



Working machines such as this Cushman are essential in the maintenance of good turf quality on the golf course, following professional construction.

THE occasion of my election as Chairman of the British Association of Golf Course Construction provides me with a reason - or excuse - to look back on 25 years of Golf Course Construction and to compare conditions at the start with those which exist nowadays.

It may come as a surprise that today there is less divergence of opinion between the main architects and contractors on basic construction than there was at the start of the golf course boom of the mid sixties.

It was then the exception rather than the rule for Architects to specify that greens were built on underdrained stone carpets. Certainly most specifications stipulated the use of local soil topped with "2" of seed-bed compost!

Greens were built in isolation from their environments and the imaginative marrying-in of greens with wide gently contoured surrounds was almost unknown. There was none of the current emphasis on keep-



Brian D. Pierson

ing constructional machinery away from vulnerable and very important approaches.

Some specifiers were still advising the use of perennial ryegrass for fairways and only minimal attention was given to construction and design.

What a contrast today! There is almost universal agreement

that both greens and tees must be built on drainage rafts, properly blinded and with a uniform imported sandy soil root zone two mix.

Often on entire courses from greens to rough is sown with basically the same fescue/bend seeds mixture, variations occurring only regarding seed rates and perhaps the use of cheaper strains for the rough.

Of course it costs a great deal more to build a golf course today than 25 years ago - from which time there are however plenty of examples of quite satisfactory courses being built for less than £10,000. This is not only due to inflation, but much more to higher standards and more elaborate specifications, including full automatic irrigation.

However, a word of warning may be appropriate. If the need for more golf courses is to be met economically (which does *not* mean building cheap, bad courses) then money must not be wasted in enormously expensive earth moving opera-

tions. Nor must we overly rely on extensive water features, to create character.

Contractors have to build to architects specifications and none of us should be inveigled into accepting constructional standards which have no relevance to our climatic and soil conditions. Sand greens! Will they ever work!

We, the contractors, have the experience and skill to make good courses to suit our Northern European conditions. It is depressing when inexperienced clients opt for much more expensive specifications quite needlessly, just because they think if they pay much more they will necessarily get a much better golf course.

The need for more courses is not arguable. How to produce them is, but we should, I feel, be thinking far more about providing for the beginner golfer because if he starts on something better than golf in a field, I feel that the long term future of golf will be in much safer hands.

BRIAN D. PIERSON