

7034
P.C.C.
DICTATED BY.....
TYPED BY.....
READ AND CHECKED BY.....
SIGNED BY.....
THIS COPY CHECKED WITH ORIGINAL
RE: THE MAILING
.....

Ernest Dawson
D

1st September, 1911.

Mr. Harold H. Blossom,
621 Timken Building, San Diego, California.

My dear Mr. Blossom;

I have received your letter of the 25th instant and have had a consultation with Mr. Dawson over the plan.

I am of the opinion that the east and west drive shown on my plan #53-D, south of the California State Building ought to be retained from the square concourse south of that building to the drive east of Machinery Hall for proper circulation in connection with the fighting of fires, and more especially because of the possibility that it may be decided later to omit the Art Building and thus obtain funds for the construction of the bridges shown on plan 53-D. I shall therefore write again to Mr. Goodhue suggesting the advisability of omitting the building which stands at the west end of the Art Building and which would be in the way of this drive if it should later be carried through. I do not

Mr. Blossom - 2.

mean to urge upon him the particular form of building at that point shown on my plan 53-D, because he may not wish to be responsible for that particular grouping, but I think I can urge upon him the omission of this building entirely. I am of the opinion that it would not be satisfactory to the United States Government to build in the manner suggested by him on his plan 17th August. The government probably would want a much larger building if it has any at all, and would probably want more ample surroundings and a better driving approach than that shown on Mr. Goodhue's plan. The same is likely to be true of any county or state which might be offered the location. They would easily accept it if the drive goes through from the bridge, as on my plan 53-D, but they would feel that they were shoved out too far one side, I think, if treated as on Mr. Goodhue's plan. Considering that I yielded to Mr. Goodhue with regard to the diagonal drive at the edge of the canyon northwest of the California State Building, I certainly think he ought to defer to my judgment as to the requirements of the drive circulation by acceding to the proposed drive south of that building.

I acceded to Mr. Allen's idea of retaining most of the curved drive from La Glorieta up, and if that is retained I certainly think the buildings south of it ought to be kept out of the way and presumably be far enough south to center on Cedar Street. I like the outlines of his Agricultural Building but I do not see how so wide a building south to north can be properly contained on that site if the curved drive is retained.

It seems to me that before the estimate is completed and presented to the committee there should be a conference with Mr. Marston and Mr. Wangenheim as to the expediency of omitting the Art Building. In my opinion San Diego is not sufficiently populous nor sufficiently wealthy to justify its Park Commission in expending \$150,000 on an Art Building, but it would be justified in spending that amount or more on bridges and drives connected with them.

The arrangement of the service yard shown on my plan seems to me the best yet, but if the Domestic Liberal Arts Building is to be of the shape shown on Mr. Goodhue's plan it may be necessary to introduce

a straight drive immediately east of that building (which would be the service entrance) and to have the service building and yard east of this straight drive with the sheds and buildings built out over the present diagonal drive on wood or plaster underpinnings so they would be accessible from the upper side. That is the only way that occurs to me in which sufficient space for sheds, storehouses, etc. can be obtained in a location convenient to an outside gate.

In regard to the elevation of the lake I can agree to lower it to elevation 200, but if the California State Building floor is 210 and the elevation at the north side of the plaza is 207, I think the drive thence to the lake could be kept level at 207 and the lake be at 203 or, if necessary for engineering reasons, at 202, but I do not care very much as a matter of design what the elevation of the lake is within two or three feet.

In regard to leaving the west side of the Plaza Larga without any building to be erected by park funds or the Exposition, it seems to me a perfectly safe assumption that this space will be occupied by state or county buildings and a restaurant (if it should be

thought admissible on account of fire risk,) and, of course, with the assurance that whatever building is put there will be designed by Mr. Goodhue, (or ^{by} Mr. Gill with Mr. Goodhue's approval) The advantages of the site would be so great that those who would put up the building would surely agree to that very reasonable condition. It does not strike me that there ought to be even as much space unoccupied by buildings there as shown on Mr. Goodhue's plan. His crosswise enlargement of the plaza would be an attractive feature but would add to the expense and would diminish the amount of high class space for buildings and would interrupt the mission-like simplicity of the proposed arcades. Also make difficulty with profile on up hill drive.

Your study for the extension of Sixth Street expresses my idea except that I think a little plaza would be in order at Date Street. I have asked Mr. Dawson to have a profile drawn up and a rough estimate made of the probable fill. If this seems exorbitant and beyond all possibilities at the present time, I shall next try throwing the drive and walk close to the boundary without regard to the unfortunate lack of symmetry in connection with Park Avenue, but with the understanding

Mr. Blossom - 6

that eventually the Avenue will be extended down the hill full breadth.

Don't forget to revert to the entrance drive from Date Street shown on my third preliminary plan, the one I had before I left San Diego, which provides a connection with West Drive.

Yours very truly,