New Texas Country Clubs

As an institution, the country club might seem to verge on anachronism. Identified particularly with the game of golf, its social origin is irrevocably bourgeois and its preferred locus is suburban, if not actually rural. Yet in Texas the country club as a building type is presently the object of some design activity, occasioned both by newly formulated programmatic requirements and by the search for appropriate architectural images.

Today, new country clubs in metropolitan areas are being built not only to fulfill the social and recreational requirements of upper-middle-income families, but to attract corporate use of their conference, recreational, and guest accommodations. Entrepreneurs—like the five-year-old Houston firm of Kindred Watts Inc. have made a substantial business out of packaging and operating such country clubs for real estate developers.

Two Kindred Watts projects for which Ford, Powell and Carson of San Antonio are architects are the Riverside Club in Grand Prairie (on the suburban Metroplex between Dallas and Fort Worth) and the Mission Country Club in Odessa, connected to a new residential community being developed between Midland and Odessa.

The Riverside Club is for all practical purposes, a small resort hotel. In addition to a separate three-story Athletic Center, the four-story Main Clubhouse contains 51 "clubdominion" units. The architectural image is simple, modernist, and white, calculated for maximum impact when seen across the green of the golf course beneath the hot, bright blue Texas sky. Developed by the Beden's Development Corporation of Dallas, the 130,000-square-foot complex is currently in the design development stage.

The Mission Country Club projects another image. A "Mexico, Five, Four, Three" theme design manager for both jobs, explains, "Riverside is based on a corporate philosophy of golf club and athletic center as part of a large commercial development, with office buildings bordering the golf course. Mission, designed for the club's custom image of a country club, surrounded by large estate lots. The Mission Country Club is a modernist building too. But it incorporates elements of Frank Lloyd Wright and Carl Auböck, a regional "vocabulary": sheek brick walls, topped by roofed cupping and broken only by narrow rows of windows; cedar portales shading exterior spaces; and a succession of 18 mosaic hvedes carpeted by lanterns and supported on cylindrical reinforced concrete columns. The hvedes provide a linear promenade, a structured formal element to which the brick-clad box-like massing of the club adhere according to programmatic requirements. The 39,000-square-foot second-story locker and recreation rooms in a partially exposed basement level from public spaces will be raised next year. Prior to this, the clubhouse will have a free-standing pro shop, a two-story clubhouse to serve the swimming pool and tennis courts, a set of custom community facilities. Corporation of Midland is the developer. Under construction, since Mission is a clubhouse is scheduled for completion in July 1984.

A third Kindred Watts project, undertaken for Sugarland Properties, a partnership of Gerald D. Hines Interests and the Royal Dutch Shell Pension Fund, is the Sweetwater Country Club in First Colony, a 10,000-acre mixed-use residential and commercial development at Sugar Land, a suburb on the southwest edge of Houston. Designs from a number of architects were solicited in 1981; a scheme by Charles Moore and William Turnbull was selected, and has been developed with Richard Fitzgerald and Partners, Gentry, Haynes and Whaley were consulting engineers. Moore, a graduate architect and interior designer, and JBS, Inc. was the general contractor. The first two buildings of the Clubhouse and the Tennis Building—were completed in May and August respectively. A set of "clubdominions" for which W. Irving Phillips, Jr., is architect, is in design.

The Clubhouse that emerged at Sweetwater is very different from the one represented in Moore and Turnbull's initial drawings. It preserves the notion of a diagonally stepped plan inscribed in a square and the "vocabulary" that will define the edge of the corner for a motor court and visually stabilized by two massive brick stacks. Gone is the light hearted, c kristen buhany interior, where a serpentine w wall secreted staircases and elevators in a "brick" screen partitioning the main public areas. The square footage of the clubhouse shrank considerably (it ended up at 54,000 square feet). The external image at Sweetwater was preserved and, indeed, the building complex sits very comfortably in its purpose-made site.

But the lack of what promised to be a rich spatial experience is a disappointment.

The best known new Texas country club, under construction since October 1982 and scheduled for completion in early 1985 is the Rivercrest Country Club in Fort Worth. Designed by Taft Architects, it will replace the club's second clubhouse, which burned in January 1981. Like the Riverside Club and Mission Country Clubhouse, the new River Crest clubhouse has a pyramidal roofline, a club symbol that is anchored by tall, vertical stacks. But unlike Sweetwater, River Crest's organization of tightly interlocked internal spaces gives a more solid, higher degree of separation and section. The partially exposed basement contains locker and service facilities; the main floor a series of dining spaces and the kitchen, and the roofed and screened promenade, which rises up beneath the roof. The kitchen is at the center of the plan, accessible to all the club's different spaces. Stairs, elevators, and mechanical risers occupy intermediate bands of "servant"

Houston's Green Ribbon Committee produced its "Action Plan" for parks in January 1983.1 Its 62 citizen members had been appointed to recommend goals, directions, and courses of action to create a high quality park system for the Houston metropolitan area. They began in March 1981 by assessing the existing parks and recreation system, then determined public priorities and formulated goals and strategies based on a forecast of area-wide needs up to 1990. The Green Ribbon Committee resulted from a 1979 agreement signed by the chairmen of the city of Houston Parks and Recreation Department, the Conservation and Recreation Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior, prompted by the findings of the 1977 National Urban Recreation Study and ensuing pressure from local groups.

The Green Ribbon Committee's report made six major recommendations.2 First, it would create a parks management system to coordinate interagency activities and to provide overall guidance for park planning and development. This comprehensive framework would consist of an Executive Parks Council representing executive branches of local government and school districts, and a Parks Advisory Commission composed of citizens representing various other public and private interests.

The second recommendation calls for the adoption and maintenance of a shared capital improvement program among local government bodies responsible for providing parks. Generally, the committee recommended that in the early stages of the program funds be spent primarily to acquire land, with emphasis

Playing the Recreational Standards Game

The actual needs for physical improvement of park lands are addressed in the fourth and fifth recommendations. Specifically, Houston needs to add at least 5,000 acres to its current park inventory by 1990. This will remedy existing and future deficits in park space, particularly at the "neighborhood" and "community" levels. The committee noted that available facilities were unevenly distributed in relation to population concentrations. The report estimates the cost of such an undertaking at about $400 million. It stresses the necessity of improving parkland, once acquired, and spells out a broad range of quite particular recreational standards.

The final recommendation expresses the need for a regular review procedure, in which the Parks Advisory Commission could evaluate all park activities and report to the Executive Parks Council. This recommendation seems to be an extension of the first; it calls for the continuing role of the Parks Advisory Commission.

The intentions and subsequent work of the Green Ribbon Committee are laudable and should be commended on principle separate from the current criticism. They have recognized the real need for interagency coordination and have recommended steps toward its realization. They have directly faced the controversy over use of Houston Independent School District lands as park facilities, and have proposed a -argued on national and international terms. Their report has laid guidelines for making the provision and improvement of recreational lands more broadly available, and perhaps less burdensome to the public, and they have made public participation an integral part of the future parks program. Furthermore, the report from the committee is reasonably comprehensive and technically competent, at least within its frame of reference.

Unfortunately, the deliberations of the committee seem to have skirted several fundamental questions. First, how are initial recommendations for land acquisition and physical improvements to be made? Throughout the report, the Green Ribbon Committee notes that the legal mechanisms for acquisition of parkland needs, quantitative space standards are rarely the only sensitive issues. The report tacitly assumes that such standards are reasonable and exclusively represents the values one might expect to find in locker rooms and the system of sufficient quality to merit national and even international recognition. This is arguable. In fact, the planning orthodoxy which embraces these kinds of empirical standards is far from unsuitable.

Such standards are usually derived using a step-by-step process. First, specific recreational functions are identified, to which use characteristics are ascribed (such as space requirements, frequency of use, type of users, etc.) and are used to support the function. Second, the functions or activities so delineated are aggregated into discrete groupings, usually with reference to ideas of convenience of access, frequency of use, and the level of participation or service. As use character aggregations give rise to a hierarchical spatial distribution of recreational opportunities ranging from neighborhood parks through community and district parks to larger city-wide facilities.

For the resulting model or standard to work, we must assume that: (1) the characteristics of use and the implied preferences are accurate for all the user groups in question; (2) opportunities at each level of the hierarchy are accessible, and the system would be useful for various forms of passive and active recreation described in the model are continuous within the population and in a satisfactory system of access. Moreover, the model and the model truly reflects desirable access opportunities. Further, there are changes in life styles and in recreational tastes should not unduly disrupt the usefulness of the model.

Even without the misgivings one might have about these underlying assumptions, the report's ultimate standards (and therefore measures of quality) seldom reflect the rich possibility for adaptation and transform
space, while public rooms migrate to the periphery, overlooking the golf course and the surrounding River Crest neighborhood. Fort Worth's most elite residential enclave. In place of the lyricism of Moore and Turnbull's original design for Sweetwater, Taft Architects have pursued a more earnest approach.

The external imagery recalls traditional architectural forms while avoiding historical literalism. The club's substructure is poured-in-place concrete, strutted with horizontal bands of ceramic tile. The walls of the superstructure are faced with brick, interrupted regularly by horizontal courses of molded terra cotta. Roofs will be surfaced with glazed tile. The River Crest Country Club will contain 51,000 square feet and cost about $8 million. Geren Associates/CRS of Fort Worth is associate architect and consulting engineer, JBM, Inc., is general contractor, and the New York decorator Mark Hampton will design the interiors.

It fails to address the fundamental question: what is it, after all the land has been acquired and the planning completed, that makes a park system great? 28 At first glance, such a question might seem unanswerable. It is certainly formidable. But in order to make the qualitative distinctions that go beyond individual taste and that result in some parks being more widely acclaimed than others, answers to this question must be sought. It is instructive to consider parks whose communities have conferred special status upon them. Invariably, the intrinsic value of the setting derives from the landscape conception, transcending simple considerations of function.

Berlin's Tiergarten and the park system to which it belongs, London's Regent's Park, New York's Central Park, and Munich's Englische Garten, to name a few examples, derive their compelling quality as places of urban recreation from their spatial organization, their controlled yet various thematic qualities—in short, from their design. They are artifacts for the mind as much as for the body. On the one hand they are fantastic, offering spectacle and delight; on the other, they celebrate man's contrivance of his natural setting. In the end they are cultural artifacts, where greater emphasis is placed on use through imagination and improvisation than through predetermination.

Clearly, not all parks can or really might be so compelling. It is hard to speak of a neighborhood park in the same breath as the Tiergarten. My point is that transcendental qualities and broad intrinsic values are just as much a part of the quest for a city's landscape as the means that may be required to achieve them. Unfortunately, on this point the Green Ribbon Committee's "Action Plan" is mute.

These four architectural projects demonstrate the programmatic breadth of what today in Texas can constitute a country club. They demonstrate also the tendency to use architecture to image building projects. This can be seen as part of a post-modern (or anti-modern) polemic. But on the suburban fringes of Texas cities, it also serves to create a strong sense of place.

Stephen Fox

---

Park Standards and Inventory by Category
(Acres per 1,000 population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Category</th>
<th>Standard 1982 Inventory (z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolis</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 Morris, Williams, and Stauffer, "Report of the Green Ribbon Committee," 12. Included in the current inventory (1982) are 35,368 acres of public parkland, including Addicks (Bear Creek Park) and Barker (Cullen Park) reservoirs; 2,894 acres of public school land; 1,357 acres from private homeowner association inventories, and about 297 acres of land from other institutional sources. Other Harris County Flood Control District lands (easements, rights-of-way, etc.) were not included.
10 "Greater Houston deserves a park system that is recognized both nationally and locally as among the top systems in the world." Morris, Williams, and Stauffer, "Report of the Green Ribbon Committee," 1.

Peter G. Rowe