

7.18.11

10th August, 1911.

Mr. Bertram G. Goodhue,  
Santa Barbara, Cal.

My dear Mr. Goodhue:

I have received your letter of the 3rd instant. I am exceedingly sorry if my way of putting things in discussion with you as to matters of design in connection with the Panama-California Exposition has been disagreeable to you. I can assure you without reservation that nothing is further from my desire than to have my remarks produce that result. I have the greatest respect for your ability as an architect and the highest regard for your personality and it is my wish to be perfectly frank and cordial and sympathetic with your ideas and wishes. I make suggestions and criticisms primarily from a sense of duty toward my employers, but also in the hope that what I have to say may occasionally be of assistance to you. Our work must necessarily be intimately related and so closely knitted together at places

Goodhue - 2.

that it is almost if not quite impossible to clearly define the boundary between our respective spheres and I hope that you do not feel that such a boundary is of any practical consequence. Some of my suggestions are necessarily of an aesthetic character, while others are based upon practical reasons. In some cases they may be of such importance in the development of Balboa Park that I must, in the discharge of my duty toward the Park Commissioners, urge them more strongly upon you and perhaps even in some cases of difference of opinion bring them to the Park Commission for decision. I hope, however, that this will seldom be necessary.

At present I have accepted your modifications of my plan in a general way by telegraphing Mr. Marston to that effect, but in doing so I felt obliged to call attention to what I cannot avoid regarding as defects in your scheme which are of such a nature that they should properly be decided by the Park Commissioners as matters of park development.

By far the most important of these questions is that of the crossing of Spanish Canyon to Mesa Viscaino. It was my suggestion, subject to approval by the City Engineer or whoever will be responsible for the main

Goodhue - 3.

features of the emergency reservoir, more especially as regards the elevation of the surface of the water, that the dam should be moved far enough down the Canyon to become useful as a support for the driveway and walks to connect the main group of Exposition buildings with the buildings and other Exposition features of a temporary character which it may be later determined to place upon Mesa Viscaïno. This suggestion you accepted in your plan and worked out very nicely. The arrangement seems to be all that could be desired as a connection between the main group of Exposition buildings and Mesa Viscaïno. It is also satisfactory from the point of view of park design. It does not, however, at all serve as a reasonably direct connection between the Date Street entrance and the drives on Cabrillo Hill and the Plaza Musica. Considered as an approach from Date Street entrance to the California State Building and Art Museum (which are the permanent buildings to be provided with suitable access in the permanent development of the park) it would, passing around the head of a branch ravine on the north side of Spanish Canyon as shown on your revision of our plan, always appear very awkwardly circuitous and unreasonable. Also, considered as a matter



Goodhue - 4.

of park design, as a portion of a circuit drive in the park after the Exposition it is similarly awkward and objectionable, so much so that I think it would be always felt to be a case of bad park planning. I therefore stated to Mr. Marston that in my opinion, as a matter of park design, it is essential that there should be a bridge across the Spanish Canyon at or near the northeast end of Cabrillo bridge. I have not studied out grades in detail but my thought is that the two bridges should have their ends so close together that they can be connected by a piece of retaining wall so as to become in general effect a connected architectural design. I hope the drive from the southeast end of this Spanish bridge so located can be carried to the Plaza and the drive east of it passing south of the California State building without excessively steep grade. Such a connecting drive seems to me very essential for park development and also for a reasonably direct and convenient approach to the Art Museum and California State Building as permanent buildings and to the main group of Exposition buildings. I should think that you would be inclined to agree with me in this matter, but I did not

Goodhue - 5.

have time to correspond with you about it before calling it to Mr. Marston's attention. I had no idea of seeking to have you overruled in the matter without adequate discussion but Mr. Dawson had promised the committee that I would announce my choice between the two plans before a certain date..

This question brings up two others: First, to find the money for this Spanish bridge; second; to ask you to modify your design for the group of buildings in such a way as to provide for a suitable drive from the <sup>Spanish</sup> bridge to the California State Building. In other words, the drive as I imagine it without having studied it definitely, would necessitate separating the building which you have marked "United States Government Building" from the permanent buildings sufficiently to provide a gap through which the drive can pass. As an alternative it would conceivably be possible to carry the drive east and west along the south side of the site which you have marked "Government Building" but I am inclined to think you might consider that the drive would then be too far from the front door of the California State Building and Art Museum, but if you think not and decidedly prefer that alternative I think I can agree to it, although it would involve a change in your design for buildings on each side of the Plaza Larga.



Goodhue - 6.

in order to carry this drive straight across to the drive east of Plaza.

I have considered as an alternative the location of the Spanish bridge nearly as shown on plan 53-B, but I have not drawn it out yet and am not prepared to say whether it will be better or worse than having the bridge start ~~near~~ near the northeast end of Cabrillo bridge. My predilection however is decidedly in favor of the latter site, as the bridge would be some 15 <sup>to 25</sup> feet lower and not any longer if as long, and would make a better architectural grouping with the Cabrillo Bridge, and would be one-third more distant from the dam. The comparative nearness of the upper site for the bridge to the dam I feel to be a decided objection to it. In the upper site the bridge would be about 640 feet from the dam, while the lower site would be some 840'. Besides that it would at the lower site be located essentially at the junction of the Spanish Canyon with Cabrillo Canyon and when covered with vines will frame in the east side of Cabrillo Canyon along the general line of the top of the steep part of the bluff, thus adding to the effect of continuity and deepness in Cabrillo Canyon and at the same time lengthening the view up the

Goodhue - 7.

Spanish Canyon toward the <sup>dam</sup> ~~dam~~, making what is left of the Canyon appear much longer and much more worth while.

I have other less important criticisms to make on your plan, but I may say that if after full consideration you cannot agree with my ideas I shall not feel it necessary, except in one case, to bring them up to the committee for decision between us.

This one case is a matter of park design and I do not see how it can be of vital importance to you as a matter of architectural design. It is that the existing drive La Glorieta at the north end of El Rodeo should be continued across the Plaza Larga to a junction with the existing park drive which goes on down to the 18th Street entrance. It might be possible of course, as a matter of park development, to omit this cross drive during the Exposition and add it afterwards, but the chance of subsequent administrations attending to this matter is such a small one that I think the present park commission should certainly attend to it. To get this cross drive will necessitate simply the moving of the Administration Building a little further north and other consequent slight adjustments of the outlines of buildings, etc. Incidentally, I may say that I think this cross drive is really necessary for practical reasons during the Exposition, as a means



Goodhue - 8.

of intercommunication by vehicles, especially for circulation of fire-fighting apparatus.

I have no decided objection to the omission of the circle at the east end of the straight portion of El Camino Real and to the projection southward of a wing of one of the temporary Exposition buildings east of the Plaza Externo, if you think that is treating the approach from what is now the most populous portion of the City with due aesthetic consideration.

It has always seemed to me that it would be a good idea to have the building west of Plaza Externo with its east and west axis on the center line of Cedar Street (extended,) and I still think it would be preferable <sup>than</sup> to have it only a few yards away from that line, as you show on your plan, especially as it would fit the topography better. To move this building some 40 feet south would reduce the space between the north side of the sidewalk of El Camino Real and the building from about 120 feet <sup>(as</sup> shown on your plan) to 80 feet, but it seems to me that 80 feet would be a sufficient distance from the street.

It seems to me it would be very desirable to extend the building north of El Camino Real and west of



Plaza Externo sufficiently far west to have some important architectural feature on the south facade (and possibly also on the sky line) <sup>located</sup> on the center line of 13th Street, (extended) and also of course opposite the center of the circle, even though it is not proposed to have any entrance to the building from this circle. These changes would involve, I think, a change of floor level in the long building or else a separation of the long building into two buildings; one to be symmetrically related to the circle. Also, if this building is moved south as I suggest you may deem it necessary to reduce the size of the building due west of the circle, or you may think best to unite the separated building north of the circle with that west of it, having architectural features in each case properly related to the center of the circle.

Another matter I think you ought to give further consideration to is whether it is advisable to have a building approximately 380 feet long with its length along the east side of the Plaza Larga, the difficulty being that as the grade of the arcade is 3.3 per cent there would be a rise of over 12 feet in the length of

the building and still more to the center of the drive at the north end of the building. This I should think would make it rather awkward to connect the floor at or near the south end with the arcade paving. At the same time your plan leaves a considerable blank space between this building and the drive east of it, which of course is very nice from a landscape point of view, but is not very essential, in that regard, while it seems to lose an opportunity for broadening and shortening the building. You understand this is not a suggestion that I urge upon you, I simply thought it possible that in the haste of preparing the sketch you had not perhaps given full study to these considerations.

Another point of design is, I think, important, yet not one which I should think it necessary to ask the committee to pass upon. It is the excessive height which your plan calls for in the walls of the California Building and Art Museum below the floor level. I think it is a capital idea of yours to have the walls of these buildings descend down into the Canyon to some extent, as it adds to their mass and individuality and picturesqueness. I simply question whether you have not gone to an excess in this idea. The Canyon is only 80 feet deep below the



Goodhue - 11.

floor level of these buildings. If the walls in question are vertical they will be from 40 to 45 feet high at places and if they are battered slightly they will probably be 5 feet higher. Now it seems to me that to descend 50 feet down into a canyon which is only 30 feet deep would look all out of proportion and would not strike most people as being reasonably necessary. I think from the landscape point of view the Canyon in its relation to the buildings, dam, etc. would look a great deal better if your walls do not extend, including batter, to more than 20 or 25 feet below the floor level.

I propose, if you see no objection, to extend the lake east of the circle close up against the drive and walk for a longer distance from the circle than is shown on the plans sent me.

One other point of architectural design I fear I shall have to trouble you with; that is, whether it is not better to enlarge the Plaza Musica southward even if you are unwilling to enlarge it correspondingly east and west to keep it square. The purpose of this enlargement not being to make it large, although I think that would be a very good thing, but to throw the arcade against

Goodhue - 12.

the two buildings south of Plaza Musica and throw the east and west drive into Plaza Musica. It strikes me that it might appear to some people a weak design to have one drive south and one drive north of the <sup>E. & W.</sup> arcades when the arcade in general is obviously intended as an attachment to buildings and not merely as a cover to a walk. You will remember that I arranged the arcade in this manner on my first sketch and I cannot help feeling that in reducing the size of the Plaza and making it correspond exactly with the façade of the California Building you have introduced a peculiarity of design which is not altogether reasonable and attractive in appearance. If you will give this matter fair consideration and if you then decide against it I will say nothing more about it, as it is much more distinctly an architectural than a landscape or park question.

I fear we are going to have more troubles of design when we come to reduce the cost of executing the plan to the reduced amount now specified by the committee, but I need not take up this matter upon this occasion as it will be better to delay it until we have agreed upon modifications of plan 53-0 and have had an estimate made for the proposed revised plan. d-

Yours very truly,