

Communications: It's time to redesign the Council Chamber
Peter Valentine 37 Brookline St. 1/24/2000

The decor of the council chamber is gaudy and authoritarian. Why should citizens enter into their public meeting place under a decor that states authoritarian - plebian ? That kind of history is best left in picture books and museums.

The council chamber totally lacks a sense of community. That in fact it is a place for the meeting of the citizenry some of whom are conducting the meeting and have been given various administrative capacities. Secondly the council chamber design is disfunctional, Not suitable for healthy communication.

At a meeting of the rules committee council members stated

"the lighting is too bright it hurts the eyes"

"sometimes the lighting blocks out the vision
so it's difficult to see the councillors on the other
side"

an unhealthy design drains the mind and body's energy

the council chamber doesn't allow a sense of relaxed
accessible communication among councillors

it's difficult to see other councillors to the side and pits
four councillors opposite one another over a large
incommunicative distance

therefore the only access councillors have to communicate is
over a booming microphone

I believe the purpose of the original design was to enable the public to see the councillors but this design forces the council to function in a loud stressful way.

shouldn't councillors meet as people just calmly talking with
with one another and working things out, rather than being
forced to sit in a theatrical stage-like performance arena ?

For example seating closer together in a simple parabolic half circle. Tables with draws and or shelving. Comfortably cushioned adjustable seating rather than stiff gaudy thrown like seats. (Please note that all the chairs are the same size and shape, yet the sizes of the councillors differ). Councillors could then see and hear each other easily and communicate in a comfortable way. This creates an environment for more reasonable interactions and intelligent deliberations. A large TV screen in the chamber could solve the public's need need to see councillors directly.

There's no doubt except for the chairperson, councillors should change seats at each meeting. This will continually stimulate a sense of newness and vitality as opposed to same old seat, same old meeting. To hold the same seat for two years a induces a sense of historical territorial ownership. Councillors are there not to own property but to come up with stimulating ideas and ways of communication which empower the citizen's lives. That should be a councillor's enjoyment rather than territorial chamber ownership.

In the background there still could be a stage-like area for presentation and special events. Is the intention to create an environment where unity and smooth flow of communication is achieved or to persist, because of history, in a state of architectural authoritarianism and drawn rigid lines of confrontation ?

The Goal - To be comfortable, to easily be aware of what's going on and what is said and to be able to communicate in a relaxed way.

Let's draw the curtain's on the council chamber's booming, glaring ostentation. It doesn't depict the true vision of what America stands for. A people's government. Ostentation breeds authoritarian arrogance and time waisting.

Consent Communciation #3

145

A communicationw as received from
Peter Valentine, relative to the decor
of the Sullivan Chamber.

S-14

In City Council January 24, 2000

PLACED ON FILE