

4057
DICTATED BY J.C.A.
TYPED BY M.V.R.
READ AND CHECKED BY.....
SIGNED BY J.C.V.
THIS COPY CHECKED WITH ORIGINAL
BEFORE MAILING
M.V.R.

J.F.L. ✓
Blasman M.V.R.

17th March, 1913.

Mr. Frederick Gordon Lysle,
Room 645, Spreckels Building, San Diego, Cal.

My dear Mr. Lysle;

I have received your letter of the 6th instant addressed to my brother.

I believe my brother gave no opinion on the matter, it was I who represented our firm in the work we did for the Park Commission at San Diego.

The question of the extension of Sixth Street was an interesting one and I feel that you are entitled to know what I think about it.

I was opposed to the immediate extension of Sixth Street, but was quite willing to consider that the time would come when it would be justifiable; but in that case I assumed that it would of course be a park road and not a city street. I advised the Park

bounded almost everywhere by the rears of residence lots instead of by border streets with houses facing towards the Park. Unless there is some very weighty objection in particular cases, it follows that a good plan for the development of the park would include the location of boundary roads in the borders of the Park. In making plans for further improvement of Balboa Park, therefore, I included plans for border streets wherever the topography and other conditions made it possible and reasonable.

This principle of park planning lead me to favor the idea of eventually extending Sixth Street, not as a city street, but as a park drive to connect with the portion already constructed. I expected that the Park Commission would negotiate with adjoining land owners to secure, in return for the privilege of facing on this park border drive, a few restrictions adapted to controlling the future buildings in such a way that they would do the least possible damage to the Park. That is to say, there ought to be a building

Mr. Lysle - 4

limit line so that the main front walls of buildings would not crowd directly upon the sidewalk. But this should be modified by permitting the intrusion of bay-windows, porches and other customary architectural projections into the restricted space. Another needed restriction would be ^{as to} the height of buildings so as to prevent sky-scrappers which would obstruct the view of the harbor from the Park. Another restriction would be to prevent stores, work-shops, factories and other objectionable buildings within say 50 feet of the Park.

I should be inclined to advise the Park Commissioners that if the private owners would not agree to such restrictions, the Park Commission should oppose the construction of the proposed border road or else should be provided with a special fund and needed laws or other authority for the purpose of obtaining restrictions by right of condemnation and paying for them.

The main point which you bring up is that the advantages of this border road and of securing the

conditions of development on adjoining private land would not by any means justify the Park Commission in making the necessary sacrifice of the natural beauty of the little canon. I, on the other hand, was convinced that the sacrifice would be justified by the advantages to be gained from the point of view of park design, public utility and support of public opinion.

I believe that so much of the beauty of Balboa Park as is dependent upon the surface of the ground, that is to say the hills and cañons and the natural verdure upon them, is of vastly more importance in the interior of the Park than on the borders, which are necessarily more or less dominated by improvements already made or that will be made on adjoining private property. I believe the citizens should make almost any sacrifice of convenience and improvement to land values which might result from carrying a commercial street and electric railway or both through the middle portions of the Park in order to preserve the middle portions of the Park, but I am of the opinion that the sacrifice of ^{natural} of

Mr. Lysle - 6

beauty incident to the creation of border streets wherever they will result in securing a handsome frontage of houses would be fully justifiable. In fact it would be absolutely essential in most cases to securing the best results from the point of view of park design.

I should be obliged to you if you would not permit this letter to become public. You may explain my views to the few friends you mention who have some professional interest in the matter. I fear that non-professionals will fail to appreciate my attitude and merely become inimical, and unconsciously will misrepresent my arguments.

Yours very truly,