

Golf Architecture on Public Links

Should the architecture of a public course be different from that of a private club? This question is suggested by the very wide differences in type of municipal courses as they now exist. There are two factors which make the query of interest. First, simple courses can be built much more cheaply. Second, the more difficult a course is made, the fewer players will it accommodate, as every bunker or other difficulty tends to slow up the play. We may assume that a fundamental consideration in building municipal courses is to provide the greatest good to the greatest number of people. It is reasonable to believe that both low cost of construction and upkeep will contribute to this end. If a town builds a course that is unduly expensive, it will be difficult to get the people to consider a second one, whereas if the cost is low it should be relatively easy to secure as many courses as the public desires. All of these considerations point to the conclusion that in the beginning at least public courses should be simple in type, to ensure both low costs of construction and of upkeep. Specifically this involves (1) tees on the ground, really the most desirable type unless elevation is needed to secure visibility; (2) wide fairways with little or no rough; (3) few or no bunkers, and any such as are necessary should be simple; (4) greens of standard size, most of them on the natural ground surface, each with a mound or low ridge near the back to increase visibility.

From such a basis the course may be improved from time to time as public sentiment may indicate. In the beginning at least there will be no criticism that the course is too easy. Most important, however, is that modest cost and upkeep will make public golf courses popular with the tax payers, whereas expensiveness in either cost or upkeep will create popular opposition.

It is to be hoped that both park commissioners or other city officials, golf architects, and indeed all amateurs interested in golf progress, will consider carefully the matters here discussed. All are interested in providing golf for as many as possible, and to secure this means careful heed to every factor that makes for low cost to the public.

NEW MEMBER CLUBS OF THE GREEN SECTION

Commonwealth Country Club, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Kishawana Country Club, Brewster, N. Y.
Athletic Assn. of the Philadelphia Electric Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Thornburg Country Club, Thornburg, Pa.
Kanawha Country Club, Charleston, W. Va.
Alladin Country Club, Columbus, Ohio.
Fort Harrison Country Club, Terre Haute, Ind.
Country Club of Terre Haute, Terre Haute, Ind.
Big Oaks Golf Club, Chicago, Ill.
Beverly Gardens Golf Club, Evergreen Park, Ill.
Monroe Country Club, Monroe, Mich.
Wichita Country Club, Wichita, Kans.
Lingan Country Club, Sydney, Nova Scotia.
Uplands Golf and Country Club, Toronto, Ontario.