BEFORE describing the two houses, chosen to illustrate those costing from forty-two hundred and fifty dollars to forty-five hundred dollars, I wish to show two of a more costly type; namely, "Greenmoor," in Buxton, and one in Rugby. The former shows an attempt to solve a problem often to be faced by architects, and hence of real importance; namely, how to secure on the upper floors of a house more accommodation than easily results from carrying up the walls from the ground floor.

"Greenmoor," as will be seen, stands completely isolated from any other building; this made it difficult to contrive the seven good bedrooms without giving the house a "top-heavy" appearance, or making it too tall for its isolated position. Very often houses which might be charming grouped along a street seem out of proportion in a country lane or in a suburban garden; and frequently this results from the fact that the question of a more extended area on the upper floor has not been given proper consideration. To let the upper stories overhang the lower perhaps becomes legitimate in such cases, and to plan the roof in such a way as to give much bedroom space in it is essential, especially where the ground space is limited.

Overhanging upper stories are almost universal in old timber-
framed houses; their primary objects (as always in good work) being those of practical expediency. Water-tight timber-framed walls were not so much easier to build in bygone days than they are today. Timber shrank and warped, and when it was framed in a wall this shrinking and warping resulted in crevices appearing between the wood and the rest of the wall, through which moisture could come. Hence our forefathers protected such walls from the rain by wide projecting eaves and verges, and by overhanging each story beyond the one below it. The result was that not only did eaves and verges keep much rain from upper stories, and each projecting story much from those below it, but water running down a wall face and coming to an overhang fell clear to the ground, instead of trickling down to find its way into crevices in the lower walls.
that there are no longer districts in which the abundance of timber makes this form of wall more economical to build than a more water-tight one, quite the reverse in fact.

Surely it is now only legitimate to use it in cases in which we must build an overhanging wall or in which we can only have woodwork to support a wall. When it is laid on the face, or placed a little in front (of one brick or stone wall with another under it), it can only look ridiculous, even though it

THIS PICTURE GIVES A GLIMPSE OF THE LIVING ROOM AND STAIRWAY OF THE HOUSE AT RUGBY; THE ARRANGEMENT ABOUT THE FIREPLACE IS SINGULARLY COZY, ESPECIALLY FOR AN ENGLISH HOUSE WHERE THE ENTIRE ROOM IS NOT ALWAYS WARM, AND WHERE TO GATHER AROUND THE FIREPLACE MEANS COMFORT AS WELL AS GOOD CHEER. THIS OFTEN BRINGS ABOUT INTERESTING AND BEAUTIFUL BUILT-IN FITTINGS.

A second view of the living room in the Rugby house, showing how charmingly the fireplace nook is arranged with seats and windows.

Barry Parker & Raymond Unwin, Architects.

This is a view of the fireplace corner in the living room of the house at Stone, Staffordshire: this picture makes an interesting contrast with the living room in the Rugby house: it is equally attractive and interesting in detail, but evidently planned for another kind of personality.

A SCHOOLMASTER'S HOUSE AT REPTON, DERBYSHIRE, ENGLAND, SHOWING AN INTERESTING USE OF CONCRETE IN A MODERN HOUSE. IT IS WELL WORTH WHILE STUDYING THE FLOOR PLANS OF THIS HOUSE, WHICH SHOW HOW A HOUSE DESIGNED FOR ONE PERSON CAN BE REMODELED INTO TWO DWELLING PLACES.

"GREENMOOR," BUXTON, DERBYSHIRE, SHOWING A COMBINATION OF STONE AND CONCRETE, WITH A SLIGHT SUGGESTION OF HALF-TIMBER IN THE FRAMING OF THE WINDOWS: THE HOUSE IS EXTREMELY WELL PLACED.
be strong enough to carry itself without support from the wall behind it. So used, it becomes merely a surface decoration for which should be substituted something which has intrinsic beauty, and which does not simulate construction, but proclaims itself as decoration. Let us use construction decoratively wherever possible, but never use what appears to be construction, and is not, as decoration.

So it is doubtful whether it was legitimate to carry framing similar to that of which the first-floor windows and balcony are formed into the spaces which intervene between windows on the east side of "Greenmoor." But as these spaces were so few and small, and it seemed so natural to fill them with framing, and form them into panels carrying the lines of the frieze around the building, it would perhaps be pedantic to object.

That the application of the principle
embodied in the foregoing paragraphs is difficult but increases the
importance of a clear conception and firm grasp of it. It is admittedly
extremely difficult to be sure that we are not using as decoration
that which appears to be construction, and is not. But to do this
always imparts a subtle indefinite sense of insincerity, and want of
dignity, if nothing more; hence the importance of being so imbued
with the spirit of truth that the instinct for it becomes so strong
that the slightest violation of it causes pain.

Let us try by further illustration drawn from the use of the column
to make clearer the principle we are considering. The column is
primarily constructional. The ancients in hot climates erected a
series of columns at a distance from the walls of their temples to
secure coolness within. These columns supported the roofs, which
were brought over onto them, so preventing the sunlight from fall-
ing on the walls. The effect was magnificent. So attempts to repro-
duce it were made in sunless climes, where the absence of reason
for it, based upon its practical advantages, produced an element of
falseness, and disillusion followed.

That less of the none too abundant light might be excluded from
subsequent buildings the wall was brought forward up to the col-
umns. These latter therefore lost their function as supports; so a
stronger element of falseness was introduced, bringing with it greater
disappointment with the effect produced. Eventually a form of
building was reached which is ever present with us today; one in
which columns, three-quarter columns, half columns and pilasters
with their entablatures seem to have been “clapped on” to the face
of the structures, though striving to appear an integral part of them.
An uncomfortable feeling is produced such as could never arise
from the use of pure ornament as decoration.

Mr. Norman Shaw has connected two wings, which occur in the
upper part of the Piccadilly front of the Piccadilly Hotel, by a screen
formed of columns supporting an entablature. Merely to glance up
at this brings a feeling of calm and tranquillity to many amidst the
bustle and turmoil of life in the street below. We must admit that
numerous other instances could be given of elements originally con-
structional, used beautifully as decoration, and not take the position
that what was constructional should never be used as decoration
pure and simple, even though we hold it better to use what is always
pure ornament when we want decoration.

Where then may we find the differences between the insincere
buildings which jar on us, and this of Mr. Norman Shaw’s or the
many others which furnish instances of the successful decorative use
of much which first came into existence to fulfil the demands of con-
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struction? Shall we have found it if we discover that in those we admire, whatever was once construction and is now used as decoration is unmistakably so used, giving the observer no chance of confusing the one with the other? It would seem as if pure decoration should proclaim itself and claim a right to exist as such, as admittedly decoration pure and simple.

There would also seem to be many degrees of architectural insincerity, ranging from the deliberate lie told with intent to deceive (as when wood is made to simulate stone vaulting) through shams such as imitation ruins, then through the many uses of effects without legitimate causes, and finally to confusion between construction and decoration. I am inclined to believe that the way to safeguard against the taint of untruth is to think first of what is necessary to a building, necessary to enable it to fulfil its functions, necessary to its strength and stability, its water-tightness and durability; then how we may use to the full the decorative qualities inherent therein. Finally (having in imagination swept all else away) we should allow nothing to be added which cannot show an indisputable right to exist because it is beautiful and which proclaims this as the reason for its being. For we must always remember that a purely ornamental feature can only base a valid claim to existence on the ground of its own beauty.

To return to the houses illustrated. The one at Rugby brings up many problems in addition to those we have already considered; mainly, those which arise when designing houses which have a limited frontage, and which must be sandwiched in between other buildings. During a discussion which once followed a lecture of mine, an architect said that the real difficulties of planning only began with such a house. I think in taking this view he overlooked much in the work of his profession worthy of being taken more seriously; still it is true that with the additional limitations entailed by a restricted site further care and skill are required of the architect, and some loss of comfort and convenience is inevitable.

But if a site such as we are now considering limits the architect in some directions, it opens up for him a wider field for the exercise of his faculties in others. It gives him opportunities for considering his work in relation to that of others, which are lacking in designing a house to stand alone. His own work has more unmistakably to take its place as part of a whole, that whole being the street in which it is placed. This broadening of his view can scarcely fail to have a beneficial influence upon his work, the bigger conception giving breadth to it. Hitherto, often the architect has thought only of the appearance of his own building. Sometimes he has yielded to the
temptation to make the surrounding buildings look mean, as he con-
fesses by the way he treats them in his perspective drawings. But
when every architect designing a building realizes that his design is,
or is not, a part of the beauty of the whole street, and that he per-
sonally is responsible for his share of it, then not only will the gain
in civic beauty be enormous but the individual work of each man
will appear to the greatest possible advantage.

The site at Rugby is not really a narrow one; there is good pas-
sageway on either side of the house. In the next issue we shall con-
sider houses designed for much narrower frontages, but even here
the importance of dispelling the cramped and airless feeling usually
associated with the interiors of houses with restricted frontages
should be our first consideration. By devoting the whole ground
floor front of the house to one large room, and not excluding en-
tirely from it the space which would usually be shut off into the
entrance hall or that occupied by the staircase, we at least secured
a feeling of spaciousness and openness. In addition, vistas were
opened up.

As will be seen from the block plan, we were fortunate at Rugby
in having greater openness on the south rather than on the north
side. At any time there was the danger that the neighbor might
erect a fence on this north boundary, which would block the south
ground-floor windows, so we contrived diagonal windows in both
dining and living rooms, so that the outlook could not at any time
be completely obscured.

Interest in planning the Repton house centered around securing
many of the advantages that were sought for in the Rugby house, but
in it the special difficulty arose from the fact that it was for an assis-
tant master at a large public school. In the event of his wishing to
let or sell it, it would probably be to some of his colleagues, and
more likely than not two masters would share a house of that size.
The large living room would have to be divided into two rooms with
a hall between; this would be done by erecting partitions where
the dotted lines are shown on the ground-floor plan. Circumstances
made it somewhat difficult to contrive that each of these rooms
should, in this event, have some south sunlight without sacrificing
the outlook from one or the other.

Of the house at Stone there is little to be said in special com-
ment, except that it is chosen as typifying houses costing between
four thousand two hundred and fifty to four thousand five hundred
dollars. It is placed (as was "Glaedhame") on land falling in a
southerly direction, with the finest view in the same direction and
with the approach convenient from the north.