind resistant. Service should be accommodated in an area for 150 seats around open air tables sheltered by umbrellas and/or trees. The operating period of the pavilion could be from May through October, weather permitting. Food preparation is to be off-site with the pavilion containing equipment and space necessary for service. The overall character of the food service area should reinforce the dignity and quality of the Square and not resemble or suggest fast-food service.

   o It is estimated that the design should accommodate from 300 to 500 square feet of serving area in light frame, temporary, pavilion-like structure.
o The design should provide a space for 150 movable chairs and stationary tables in an open air layout.

o The food service area should be in proximity to sidewalk areas and not obstruct pedestrian circulation, nor should it conflict with access to Trinity Church and the St. James Avenue entrance to the Hancock Tower. It's overall character should contribute to creating a place of beauty and quiet enjoyment.

5.3.3 Market: Throughout the year, Copley Square could host a series of markets for the sale of seasonal products. Currently a Farmers Market operates on the Square two days a week from mid-June to mid-October and could serve as a model for similar ventures. Approximately twelve growers now sell flowers and produce from pick-up trucks and station wagons parked in a circle on the Square. More appropriate and attractive arrangements can be made for the Farmers Market as well as for other groups. At various times of the year the market area could accommodate seasonal sales, such as flowers in the spring, pumpkins in the fall, Christmas trees, holly and wreaths in the winter, and the like. The designer should develop a design for the market and designate a specific site for about a dozen market stalls.

o Space should be designated for a seasonal Farmers Market-type operation, which, when not occupied by sellers, must serve the informal needs of visitors and be an attractive component of the Square.

o Temporary market stalls, the location of which would be designated in some manner should be provided, permitting daily set-up, take-down, and removal.

5.3.4 Vending: Copley Square could also host a modest number of vendors, possibly with wheeled carts. Unique foods, specialty and seasonal items will be encouraged. Carts must be removed at the close of the day.

o A variety of locations should be designated which are consistent with the overall design approach and the dignity of the Square, and which do not obstruct circulation patterns.

5.3.5 Programmed Activities: A design for Copley Square should not rely on highly-promoted events and attractions for its meaning and purpose. It should primarily serve as a place of beauty which is quiet when empty but never dull and unattractive. However, the value of public space in enhancing the life of the community must not be overlooked. Planned events can reinforce the meaning of local institutions and political processes that shape daily routines. These might include festivals, political events, holiday events and cultural events, such as: ethnic and neighborhood festivals; flower shows; Christmas and New Years celebrations; theatre, dance and musical performances; and political debates and rallies.
To accommodate scheduled performances and other activities on the Square, the design should provide an inviting, open-air space to accommodate up to 300 persons, sitting and standing.

- The space should be flexible enough to accommodate many uses.
- The space should be pleasant and attractive to the user, whether the users are conversational groups or 300 spectators.
- The character of the space should complement the Square and surrounding architecture, and may suggest symbolic meaning through its spatial composition and its furnishings.
- The design of the space will necessitate an understanding of the need for supporting equipment and services: lighting, sound, electric, telephone, the storage capacity to render the equipment hidden; and seating which may be fixed, movable or combinations of the two, depending on design treatment.

5.3.5 Trinity Church: As a result of the 1966 completion which joined several parcels of land to create its present form, Copley Square serves as the front door of Trinity Church. The design of the Square and consideration of its use are inseparable from understanding the Church's formal relationship to the Square and accommodating the needs of Trinity parishioners.

- The design should minimize conflicts between activities on the Square and Church ceremonial occasions, such as weddings and funerals, as well as weekly services and daily activities.
- The design might make reference to the original Trinity Church triangular site which influenced Richardson's design.
- Parking stalls for six officers of the Church should be located in proximity to the Church and on Church property in an unobtrusive location, possibly along St. James Avenue.
- While most parishioners, tourists and visitors use the front doors of Trinity, the Clarendon Street entrance serves a significant arrival and exit function, particularly in regard to special occasions and the conducting of Church affairs.
- The design should incorporate the present curb cut and forty-foot radius cul-de-sac which provides vehicular access to the front entrance of Trinity Church.

5.4 Design Information

Zoning changes and exceptions have created a unique composition of building heights and volumes at Copley Square along to North side of Boylston Street, building heights are limited to 155 feet in a projected architectural district. In contrast, the south sides of Boylston Street
and St. James Avenue presents building volumes and heights that vary dramatically from the architectural district. While capitalizing on this opportunity for views and vistas, the design for Copley Square should be guided by notions of simplicity, elegance, clarity of purpose, attention to detail, quality of material and respect for tradition. Copley Square is well-furnished with architectural monuments - the New Old South Church, the Copley Plaza Hotel, the John Hancock Tower, and the recent Westin Hotel. It is renowned for the presence at its edges of the Boston Public Library and Trinity Church.

The design should be shaped, in part, by the approaches to and views of these structures. Consideration of spatial experience must be from the point of view of pedestrians, both within the Square and along the periphery.

5.4.1 Relationship to Streets: Copley Square should offer an easy flow from the surrounding streets, having as many entrances and exits as possible. To facilitate ease of surveillance and social control, major seating and activity areas should be visible to passing pedestrians and motorists. The location of activity areas, when appropriate, should take advantage of existing pedestrian movement along Boylston and Dartmouth Streets. Ease of visual and physical access and a sense of continuity with life in adjoining blocks and streets should be emphasized.

5.4.2 Lighting and Environmental Controls: The design of Copley Square should be beautiful and attractive day and night, and provide, where possible, design features which mitigate harsh climate conditions.

- Adequate and attractive lighting to enhance nighttime enjoyment of Copley Square should be an integral part of the design.
- Wind comfort criteria should be met through wind abatement strategies, where possible, providing protection for outdoor eating, outdoor seating, walkways and outdoor performance areas.
- Where appropriate, consideration should be given to the acoustical requirements for programmed activities.

5.4.3 Storage: Storage of equipment and materials on the surface of the Square is undesirable. Provision should be made for limited storage of approximately 400 square feet. The storage area should not be accommodated in a free-standing structure, but may be located partially or totally below grade, for such items as:

- portable stage equipment
- movable chairs
- maintenance equipment
- lighting and electric controls; telephone
5.4.4 Traffic and Pedestrian Conditions: Traffic signals, pavement detail and other design considerations should emphasize and secure pedestrian crosswalks. Special attention should be given to the difficult intersection of Huntington Avenue, St. James Avenue and Dartmouth Street. The mid-block crossing to the St. James Avenue entrance to the John Hancock Tower is also dangerous.

- **Circulation:** Copley Square's location is at the center of a vehicular and pedestrian interchange. With the construction of new developments at its edges, this function will become even more important. A design should provide for adequate circulation at the edges of the Square and within its interior, without creating a barren crossroads.

- **Transit:** Two to three tour buses currently park along the St. James edge of the Square. Other than these buses, transit vehicles will not dominate the Square and inhibit pedestrian movement.

- **Pedestrians:** Cross movements in both diagonal directions must be planned for heavy pedestrian flows. Protection from harsh winds and inclement weather should be considered for main pedestrian routes. Cooley Square should be free of barriers and permit easy access to elderly and disabled pedestrians.

- **Vehicular Access:** Curb cuts should be kept to a minimum, but truck access should be provided for food service delivery and waste pick-up. Because of the need to service a range of activities on the Square, loading areas should be designated for delivery and removal of equipment associated with markets, vending and programmed events as well as maintenance and cleaning.

- **Parking:** Permanent parking is not allowed in the Square (except for the six spaces for Trinity Church). Parallel parking is permitted along Boylston and Clarendon Streets.

5.5 Management

The competition to design Copley Square should produce a beautiful design which must have the capacity to evolve over time. An organization is proposed to manage and maintain the revitalized Copley Square. Management and maintenance costs are estimated at two dollars per square foot per year, or approximately two-hundred thousand dollars per year. Possible revenue sources to defray management and maintenance costs include income from endowment funds, concessions, a voluntary assessment district and normal expenditures from the City Parks Department.

To meet management and maintenance requirements, the designer should utilize design concepts and use construction materials which engender minimum management and maintenance costs.
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Copley Square Centennial Committee
Membership List - May 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Katherine Ahern</td>
<td>Hunneman &amp; Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William L. Boyan, Jr.</td>
<td>John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nancy K. Burke</td>
<td>Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kevin Ann Cartwright</td>
<td>Back Bay Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Anthony B. Casendino</td>
<td>American Society of Landscape Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kenneth C. Collison, Jr.</td>
<td>St. Botolph Citizen's Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. James W. Crawford</td>
<td>Old South Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John J. Doherty</td>
<td>Boston Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell A. Gaudreau, Jr. Esq.</td>
<td>Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Paul F. Hellmuth</td>
<td>Museum of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kenneth A. Himmel</td>
<td>Urban Investment and Development Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Hoffman</td>
<td>Liberty Mutual Insurance Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Mayor Katherine D. Kane</td>
<td>City of Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tunney F. Lee</td>
<td>MIT/State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward J. McCormack, Jr., Esq.</td>
<td>McCormack &amp; Zimble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert R. McCoy</td>
<td>Parks and Recreation Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ann Nemrow</td>
<td>Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Joseph W. O'Connor</td>
<td>New England Mutual Life Insurance Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence T. Perera, Esq.</td>
<td>Hemenway &amp; Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bernard H. Pucker</td>
<td>Newbury Street Art Galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Spencer Morgan Rice</td>
<td>Trinity Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert J. Ryan</td>
<td>Boston Redevelopment Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roger A. Saunders</td>
<td>Saunders Hotels Company, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Anthony Tappe</td>
<td>Boston Society of Architects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stella Trafford</td>
<td>Friends of the Public Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alan Tremain</td>
<td>Copley Plaza Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. William H. Wainwright</td>
<td>Institute of Contemporary Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth C. Whitman</td>
<td>Back Bay Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Joan Wood</td>
<td>South End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Presentation Boards of Finalists from 1983
Copley Square Competition

First Place: Dean Abbott of Clarke & Rapuano
Second Place: Krisan Osterby-Benson, Peter Schaudt, Michael Van Valkenburgh, John Whitman with Sippican Consultants International
Third Place: Cooper, Eckstut Associates
Commendations: SWA Group
Samuel Coplon and Harry Dodson with Moriece & Gary, Inc.
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Copley Square from the corner of Boylston and Dartmouth Streets. Late August 1980.
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Copley Square Design Competition
Copley Square Design Competition
Copley Square Design Competition
A DIALOGUE


ARCHITECT IN SOCIETY


7. Saint, op. cit., p. 80.


14. Burgess, op. cit., p. 73.

16. Discussions with Gunter Behnisch while he was a visiting Professor of Architecture at MIT, September 1986.

17. Gutman, op. cit., p. 28.

SOCIETY IN ARCHITECTURE


5. Ibid.


7. Schon, op. cit., p. 79.


10. The Governor's Design Awards was sponsored by the Massachusetts Council on the Arts and Humanities, and administered by the MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning.

COMMUNICATION

1. Burgess, op. cit., p. 33 (Quote is referenced.)


3. Discussions with Judith Chafee, visiting Professor of Architecture at MIT and a former student and employee of Paul Rudolph December 1987.
A PLACE NAMED COYLE SQUARE


3. Ibid.


15. Nicholaeff, op. cit., p. 27.


26. Nicholaeff, op. cit., p. 82.

27. Nicholaeff, op. cit., p. 82.


33. Krieger and Green, op. cit., p. 46.

34. Krieger and Green, op. cit., p. 49.

THE GREAT SOCIETY: COPLEYSQUARE 1966


2. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files.


5. O'Connor, op. cit., p. 133.


11. Edward J. Logue, Seven Years of Progress (Boston, MA: Boston Redevelopment Authority, 1967) p. 3.


14. Ibid.


20. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983. Sasaki Correspondence.


22. Stuart Dawson, op. cit.


27. Ibid.

28. Ibid.


31. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.

32. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Boston Conference: Copley Square, pp. 16, 68.
34. Golden and Mehegan, op. cit., p. 23.
35. Herbert J. Gans, Urban Villagers
38. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983. Sasaki Correspondence.

A NEW SQUARE: 1983 COMPETITION

3. Copley Square Centennial Committee. Committee Minutes.
5. Ibid., p. 100.
7. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.
12. Piper, op. cit.
13. Piper, op. cit.
15. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.
16. Ibid.

17. Piper, op. cit.

18. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.


21. Ibid.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.


25. Copley Square Centennial Committee, Committee Minutes.


27. Ibid.

28. Ibid.

29. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.

30. Ibid.


32. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.

33. Copley Square Centennial Committee, op. cit.

34. Ibid.

35. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

39. Ibid.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid.

44. Abbott, op. cit.


46. Casendino, op. cit.

47. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.

48. Casendino, op. cit.


50. Ibid.

51. Casendino, op. cit.


53. Ibid.

54. Abbott, op. cit.

55. Abbott, op. cit.

56. Abbott, op. cit.

57. Chabrier, op. cit., p. 75.

58. Chabrier, op. cit., p. 75.

59. Casendino, op. cit.

60. Casendino, op. cit.
61. Casendino, op. cit.


63. Casendino, op. cit.

64. Abbott, op. cit.

65. Casendino, op. cit.

66. Copley Square Centennial Committee, Committee Minutes.

67. Bast, op. cit.

68. MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning, Copley Square Project Files, 1983.

A CONTINUING DIALOGUE OF ARCHITECTURE


2. Sullivan, op. cit., p. 245.
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 1: Diagram of design process.
Drawing from John Zeisel, Inquiry by Design

Figure 2: Grids of Boston's Back Bay and South End.
Drawing from Doreve Nicholaeff, The Planning and Development of Copley Square.

Figure 3: Six wedge shaped lots which became Copley Square.
Drawing from Doreve Nicholaeff, The Planning and Development of Copley Square.

Figure 4: Charles McKim's Copley Square proposal, 1890.
Drawing from Boston Public Library.

Figure 5: Ralph Adams Cram's Copley Square proposal, 1895.
Drawing from Boston Public Library.

Figure 6: Frank Bourne's Copley Square proposal, 1912.
Drawing from Boston Public Library.

Figure 7: Aerial view of Copley Square, c. 1965.
Photo by Sasaki Associates.

Figure 8: Model of Winning design, 1966 Competition.
Photo by Boston Redevelopment Authority.

Figure 9: Rendering of Sasaki design, 1966.
From Sasaki Associates.

Figure 10: Copley Square Centennial Committee Logo.
Courtesy Copley Square Centennial Committee.

Figure 11: Posters announcing public symposia.
Courtesy MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning.

Figure 12: Posters announcing public symposia.
Courtesy MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning.

Figure 13: Winning Solution for 1983 Competition by Dean Abbott.
Courtesy Boston Redevelopment Authority.

Figure 14: Second place solution for 1983 Competition.
Drawing by Michael Van Valkenburgh.

Figure 15: Rendering of Abbott design, 1983.
Drawing from Boston Redevelopment Authority.
Figure 16: Fountain design by Dean Abbott. Drawing from Boston Redevelopment Authority.

Figure 17: Public Relations Logo - Copley Square. Courtesy Copley Square Centennial Committee.

Appendix A: Courtesy Boston Redevelopment Authority.

Appendix B: Courtesy MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning.

Appendix D: Courtesy Boston Redevelopment Authority.
Abbott, Dean; Clarke & Rapuano, Inc. Interview, Cambridge, MA, April 7, 1987.


Bast, Beatrice; Copley Square Centennial Committee. Interview, Boston, MA, April 2, 1987.


Casendino, Anthony; Childs, Bertman, Tseckares & Casendino. Interview, Boston, MA, March 17, 1987.


Copley Square Centennial Committee. Jury Comments.

Copley Square Centennial Committee. Minutes of Committee Meetings.


Harris, Robert S. A Design is a Spinoff in the Development of Understanding. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, 1969.


MIT Laboratory of Architecture and Planning. Copley Square Project Files.


Piper, Tom; Division of Capital Planning and Operations. Interview, Boston, MA, March 5, 1987.


