CW’s 2007 Westlawn/Island Packet Yachts Design Competition attracted dozens of entries from around the globe, the best of which is a handsome 31-footer from the land Down Under.

Last September, we announced Cruising World’s Westlawn/Island Packet Yachts Design Competition, reviving a tradition that dates to the 1980s. The competition’s purpose was to “encourage and highlight new and exciting designs for serious cruising under sail.” The announcement unleashed a veritable explosion of creativity, and when the deadline arrived on March 1, the in-box at Westlawn groaned under the combined output of 53 yacht designers from 12 countries.

Flattered, I readily accepted Cruising World’s invitation to be a judge. Others—Dave Gerr, the director of Westlawn Institute of Marine Technology, Norm Nudelman, the provost of Westlawn, and Chris Wentz, the president of Z-Sails (hereafter referred to collectively as the Westlawn Group)—took on the initial heavy lifting for the judges. They spent a day going over each one of the entries, then skimmed the best 10 off the pool for the rest of the panel—Bob Johnson, the founder and president of Island Packet Yachts; Rod Johnstone, the co-founder of J/Boats; Bruce King, an eminent yacht designer; and me—to review.

The finalists hailed from five countries, and they banged every corner of the envelope, from a superlight, superfast (and, at 57 feet, rather large) catamaran with accommodations in a pod to a boxy, plywood monohull with triple chines.

To encourage as many entries as possible in this revived competition, the design brief was loose. The basic requirement was for a boat between 30 and 60 feet LOA capable of serious cruising with two or more people for a minimum of three weeks. Entrants were asked also to submit a “mission statement” of up to 1,000 words in which to refine objectives; some designers let themselves—and their designs—down by not using this requirement to their best advantage.

Each of the judges graded the designs from 1 to 10, using the parameters set out in the competition rules and some of their own, and the final tally was a simple arithmetical average of each design’s scores. Each judge has his own gazing mirror, so there was quite a spread of ratings, but all concurred that the designs that floated to the top deserved to be there.

The winning designer, Richard Boult, of the rugged Australian island state of Tasmania, wrote a succinct but detailed mission statement and followed it through to deliver a...
Richard Boult added some specific requirements to define both his design and the parameters by which it would be judged. Boult restricted his ambitions to "coastal and estuary cruising, with the capability for short ocean passages, 500 to 600 nautical miles maximum," and he further specified that to enhance safety, the boat should have a limit of positive stability (LPS) of at least 140 degrees and two watertight bulkheads.

From its simplicity of outfit and philosophy, it could easily have appeared in a design competition of the 1980s, but it’s thoroughly modern in terms of its hull shape, rig, and blend of construction materials. It reflects both the progression yacht design has followed over the last two decades and the parallel advances in computer-aided-design technology that can help simplify the construction process. Boult has defined the hull contours, not by conventional waterlines, buttock lines, and diagonals, but by lapstrakes geometrically developed in a CAD program (lapstrake and clinker-built effectively describe the same process). It’s harder to interpret the hull shape from the drawing, but the technique enables it to be assembled essentially from a kit of pieces computer-numerically-cut (CNC) from plywood panels.

Wood may not appeal to everyone. Bruce King pointed out that Boult’s hull, constructed by his Quick Clinker technique, would lend itself to being splashed for a one-piece mold, so that the design could be built in fiberglass. "It seems to me somewhat like the 'folk boat' for the 21st century," wrote King. "I was impressed with the designer’s knowledge, his mention of the adverse effect of stern width on sailboat balance, and his adherence to that knowledge in the execution of the design." Boult gave up some volume in the quarters to ensure that the boat has good manners under sail. "Consideration was given to the width and shape of the transom to try to ensure that the vessel’s heeled waterlines remain balanced such that it doesn’t become difficult to steer or the mainsail requires trimming," Boult wrote.

The Quick Clinker 31 isn’t luxurious by present-day standards, but it should certainly provide comfortable enough accommodations to match the sailing-as-an-outdoors-activity theme of the design. Says Dave Gerr: "Richard Boult’s Quick Clinker 31 wasn’t only beautifully presented but also promised simple, enjoyable sailing in a boat of modest cost—a boat you could cruise on with few more complexities than a daysailer."

Bruce King’s comment—"Nice presentation of a contemporary design"—echoes most of the judges’ thoughts about the runner-up, a 57-foot sloop from Keimpe Reitsma, lovely-looking sailboat and a novel take on an old construction technique with which to build it. In many ways, his Quick Clinker 31 embraces the spirit of the design competition of years ago, which elicited many variations on the theme of “Go simple, go now.” He won over most of the judges with his boat’s “clean hull lines and appearance” (Johnstone), “very thoroughly thought-out construction” (King), and “simple, straightforward arrangement” (the Westlawn Group). I faulted the design for being scant on such cruising necessities as light and ventilation in the cabin and a clearly defined anchoring system. Johnson thought it “attractive” but “too small,” and he asked, “Who wants wood?” Nevertheless, we both gave it high marks for the same reasons the others did.

Bruce King’s comment—"Nice presentation of a contemporary design"—echoes most of the judges’ thoughts about the runner-up, a 57-foot sloop from Keimpe Reitsma,

### Richard Boult’s Quick Clinker 31

- **LOA:** 31’ 3” (9.52 m.)
- **LWL:** 30’ 1” (9.16 m.)
- **Beam:** 10’ 3” (3.12 m.)
- **Draft:** 5’ 7” (3.12 m.)
- **Sail Area (100%):** 495 sq. ft. (50 sq. m.)
- **Ballast:** 3,771 lb. (1,710 kg.)
- **Displacement (half load):** 9,351 lb. (4,241 kg.)
- **Ballast/D (half load):** .40
- **D/L:** 153
- **SA/D:** 17.84
- **Water:** 34 gal. (130 l.)
- **Fuel:** 22 gal. (84 l.)
- **Mast Height:** 47’ 3” (14.4 m.)
- **Engine:** 18-hp. Volvo D1-20 with saildrive
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Keimpe Reitsma set as his goal a vessel for serious offshore cruising that would be suitable for sailing long distances and able to accommodate its crew living aboard for long periods of time in different climates. That crew would typically be a couple, with or without children, and they could work from the boat in space set aside to be fitted out as an office.

The Westlawn Group found it to be a “beautiful, attractive, practical boat,” and “very businesslike and seaworthy.”

“I like the relatively narrow hull by today’s standards,” wrote Bruce King, a sentiment I shared. Bob Johnson rated it in his top three despite its being “too big for a couple to handle” and “potentially too expensive,” while Johnstone had reservations: “This is a beautiful boat that could be a great passagemaker, but I’m not sure I’d like the ride.”

Reitsma incorporated many features into his 57-footer that would appeal to passagemakers: a sunken cuddy forward of the cockpit, a storage cabin, the headstay set aft of the bow and clear of the anchors, a garage aft for the dinghy. With a little more development, this boat would be a serious head turner in cruising anchorages the world over.

**First Runner-up**

Keimpe Reitsma’s Cruising Sailyacht 57 feet

Keimpe Reitsma’s Cruising Sailyacht 57 feet who lives in the Netherlands, though Bob Johnson noted that it would be expensive simply because of its size.

In third place, Paulo Bisol’s Deep Blue 48 also impressed the judges with its “nice, attractive profile [and] good presentation” (the Westlawn Group), but some felt it might be tender and suggested that its displacement target was overly optimistic.

All the judges were excited by the volume and variety of entries, compelling evidence that the cruising dream still fires imaginations with ideas, from the weird to the worldly, for making it come true. There is, certainly, a boat to fit every voyage.

Gerr, with his colleagues at Westlawn, guides countless aspiring designers toward professionalism, and for him, design competitions make valuable contributions to both teaching and learning. “I’ve long missed the design competitions that were more common 15 or so years ago,” he says. “Not only do they encourage new thinking and promote new designs; they also make sailors aware of the design considerations cen-
SECOND RUNNER-UP

Paulo Bisol’s Deep Blue 48

LOA 47’ 1” (14.35 m.)
LWL 44’ 4” (13.50 m.)
Beam 12’ 4” (3.76 m.)
Draft 5’ 10” (1.78 m.)
Sail Area (100%) 926 sq. ft. (86.0 sq. m.)
Ballast 6,020 lb. (2,730 kg.)
Displacement 20,286 lb. (9,200 kg.)
Ballast/D .30
D/L 104
SA/D 19.9
Water 185 gal. (700 l.)
Fuel 122 gal. (460 l.)
Mast Height 58’ 5” (17.8 m.)
Engine 67-hp. Perkins-Sabre
M65 diesel

“You know how big the boat is and where it wants to go,” Bisol wrote in his concept statement, referring to the title he gave this design, and many of the features that he’s included speak to that sentiment.

“I like the concept—narrow, easily driven, short rig, shallow draft,” commented Rod Johnstone. Bob Johnson liked it for its “reasonable size,” adding that Bisol presented “practical features [and] original thought.”

“Nice attractive profile, good presentation,” wrote the Westlawn Group, agreeing with Bruce King’s “nicely proportioned design with pleasant relationships between the visual masses.”

They also agreed, however, that the engine installation was tight, and this proved the thin end of a wedge of inconsistencies that undermined its otherwise well-reasoned specification, which included both a control station modeled after those seen in Open-class racing yachts and several watertight compartments. Both Johnstone and I remarked that it would be tender, and I remain doubtful that “light displacement” and “round-the-world sailing for a family” are compatible statements, but the basic design has considerable merit and is well worth exploring.

J.McG.