

teach him, or to convince him that your experience and advice is the thing he has sought.

If the artistically ignorant man poses in his new home, the very fact that he acts the artist gradually tends to give him the artist point of view. One cannot pretend to appreciate a thing without soon really appreciating it.

It is, of course, fortunate when a client sincerely yearns for good architecture and is willing to defer to his architect for most of the details. But such clients are rare and hard to find. It is infinitely more to the credit of an architect to succeed when all the circumstances are trying and difficult; when the client is perverse, the money scarce, and all the rest. In the building of homes, architects do more to conserve and promote the happiness and well-being of communities than can be readily conceived. When they do it without co-operation, when they turn antagonism into harmony, when they raise vulgarity to refinement, then, indeed, have they done a great work.—*American Architect*.

Our 72nd Competition.

The response to this Competition for a Tennis Pavilion has been much better, eight designs having been sent in, as follows:—"Georgian," by A. D. Connell (with Mr. Stanley W. Fearn, of Wellington); "Deuce," by Ernest H. Hutton (with Mr. Basil Hooper, of Dunedin); "Anglo-Italia," by B. W. Johns (with Mr. Wm. M. Page, of Wellington); "Utopia," by Trevor G. Kissling (with Mr. Daniel B. Patterson, of Auckland); "Mullion," by George Drummond (with Mr. D. G. Mowat, of Dunedin); "Panikau," by Bernard Rennell (with Rennell Bros., of Gisborne); "Brunelleschi," by G. F. Wilson (with Prouse and Gummer, of Auckland); "Sapper," by D. O. Naughton (with E. R. Wells, c/o Fletcher Bros., Wellington).

The judge, Mr. Leslie D. Coombs, A.R.I.B.A., of Dunedin, who kindly set this subject, states, in a note to the editor, that he is very pleased with the response made by the competitors, and with the quality of the work submitted. "Utopia's" design he describes as "excellent," and "Anglo-Italia," "Georgian" and "Brunelleschi" as deserving of special mention. His report runs as follows:

"*Utopia*."—Easily the best design submitted. The plan is ideal for the purpose, giving the maximum of convenience without exceeding the 1,000 square feet of floor area to which competitors were restricted. All the rooms are well placed and are of workable sizes, and care has been taken to open the dressing-rooms from the porches and not from the club room. The elevations are well-proportioned, refined, and appropriate, and due importance is given to the club room. I heartily congratulate "Utopia," and I am looking forward with interest to know who he is. In case some of the other competitors object to the pergolas which adorn the plan, I may say that I have paid no

attention to them—at least I have given no marks for the features that are not asked for, but have judged the design with such features omitted.

"*Anglo-Italia*."—The doors from the tea-room to the dressing rooms destroy the privacy of the dressing rooms. This is the chief fault of the plan, which is otherwise splendid. The skylight to the tea-room is bad. Why not windows in the side walls instead? The windows and doorway between the loggia and tea-room should have been shown on the north elevation. The treatment of the pedimented windows in the arched recesses is not happy in that the pediments come too close to the crown of the arches. I suppose "Anglo-Italia" imagines he has given "scale" to his design by making his mouldings ridiculously small. For instance the mouldings of the pediments referred to, and the caps to the columns and the archivolt to the arches are hardly the proportions Peruzzi, Palladio or any of the other Italian Renaissance architects would have adopted. I am not sure what the large square of ornament shown on the east elevation is meant to represent. Is it supposed to be fancy brickwork, tile work, or merely ordinary wooden trellis work fixed to the wall for creepers to grow on? Whatever it is it is certainly out of scale with the window shown on the same elevation.

"*Brunelleschi*."—The idea of the plan is very good, but the tea-room and the conveniences are too small to be workable. The w.c.'s scale 4ft. 6in. x 2ft. 3in.—infant size. The total floor area of this design is about 800 square feet. If the amount had been increased to the allowable 1,000 square feet most of the objections to the plan would have disappeared. The elevations are effective, but the girt breaks are not expressive of the plan. Architecturally such breaks are not truthful.

"*Georgian*."—A good plan, but the lounge could have been smaller and the dressing rooms larger. The small office opening off the lounge is a good feature. The very small projection given to the eaves does not seem to be in keeping with the sunshine one expects during the tennis season. A modified Georgian style allowing of extra wide projecting eaves would have given a more appropriate effect.

"*Deuce*."—Double rooms, in addition to the club room, for both men and women, seem unnecessary. Tennis is a summer game, and the three fireplaces are unnecessary. The verandah is additional to the 1,000 square feet allowed for floor area. The elevations lack character. The treatment of the verandah is not satisfactory. I do not wish to dishearten "Deuce" with this list of faults. He is a good, straightforward draughtsman, and will soon improve in design.

"*Mullion*."—"Mullion" has exceeded the floor area allowed, in spite of the elaborate table of floor areas shown with figures going to two places of decimals. He, unlike most of the other competitors, has not given a common room. Such a room is necessary for committee meetings, if for nothing