

competition the estimates are obviously most unreliable. The superficial areas of the designs as drawn and the estimates submitted are as follows:—No. 16, area 11,632, estimate £10,800; No. 1, area 9,994, estimate £13,750; No. 2, area 9,428, estimate £12,500; No. 33, area 8,994, estimate £18,050.

I am of opinion that the estimate of No. 16 is lower than the value of his building as drawn, and the estimates of the others are higher, No. 33 especially so. I had the value of the design No. 16 in the first competition carefully estimated by a reliable builder, and the estimate coincided with my own opinion, viz., that the work will cost somewhere about £1 per superficial foot of the main floor and wall area. At any rate, as all the designs are somewhat of the same character, they would have the same relative value. Comparing these values with the builders' estimates we have:—

No. 16—£10,800	£11,632
No. 1—13,750	9,994
No. 2—12,500	9,428
No. 33—18,050	8,994

If the two wings are omitted from No. 16 the superficial area will be reduced by 1368 superficial feet, making the area of the reduced building 11,632—1368 = 10,264 superficial feet, (230 suppl. feet more than No. 1), and the relative cost £10,264.

I do not advise the omission of the two wings. I am, on the contrary, strongly of opinion that the building should be erected exactly as drawn, subject only to such minor modifications as are hereafter suggested. If a sufficient amount of money is not at present available, then the work might be reduced as suggested, with the knowledge that a perfect and complete work will result, giving no evidence of an unfinished structure. The wings could in that case be added at any time.

In respect to the estimates, it must be remembered that at the present time prices are fluctuating to such an extent and are so much higher than the prices of normal times, that it is impossible to accurately foretell what the actual tenders will be. It should be said in reference to No. 16, that if there is any difference in the relative value of the designs, it is in its favour, for while its close competitors have obtained their effects by added decorative features, No. 16 has shown throughout an artistic restraint. The excellence of his design consists in the carefully studied grouping and the fine proportion of the essential features of the design. The design throughout is characterised by studied simplicity acting as a foil or giving emphasis and added value to the few parts where architectural or sculptured enrichments are placed.

THE DESIGNS

The careful system of marking adopted renders it unnecessary that I should criticise designs in detail. Competitors can see at once why they have succeeded or failed by comparing the marks gained for any feature with those gained by the other competitors, and by studying designs in relation to them. It must be remembered that all the marks are relative. Each feature of the designs has in turn been placed side by side and the order of merit determined. Then that placed first for that feature was, if it had no defects, given full marks, and the others were marked in

relation to it. There are many features in all the designs whilst having no actual faults would have secured full marks, had there not been a design which in that particular was better.

Competitor No. 1 for instance, would certainly have obtained full marks for his well drawn Ionic portico if No. 16 had not shown an appropriate original treatment which placed it well ahead of the careful copy of antique forms. The same applies to Competitor No. 2.

The markings show the actual position in respect to the essential utilities and their artistic treatment. In this there is not a very great difference between Nos. 2, 1, and 33, but there is an artistic quality in No. 16 which carries the author far ahead of the other competitors. This quality can be readily felt by all who examine this excellent design, presented, as it is, by superb draughtsmanship. But though readily felt, the feeling cannot be translated into cold terms of numbers of marks. The system of marking ensures that the utilities of the problem have been as carefully as possible determined. The total marks of 166 out of a possible 168 indicate truly my opinion of the manner in which the author has solved the essential demands the conditions imposed. The drawings alone will reveal the manner in which he has embodied the essentials in an appropriate and artistic structure. A structure which will when erected make Wanganui distinguished as possessing the most beautiful Art Gallery in the Dominion, and one in which the essentials of Art Gallery design have been more fully complied with than in any gallery I am acquainted with elsewhere.

I have therefore no hesitation in recommending that the author of Design No. 16 be appointed as architect for the work. That he be instructed to prepare the working drawings and call for tenders.

All the competitors are now entitled to receive the honorariums offered.

I have the honor to be,

Yours faithfully,

S. HURST SEAGER, F.R.I.B.A., F.N.Z.I.A.
Wanganui, 9th October, 1916

Assessor.

Marks obtained in Final Competition

	Maxm.	No. 16	No. 2	No. 1	No. 33
General Scheme					
Convenience of approach ..	5	5	5	4	3
The lay-out of site ..	5	5	5	4	3
	— 10	— 10	— 10	— 8	— 6
The Plan					
General arrangement ..	6	6	6	6	5
Entrance Hall ..	4	3	3	3	3
Central space ..	4	4	3	3	3
The Galleries ..	12	12	12	12	11
Miniature room ..	4	4	4	4	4
Male latrines and locker room	4	4	3	3	1
Ladies' lavatories & locker rm.	4	4	2	3	1
Basement ..	4	4	2	3	3
Stairs & access to locker room	4	4	2	3	2
Curator's room ..	4	4	4	4	4
	— 50	— 49	— 41	— 44	— 73
Design of Elevations					
Front ..	12	12	10	9	10
Sides ..	12	12	11	9	9
Back ..	12	12	10	10	10
Dome ..	12	12	11	10	10
	— 48	— 48	— 42	— 38	— 39

(Continued on page 822)