THE NEW YORK ARCHITECT

A NATIONAL MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF ARCHITECTURE AND THE ALLIED FINE ARTS.

THE POLICY OF THE MAGAZINE IS DIRECTED BY AN ADVISORY BOARD CONSISTING OF TWO ARCHITECTS, TWO SCULPTORS AND TWO PAINTERS.

DONN BARBER, Editor
J. HOLLIS WELLS, Architectural Engineering Editor

SUBSCRIPTION—Ten Dollars a year in advance; Single Copies, One Dollar.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY

THE HARWELL-EVANS COMPANY

118 EAST 28TH STREET NEW YORK CITY

·THE·NEW·YORK·ARCHITECT·

VOL. IV JULY, 1910 No. 7

The New York Architect

Entered at the New York Post Office as Second Class Matter
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY
THE HARWELL-EVANS CO.
118 EAST 28st STREET NEW YORK
AUBREY HARWELL, Prest. JOHN R. EVANS, Vice-Prest. and Treas.
M. L. HOTCHKISS, Secty.
JACK MAJOR, Advertising Manager

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

One Year	$10.00
Six Months	5.00
Three Months	3.00
Single Copies	1.00

DONN BARBER, Editor

CONTENTS

There have appeared in the daily press during the last month—undoubtedly provoked by the spell of hot weather—a number of letters touching on the subject of *The Cooling of Buildings*, and pleas have been launched for the great necessity of having some way to cool the rooms of a house, as well as to warm them. Just as it is possible to heat to a comfortable temperature our buildings, just so do the correspondents demand that we should cool to a livable temperature our buildings in summer.

Surprise is manifested that architects have not put this into practice in public as well as private buildings. One writer guesses that possibly it is too expensive. We learn, too, that for illumination on the subject in general one has only to visit a brewery in the city and examine the fermenting rooms. We are informed that about twenty-five years ago the process of necessary reduction of temperature went into operation by installing a plant for the conversion of liquid ammonia into gas. This gas, it seems, circulates through pipes and absorbs the heat and returns condensed to be volatilized repeatedly. Before this process was adopted the brewers bought vast quantities of ice to attain the same object.

Another writer instances a hypothetical community in Central Africa that had always protected itself against the lion, but never opposed the tiger. The former, he says, it invariably held at bay, but the latter it suffered to go lawless and effectively predatory. Dreadfully absurd and needless as this habit is he urges, the barbarians who surrendered to it were no more ridiculous than the most civlized nations are in successfully extinguishing cold and yet helplessly accepting heat.

Another believes that the Madison Square Theatre did over twenty years ago pump coolness into its auditorium, and perhaps does now, but it was probably by an expensive process. What is generally wanted, however, is an apparatus which shall be "fool-proof," and one that can be priced within easy reach and be made to fit all houses and public rooms where people in hot days assemble. Just think what this would mean for human comfort and for the saving of health and lives and of the power to work for all of us.

All this sounds very delightful and plausible. When one comes to think of it, it is difficult to understand why humanity has always realized the need of mitigating the severity of climate that takes the form of cold, but for the most part still assumes the responsibility of not doing anything to temper heat, from which we suffer almost, if not quite, as much. We find a statement to the effect that at less expense than that by which houses are warmed in winter they can be cooled in summer, and while the winter heating, thanks to our strange refusal to learn the art of ventilation, involves the creation of conditions injurious to health, those which summer cooling would establish would probably be in every way beneficial to us. At any rate, the thing is perfectly practicable the argument follows. Of course, if adopted, it would add to the cost of living, but it would also increase the general stock of available energy, which would mean an increase of earning power to a more than compensating degree. Not much of a refrigeration plant would be required to bring the air of a bedroom to a temperature in which sleep would be refreshing, instead of impossible or exhausting, and the wonder is that the rich and the well-to-do at least do not generally, in-

stead of hardly at all, utilize a benefit which science is ready to give them for much less money than they pay for a thousand other smaller luxuries and conveniences.

One writer, in behalf of some device that will accomplish this overwhelmingly obvious need, promises that the inventive genius who sees this want and satisfies it by producing some kind of "anti-stove" will to a certainty grasp both fame and fortune.

These so-called discussions through the columns of the press are invariably entertaining and amusing, and sometimes they open up a vista where it is possible, by means of research and study, to ameliorate conditions of living and develop new schemes and inventions. But way down deep below all this surface discussion there are sides of the problem above referred to that have not been realized or touched upon. In the first place it must be remembered that in winter, when one goes from indoors out, heavy outer wraps are put on to protect the body from the shock and difference of temperature. We might, of course, reverse this process under the suggested arrangement, but this would not seem practicable. Moreover, it has been proven that one is stimulated by going from hot to cold and ennervated in going from an unnaturally cool place out into the hot sun and humid atmosphere of summer. Moreover, it will be remembered that when the air of the "Stock Exchange" was artificially cooled to any marked degree the brokers on the floor caught cold easily and were heir to throat and respiratory troubles; that artificiality in air conditions always makes for trouble of some kind physically; that we as a nation overheat our houses in winter, making illnesses in winter more common than in summer is well known. Our ordinary steam heat devitalizes the air, renders us sensitive to cold and lowers our vitality, weakens the whole system and makes us irritable.

The so-called hot weather of our climate is not unbearable, and it is certainly healthy for those who regulate their food and clothing properly. The cooling of buildings where crowds congregate may yet develop rationally and may prove a relief to a certain sweltering humanity, but we doubt if any general scheme of cooling buildings will ever be obtained or be necessary; certainly not carried to the point of cooling dwellings. It would, of course, add another item of interest to the artificiality of our city life, but it is an open question whether the human animal is not much better off with less of the modern made comforts. "Back to nature" and the simple life, which now interests a growing class of humanity, needs no such accessory as an "anti-stove."

The general business depression which is just now being felt all over the country has raised a cry among New Yorkers that building in Manhattan is practically dead, because of unsettled financial conditions. The principal reason for this opinion is the fact that the year 1909 saw the completion of the most tremendous building operations that New York has ever known. Few people realize, however, that 1909 was not a normal building year, or that its great operations were simply the finishing up of plans laid before the panic of 1907 and 1908.

Statistics compiled by the United States Geological Survey show that during the calendar year 1909 the expenditure was close to $1,000,000,000 for building operations in 128 cities of the country. New York, which was second in 1908, with an increase of a little more than $4,000,000, reported an increase for 1909 of $68,000,000.

This year, therefore, very naturally suffers by comparison, and yet withal considerable building is going on in and about Manhattan. As a general rule, we see in our streets so much building in process that we become accustomed to it, and unless some gigantic operation, like the Metropolitan, City Investing or the Singer Building, is being rushed through to completion we have an idea that nothing of importance is being done. As a matter of fact a great deal of general building is going on all the time, but it is usually of a class that does not obtrude itself upon the public attention.

Roughly speaking, building divides itself into two classes—necessary building and luxury building—the former including commercial buildings for business purposes and speculative building, the latter such buildings as libraries, art museums, churches and private residences. It is this latter class that stops first during panic times and resumes last after financial difficulties are over.

The reason is plain. In times of financial unrest the private corporation or the private individual cuts down first on luxuries. Buildings, unlike most commodities, involve large expenditures and take at the very least a year to produce. A decision to build carries with it the solving of all sorts of complicated problems unappreciated as a rule by the laity. If a museum or library has been planned, it is easy if conditions are not just right to put off actual building for an indefinite time. The individual who plans to erect a residence waits when a panic comes and puts his money away until the storm is over. It may be the one building operation of his life and may affect his whole future or the future of his family, so he goes slow if he is at all conservative.

The builder who has a business block in view, however, can often better afford to start it during panic time, because materials and labor are apt to be cheaper. He takes, therefore, this opportunity to get his building started. By the time of its completion the market is generally

normal again, so he has lost nothing by going on; often it happens that he has gained.

So while in actual figures the building operations in Manhattan cannot be said to equal those of 1909, it should be remembered, as stated above, that 1909 was not really a normal year. A glance at Fourth Avenue, at the new Municipal Building, already started; at the Grand Central Station improvements, to say nothing of numberless hotels and apartment houses and a moderate amount of private dwellings, should set at rest the fear that New York is standing still in 1910, so far as building is concerned.

The competition for the new City Hall for Oakland, California, was closed on June 15th. when, out of twenty-eight designs submitted by architects from different parts of the country, that of Palmer & Hornbostel, of New York, was unanimously accepted by the jury, although Cass Gilbert's design was such a close rival that he was awarded an honorary prize.

Those who received second prize were H. Van Buren Magonigle, of New York; Bakewell & Brown, of San Francisco; Arnold W. Brunner, of New York; Delano & Aldrich, New York; J. H. Freedlander, New York; G. W. Kelham, San Francisco; F. H. Meyer, San Francisco; Rankin, Kellogg & Crane, Philadelphia; Ward & Blohme, San Francisco, and York & Sawyer, New York.

In his report to the Board of Public Works of Oakland, John Galen Howard, architectural adviser of the competition, said that all the designs gave evidence of having received the most serious study, and that a large majority were of such merit as to be worthy of execution.

Speaking of the winning design, he said: "It is a work of exceptional brilliancy, beauty and practical usefulness. The City of Oakland may confidently look forward to having for its City Hall one of the most distinguished and appropriate structures in the country."

The jury was composed of the Board of Public Works, three architects chosen by the competitors and the Architectural Adviser, as follows:

Frank K. Mott, Mayor of Oakland.
John W. Stetson, City Attorney.
Frederick C. Turner, City Engineer.
Warren P. Laird, Professor of Architecture in the University of Pennsylvania.
W. S. Eames, Architect, St. Louis.
E. Frere Champney, Architect, Seattle.
John Galen Howard, Architectural Adviser.

THE RESIDENCE OF MR. LLOYD WARREN

The residence of Mr. Lloyd Warren, at 1041 Fifth Avenue, is of special interest as a unique example of a remodeled house. It originally consisted of two 22 ft. high stoop brownstone residences, with the usual ill-proportioned drawing-rooms, shaped like Pullman cars, and the usual break-neck staircases and narrow hall. Without adding so much as a foot in any direction to the existing buildings, Mr. Warren has so changed their interior disposition, that the original plan cannot be recognized anywhere. He has removed the front stoops, making the entrance in the basement. He has changed the narrow stairs so that one broad flight leads up to a room of vast dimensions on the first floor, this room being formed by the removal of the party wall between the two original houses, and the floor between the first and second stories. In this way he has obtained a great drawing-

ENTRANCE HALL
RESIDENCE OF MR. LLOYD WARREN

room extending the full width of the house, and two stories high, into which the main staircase enters directly, and in the rear of this room, by preserving the original division of stories, he has obtained a dining-room on the level with the drawing-room, and above it his own suite of apartments, with clere-story windows looking down on the drawing-room.

The interior of the house, moreover, has its own special character, having apparently been designed to be a repository for the personal souvenirs and collections, which Mr. Warren has made in many voyages. No attempt has been made to preserve any scholastic purism of style. The owner has in the various rooms been content to preserve a unity of coloring and of proportion; one sees, for instance, on entering the reception room on the basement floor, a scheme which seems to recall the French Eighteenth Century, but examination shows hangings of that taffeta silk which in the Eighteenth Century, the Europeans sent to China to be decorated with peonies and parrots, painted in Gouache, by the subjects of Chen

Lung. On the walls a Japanese screen by Choshun finds its place alongside of a pastel in the manner of St. Quentin. On a chiffonier of marquetry are souvenirs of travel in many lands.

The main stairway and the drawing room are

INTERIOR DETAIL
RESIDENCE OF MR. LLOYD WARREN

hung with tapestries of the Seventeenth Century, and the clere-story is paneled with heavy carvings from Spain. Again, the Musicians' Gallery is supported by Barocque columns, and a great Italian mantel-piece, surmounted by a

LIBRARY
RESIDENCE OF MR. LLOYD WARREN

large Coat-of-Arms of Brussels tapestry, forms the chief motif of one side of the room.

The general atmosphere, the scale and the colorings recall Spain in the Seventeenth Century, but the mass of bibelots and the pieces of furniture seem to be gathered from all parts of Europe. At the same time the discrepancy is not too apparent, and the decoration of the room, held together by a well-preserved scale of proportion and scheme of coloring, charms by its warmth and its air of intimacy.

The dining room, decorated by painted panels designed by Robert Winthrop Chanler, opens broadly into the drawing room, and with its cool grey tonality, furnishes a foil for the rich and sombre tones of the other rooms.

The same general scheme appears in the rooms of the upper floors, which are entirely furnished with articles brought back by Mr. Warren from his travels.

ARCHITECTURE AND ITS RELATION TO ART.

A Paper Read Before the Ontario Association of Architects by Mr. John M. Lyle. (From the report of the Ontario Association).

The title of this paper is somewhat misleading—"Architecture and Its Relation to Art"—for architecture is a fine art—the greatest of all, a combination of many arts. The first question that naturally arises in one's mind is—what is architecture? There are many definitions to be found in the different text-books available, but none of them quite explains the complex combination that is called to mind by the word "architecture," so I have dared to suggest this definition—"Architecture is the art of expressing in concrete form the structural needs and decorative ideals of man." When you consider the many arts which are covered in this definition you begin to realize the complex meaning of the word "architecture," and incidentally, the demands on those who—like ourselves—are worshipping at the shrine of the Goddess of Architecture.

The late M. Paul Blondel, one of France's most distinguished architects, in speaking of architecture, described her as a jealous mistress, who yielded her favors but rarely, and then only after the most earnest and persistent endeavors on the part of her devotees—the architects.

As I am addressing a meeting of architects, it occurred to me that it might be more profitable to us all, if we were to consider not only Architecture as an art—a study necessarily in the abstract—but Architecture, *the* art, which concerns us in our daily practice.

In Canada we find a deplorable ignorance as to what architecture is; a deplorable lack of consideration for the architect; a deplorable lack of taste. In short, we have to contend with the ideals of a new country, absorbed in the development of its industrial resources, and

not as yet ready to listen to the importuning of Venus. It is our duty as architects to educate public opinion to a better understanding of what architecture really is.

We ought to have a chair of architecture in every university in Canada, where architecture could be studied as a fine art. We ought to urge upon the Government the necessity of having our new cities—and our old ones, too—planned and re-planned by architects and not by engineers. In my humble opinion, engineers have been the curse of Canadian and American city planning. Their laying out of our streets, avenues, and squares has been stupid in the extreme, and without any consideration of the aesthetic side nor of the practical. The plans of our cities are almost criminal in their stupidity, and worst of all is the fact that the engineers are still "on the job"—doing their best to damn the future cities of our land.

I think this Association, the Toronto Society of Architects, and also the Royal Canadian Institute of Architects, could very well take up this subject with the Government or municipal authorities who are interested in the planning of new cities and try to get the method of our city planning changed. In the northern part of Ontario and other parts they are building cities and laying them out to-day on the same old gridiron plan. They are doing the same thing all through the West, and it is all wrong. Now, I think there is something we can do. If we do not get good squares and vistas to show off our buildings we are handicapped.

We ought to arrange lectures, illustrated with lantern slides—which would stimulate public interest in the study of architecture as a fine art. For instance, there are many men and women now taking an interest in furniture, and in decoration, as applied to the home. A series of lectures could be arranged covering the different styles of interior decoration.

When we gave a series of lectures in the university in the evening, it was very difficult to get the general public to go up to hear them; but if we could adopt the plan of having those lectures given in some downtown quarter and enlist the support of the Lieutenant-Governor and other prominent men and women of the community as patrons and patronesses, an interest might be created in that way that would perhaps draw other people who follow in the wake of the leaders. That plan was adopted in New York. The lectures were given in the Waldorf by a number of different architects, and they were largely attended and created quite an interest.

Once create an interest in the decorative side of architecture and you have the kernel of a growth that in its ramification opens up unlimited possibilities. We ought to have an architectural journal that would put before the reading public not only the utilitarian side, but also the aesthetic. A journal devoted to the high ideal of architecture as a fine art. May I presume to suggest to our architectural press that it would have the hearty support of the architects of this country in its endeavors to devote more attention to this side of architecture.

In Mr. Macdonald's speech last night he gave one reason why an architectural paper could not devote too much time to the aesthetic side of architecture. He said there were not many architects nor many draughtsmen in Canada as yet who would buy such a paper. That is very true. Therefore the paper had to rely for its support upon the general public; and in the subjects and matter treated in an architectural paper in Canada, that side of the question had to be considered. That is very true. On the other hand, consider the very dangerous influence in an office of an architectural paper which has perhaps not the highest ideals in regard to the publication of matter. I don't say "Construction" hasn't high ideals, but I think it could be greatly improved. I think also the question of publishing Canadian news alone is a very debatable point. A great many of the architects practising in Canada, scattered throughout the West and in the smaller towns have no opportunity of buying photographs of good architectural books or of seeing good work; and an occasional example, perhaps one sheet in any paper, of some noted example of European work or some good example of good modern English, German or Italian work, would make the paper of much more value, it seems to me, to the practising architect. (Applause.)

We ought by our example in the office to inspire our draughtsmen, the contractors, our clients, with the idea that there is more in architecture than the mere erection of a structure to shelter their heads and to give them the necessary accommodation for their daily wants. That the mason, the bricklayer, the carpenter, the plasterer—all should be encouraged to live up to the highest possible standard of excellence in their work.

I am quite aware that it is absolutely impossible in modern practice to obtain ideal conditions in the execution of work in Canada. On the other hand, it is certainly our duty, as architects, to raise the standard of execution by every legitimate means in our power. If I might be allowed to suggest one method of raising the standard along certain lines, it would be that the architect spend more time in studying his drawings, and also in making more complete ¾-inch and full-size details for the contractors' use. Contrasted with the best French and American practice, with which I am familiar, I might say that there is no comparison in the number of drawings and attention paid to studying of details as between the practice of these countries and that of Canada.

We might introduce "quantity surveying" into Canadian architectural life. We often find that there is the greatest variance in prices submitted by different contractors. Time and again we are obliged to accept the lowest tender, with the result that the contractor finds out, possibly, that he has made a mistake in his quantities; consequently, he is forced either to accept a loss, or to skimp his work in order to come out even. Would it not be much better to have the English idea of quantity surveying adopted in this country; it seems to me that the introduction of this system would materially aid in uplifting "architecture as a fine art."

We ought to educate the public to the fact that it is necessary to have plenty of time for the erection of our buildings, and that speed is not the only consideration. Structures are run up here or "slapped" up at break-neck speed—the result being that woodwork is put on top of wet plaster, and everything is rushed forward pell-mell. How often we hear people say that the only way to get workmen out of a house is to move in. Would it not be well for the architects to explain to their clients the great necessity in building operations of making haste slowly. We certainly can do some missionary work along these lines to the decided advantage of architecture as a fine art.

Surely we architects have in Canada to-day great responsibilities and great opportunities. It rests very largely with ourselves what the architecture of the future in Canada is to be. Let us unite in trying to further the study of architecture as a fine art; let us by our efforts aim to uplift the architectural ideals of to-day. Surely such ambition is worthy of our united efforts from a purely patriotic point of view—aside entirely from any actual benefits that may accrue to us individually. It seems to me that at this stage of Canada's development, we are —more or less—pioneers in our own particular field; in the past, there have not been many trained architects in Canada. The unlimited wealth and the great buildings which are sure to be erected in the future ought to inspire us to more determined efforts to upbuild our profession and to place architecture where she belongs—at the head of all the arts.