Chairman's Note

This first number of the Planning History Bulletin replaces the old Newsletter. As an organ of the Planning History Group, the new style is a conscious attempt to provide more information about our membership, our activities, and our field of study. I hope it meets with your approval and that you will feed the Editor with copy for subsequent numbers, as he requests.

Our membership has been pruned, inevitably, by the obligation to impose an annual subscription. However, we still have a total of 219 members (129 in Britain and 90 overseas) and the number is growing. It should be larger and I ask for your support in drawing the existence of the Group and its Bulletin to the notice of like-minded colleagues throughout the world. The publication and circulation of the Bulletin is costly, and I fear that your Executive Committee will have to consider a higher annual subscription before very long. But the Bulletin and the Group which supports it can only be as good and useful as you yourselves make it; if together we are successful in publishing a worthwhile venture two or three times a year I am sure you will think it worth the cost and effort. At the moment this is the only device, other than periodic meetings, of keeping in touch with each other, so please give Michael Naslas your support and encouragement.

The Planning History Group has established itself. In Britain at least a regular programme of meetings is emerging. The field is open for this practice to be followed elsewhere: non-UK members of the Executive will no doubt be glad to hear of anyone wishing to arrange meetings under a PHG umbrella, and news of such meetings could be reported in the Bulletin. In the meantime you will see that a Second International Conference is being planned, and we will keep you well informed about this.

Gordon E. Cherry
Editor's Note

In our view it has become important to find a new format for a publication which should promote the proper study of planning history. It has been agreed that the newsletter should be termed Planning History Bulletin and that careful attention should be devoted to the success of this publication. The Bulletin should become a forum for the exchange of information and ideas in the field. Nevertheless, it is advisable not to attempt too much too soon. There must at the beginning be some limits to what we do, though we hope to extend these as fast as we reasonably can. It is intended to publish the Bulletin, at least initially, twice a year (the next issue will appear in January 1980). We plan, however, to publish it three times a year as soon as it becomes acceptable.

In terms of the volume of information contained, the Bulletin will exceed the capacity of the newsletter very substantially. For example, it will contain the current bibliography, the register of research in progress, full reports of the Planning History Group meetings, information concerning other meetings and conferences, news and announcements, correspondence, book reviews, as well as information on books and publications received. In this connection, attention should be given to Tony King's note published in this issue: he is willing to help in compiling a register of members' current research activities.

The Bulletin is to be essentially a comprehensive review of the whole field of planning history and, basically, it is not seen as a platform for articles and research papers. All the same, it should provide room for two or three short articles of, say, 1500 words each. Blaise Gillie's paper, published in this issue, could be seen as an acceptable version.

I would like to see the Bulletin unfolding into a publication of considerable importance, but this depends, above all, on the support it gets. Reading this first issue may well have given rise to the need to ask questions, to comment, suggest and criticise. Please feel free to write to me on any point which is of concern to you.
Announcements

REGISTER OF MEMBERS: CURRENT RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Tony King wrote to remind me earlier in the year that when the Group first began we had a small booklet indicating members' interests and ongoing research. Now he would like to bring to our attention the following:

The Planning History Group Committee would like to compile a register of members' current research activities. Members are asked to send a brief note of these (up to about 50-60 words), and publications likely to arise therefrom, to

A.D. King
50 Lidgett Lane
Roundhay
Leeds LS8 1PL

PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER TUNNARD

It is a sad duty to let you know that Christopher Tunnard died on 15 February this year. His widow has written to Gordon Cherry, and apparently he was taken ill in October 1978, soon after our International Conference. She tells that his last book, A World with a View, is his valedictory.

Professor Tunnard was a good personal friend of many of those involved in the field of planning history and an early contributor to the Planning History Group activities. He was a distinguished thinker, indefatigable author and powerful speaker. Our deepest sympathy goes to his family.

MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING HISTORY GROUP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Planning History Group newsletter of December 1978 extended a call for members of the Group to serve on a new Executive Committee. Ideally, it was thought that we should seek approximately 20 names, internationally spread. If we received many more names than this, we would conduct a postal ballot through a subsequent newsletter (now the Planning History Bulletin). If the number of names were fewer, then we could always co-opt until another opportunity for nomination presented itself. In actual fact, a very convenient number of offers have been received from members willing to stand for election. They total 23, and are as follows:

UK Members
Mr P.A. Booth, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield.
Professor G.B. Cherry, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham.
Dr. M. Cuthbert, Department of Town and Country Planning, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh.
Mr A.D. King, Department of Sociology/Building Technology, Brunel University.
Dr. M. Naslás, Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield.
Dr. H. Meller, Department of Economic and Social History, University of Nottingham.
Dr. A.R. Sutcliffe, Department of Economic and Social History, University of Sheffield.
Mr. I.C. Taylor, Cam Firth, Leeds.
Non-UK Members
Mr. M.J. Bannon, Department of Town Planning, University College, Dublin.
Professor S. Hudson, City University of New York, Dept. of History.
Professor C. Collins, Parsons School of Design, New York.
Professor B.P. Croce, School of Architecture, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, New York.
Professor J.B. Callow, University of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto.

Dr. J.C. Geroa, Lugano, Switzerland.
Professor P. Marcuse, Columbia University, New York.
Professor M. Rose, Centre for the History of American Technology, Franklin Institute, Philadelphia.
Mina L. Rummenberger, Wisconsin, USA.
Mr. J. Salazar, Bilbao, Spain.
Dr. S. Watanabe, Building Research Institute, Tokyo, Japan.
Professor W.R. Wilson, Department of History, North Texas State University.

On this basis, therefore, there are 11 UK members and 12 non-UK members. It has been resolved that the above names now constitute the Planning History Group Executive Committee.

You will recall that the particular officers are as follows:

Chairman: Professor G.B. Cherry (for the time being the Chairman will also act as Membership Secretary)
Meetings/Conference Convenor: Dr. A.R. Sutcliffe
Treasurer: Mr. P. Booth

Conference Rapporteur: Dr. S.M. Gaskell

This meeting is being organised in conjunction with Sheffield Centre for Environmental Research, and Margaret Fulcher, the Director of the Centre, has kindly offered to contribute in the process of preparation. There will be a total of six papers, all of them invited, as follows:

1) Gordon Cherry, 'Developing attitudes and approaches to the idea of planning, 1919-45'.
2) Peter Dickens, 'The Development of Planning during World War II'.
3) Patricia Garside, 'Evolution or Genesis? The British Town Planning Movement, 1900-1940'.
4) Robert Marshall, 'Anti-urbanism and the Town Planning Movement in Britain'.
5) John Kinett, 'Ideals to Ashes: How the 1931 Town and Country Planning Bill became the 1932 Town and Country Planning Act'.

These papers will be distributed prior to the meeting. In addition, there will be an evening session on Thursday, devoted to a talk on some of Sheffield's planning problems, as well as a half-day local study excursion on Friday.

Spring 1981, Swansea
Convenor: Mike Simpson, Dept. of History, University College of Swansea, Swansea SA2 8PP

Planning History Group Meeting, Sheffield, 27-28 September 1979

The general theme of this meeting is Planning in Britain during the first half of the 20th Century. Details will be circulated shortly, but if somehow these do not come your way, the full programme and booking forms are obtainable from Michael Naslás, Department of Town and Regional Planning, Sheffield University, 8 Claremont Place, Sheffield S10 2TB.
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replacement of existing large urban centres by networks of small towns or 'garden cities' and the proposals played a major part in the genesis of the new science of urban planning which emerged in Germany in the 1930s and was spread by Europe and North America by 1914. For urban planning the metropolis was the ultimate challenge. Progress could be made towards a more efficient and humane environment in Birmingham or Frankfurt, but London, Paris, Berlin, and New York remained insoluble problems. Planning thus became locked in a struggle with the metropolis - a struggle which has left its mark on urban and regional planning as we know it today.

The crucial phase of the struggle lasted until the Second World War. Then, aerial bombardment wrecked four of the world's ten largest urban concentrations (Tokyo, Berlin, the Ruhr, and Osaka) and seriously damaged a fifth (London). In the replanning and re-building which followed, the principle of deconcentration was accepted almost everywhere, even in the metropolis such as Paris which survived the war unscathed. That triggered a brief revival in the 1950s and 1960s but it is now clear that 1940 marked a turning point; thereafter the giant city no longer carried all before it and the industrialised world began to evolve towards a looser settlement structure based on extensive networks of smaller towns. Yet many of the planning policies and popular attitudes generated in the struggle with the metropolis served to dominate urban strategies in our present-day world.

METROPOLIS 1890-1940 will include a number of papers devoted to general aspects of the metropolitan phenomenon, and detailed studies of individual metropolises. The former will include Peter Hall (Reading) on the nature and role of the metropolis phenomenon, Andrew Beer (Rutgers) on the metropolis and the intellectual, Lars Olof Larsson (Stockholm) on metropolitan retailing and Lasse Håkansson (Umeå) on the metropolis and the planning profession. The latter will be illustrated by Martin Eversley (Plymouth) on the metropolis as portrayed in music and David Sivry (PLO, London) on the problem of the expanding metropolis. Three further contributions are being invited on the metropolitan area in art, in film and in literature. The following have agreed to contribute papers on individual metropolises: Jean Bastie (Paris) on Paris, Jurgen Reulecke (Soebach) on Rhine-Ruhr, Horst Matzker (Berlin) on Berlin, and Shin Watanabe (Tokyo) on Tokyo. Papers on New York and London are currently under negotiation. The symposium will also include an excursion. Members of the group will note that there is no general call for papers, but any suggestions will be welcomed.

Full details and booking forms for METROPOLIS 1890-1940 will be included in a future edition of this Bulletin. In the meantime, enquiries should be addressed to A. Sutcliffe, Department of Economic and Social History, Sheffield University, Sheffield S10 2TN, England.

Report of History of Planning Group Meeting, 17 March 1979

Martin Cashell, CMI

The last seminar of the Planning History Group was held on 17 March 1979 in the Department of Civic Design at the University of Liverpool. The theme of the meeting was Planning in Britain, 1890-1950. The subject posed a whole series of problems, both in terms of the relationship of design and social and economic factors, and in terms of the balance of local and national factors. The papers and discussion of the meeting are to be published in a future issue of the Bulletin.

The last seminar of the Seminar was held on 17 March 1979 in the Department of Civic Design at the University of Liverpool. The seminar was on the theme of Planning History, and was chaired by Michael Hebbert. The papers were on the history of planning in Britain, 1890-1950, and were presented by a number of different speakers. The seminar was well attended, and the papers generated a lot of discussion.

The seminar was followed by a general discussion on the future of planning history, and the need for more research in this area. The seminar was well attended, and the papers generated a lot of discussion. It was clear from the seminar that there is a need for more research in this area.

The seminar was well attended, and the papers generated a lot of discussion. It was clear from the seminar that there is a need for more research in this area.
subsequent decline, and recent revival of 'History in the Planning Syllabus'. Roger Smith followed with a paper on 'Applied History in Planning Education', in which he suggested that history could be taught as an applied discipline, despite the scruples of professional historians, but that planning students needed to take steps to ensure that it was taught to a reputable academic standard. The discussion brought unexpected rewards to both speakers. The former's criticisms of T.P.I. history exam papers in the fifties were answered in part by one of the men who asked the questions, Jim Page of Chelmer Institute, while the latter's call for greater broadmindedness on the part of the CNAA was fielded reassuringly by Ken Carter, of its Planning Panel. Discussion otherwise centred on the problems of inculcating historical method into planning students; case-studies were praised in this context.

After lunch, a leading exponent of the historical case-study, Alison Bayets, gave a perspicacious analysis of the difficulties of 'History Teaching in an Architectural School'; Stephen Ward expounded - through a specially prepared case study of the National Parks in the past fifty years - his concept of 'History as Policy'; David Whitman described in fascinating detail the varieties of miniaturist teaching project which he uses to introduce graduate students to the history of housing; and Anthony King put before us the outline of his first and second year courses in the Department of Building Technology at Brunel, on the social production of the built environment, ending with a characteristically rousing call on planning historians to conceive their subject in historical rather than archaeological terms. After tea Gordon Cherry pulled these threads together, emphasising the importance of history in the planning syllabus, and reminding us also of our practical tasks to ensure the conservation of archives, to develop research on the local histories of planning and to open out the international dimension of planning history in the curriculum.

Michael Habbert
Department of Geography,
London School of Economics and
Political Science

A gathering on the theme PLANNING HISTORY: A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF A HISTORICAL PROJEC'T was held at the American Historical Association Convention in San Francisco on 29th December 1978. The composition of the panel was organised by David Godfied, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and the meeting chaired by John Hancock Urban and Regional Planning, University of Washington, Seattle. The programme outlined the following points:

1. The purpose of this panel is to stimulate comparative teaching and research in planning history. The participants subscribe both to Sam Bass Warner, Jr.'s dictum that 'if the city is ever to become susceptible to rational planning there must come to a common understanding of how the city is built', (Streetcar Suburba, p. viii), and to the notion that a comparative framework will enhance that 'common understanding'. Accordingly, each participant will discuss planning and its historiography in his particular county of research and teaching interest, and relate that discussion to developments elsewhere. Specifically, each participant will cover three issues:

1) Historiographical background - the nature and type of work that has been done in the field;
2) Planning history in the classroom - materials and bibliography;
3) Important issues in planning history including land use, economic development, conservation, housing, and social services, and how they differ from country to country.

Planning History in Japan
Shunichi Watanabe, City Planning and Engineering, Tokyo University.

Planning History Group in Japan
Shun Watanabe, Building Research Institute, Tokyo, writes to inform us that he formed a successful workshop of the research on planning history during the City Planning Institute's annual conference last November. As he explained, it was the first of this kind in Japan, and they have decided to organise themselves into a Planning History Group, which will meet once every two months.

Radbourn at 60
There was a conference in Bermon Community College, Paramus, New Jersey, on 19 May 1979, organised in conjunction with the Radburn Association.

A number of papers discussed, in turn, the relationships between Radburn and (a) the Garden City, (b) the Regional Planning Association of America, (c) the American City Planning Movement and (d) New Town Administration.

Publications

The 'Institute de Arte y Humanidades' of the Orbeqqua Foundation has recently published a quarterly magazine, called OBERN, of which Javier Salazar is editor. He has been a member of the Planning History Group since early 1978. In his letter he explains:

'Although the first number was fundamentally about architecture, the magazine content is more extensive and takes into account the more significant humanistic phenomena nowadays - artistic, architectural, urban, historical, anthropological, of knowledge and creation in general - giving priority to its manifestations in the Rampe community, we would be pleased if you could collaborate in it by sending articles or papers from time to time.'

Javier Salazar, Gran Via 89, Bilbao II, Spain.

Recently, too, Carole Hereselle Krinsky, Professor of Fine Arts, New York University, has published Rockefeller Center (New York, Oxford University Press, 1979, 235 pp., 126 illus., maps, plans, notes, bibliography; 9.95 dollars paper; 17.90 dollars cloth).

In the words of the author, 'the book is about planning, naming, patronage, decision-making, money, etc. rather than about art deco ornamentation or flamboyant personalities, so it seems to belong among the books you (we) list.'

Another useful and interesting publication has appeared this year: Alternative Communion in 19th Century England, by Dennis Kardy (Longman, 1979, pp. 268, paper £2.75).

Mervyn Miller wrote, enclosing a copy of the catalogue which he prepared for the Letchworth Garden City 75th Anniversary Exhibition held at the First Garden City Museum last year. The catalogue is intended to be a permanent document dealing with the planning, early implementation and social history of the First Garden City as well as a record of exhibits that were assembled for the special exhibition. Copies are still available price £1.00 from the Curator, First Garden City Museum, 99 Norton Way South, Letchworth.

Sheffield Centre for Environmental Research has started to publish a new series of the Occasional Papers: Urban and Planning History Papers. The following papers are available:

77/52 The effects of technological transformations upon the development of the early industrial towns. M. Naslas. (£2.00)

77/53 The municipal institutions and the improvement schemes of the early industrial towns. M. Naslas. (£2.00)

79/54 Speculative housing and the land market in London 1660-1750. P.A. Booth. (£2.50)

79/55 The transforming socio-economic structure and the political, intellectual and cultural activities in the early industrial towns. M. Naslas. (£2.00)
May I suggest a number of steps to achieving these goals?
1) That the Group forms a Working Party of three or four members to investigate the situation relating to records of the history of planning in Britain (including related activities, such as housing, architecture, landscape architecture and, where relevant, public health, transport and amenity).
2) That the Working Party should report back to a future Group meeting with proposals for the better preservation of records and improved access to them.
3) That the Group should publish a guide to sources (perhaps through CIHGC).
4) That a Records Officer be appointed to continue to monitor the situation, liaise with holders of planning source materials, and update the guide.
5) The Working Party should write to County and City Archivists, Chief Planning Officers, heads of bodies concerned with planning, the Public Records Office and individuals asking for details of their holdings and on what basis access to them is granted.
6) The Group should urge the holders of records to take all possible advice on their care to deposit them in a professionally-supervised archive. The Group should seek to establish reasonable access to them for reputable scholars.

I feel that preservation is a matter of urgency and that information and access are matters of importance in a field which is expanding as rapidly as ours seems to be.

Michael Simpson
Department of History
University College of Swansea

BASIC CONCEPTS IN THE HISTORY OF PLANNING

F. B. Gillie

The Planning History Group has produced a large number of different approaches to the history of planning. This variety appears to offer a good opportunity to study possible links between them.

But such links require a common basis of thinking and that requires basic concepts which can be accepted by research workers of different disciplines.

With this in view it seems worthwhile to re-examine the word 'planning', since it is often taken for granted by professional planners, whether they are concerned with 'town planning', 'regional planning', or any of the other kinds of planning that have been separately named, that they are necessarily and evidently concerned with a basic activity, underlying such traditional specializations as municipal engineering, building regulation, architecture and so forth. It can be argued that 'planning' is an attempt to systemaize a more basic activity, an attempt which arose because the problems of communities were running into additional difficulties affecting a series of operations which, having grown up by degrees, had consequently been the subject of little systematic thought as a whole.

This 'series of operations' will here be referred to descriptively as 'community management'. The extent and quality of community management vary widely, but it always includes two types of activity. First, there is the provision of common services, which include at least roads and may extend widely into water supply, drainage, schools, parks and so forth. The second concerns the regulations necessary to minimise conflicts between the individuals and organisations which make up a community. The most basic of these regulations is probably the prohibition of building on the public highway, but there may be many others relating to building, traffic regulation, etc.

As already remarked, the extent and quality of community management vary widely, but some degree of community management must always have existed. It may have been recognized in different kinds of community, but in different times and places, be wide or narrow, efficient or inefficient, democratic or authoritarian. Furthermore, it may be carried out by a single body such as a town council, or by a series of more or less specialized bodies, which may either co-operate or work in a chaotic manner.

Much past community management has not only been thought about by the future, but the future has shaped the community as a whole, but has sometimes influenced them, nonetheless, e.g. by extending public services in one direction rather than another. The individual who is specifically named a 'planner' may only have attacked the start of his work to inform himself on the extent and quality of existing community management, but often he does not.

However, recognition of the existence of basic, if sometimes inadequate, community management could be useful in distinguishing different uses of the term 'town planning'. For example, this term is often used to mean a study of a whole town, leading up to a programme for its future improvement and measures to deal with expected expansion. This often involves (though the study may fail to discuss the point) a general improvement in pre-existing community management.

Secondly, the term 'town planning' may refer to a limited physical design intended to secure a specific improvement, such as Regent Street or Aldwych, 'planning' in Vienna. 'Town planning' in this sense is often a spasmodic activity, and it may or may not be accompanied by a change in the make-up of existing community management agencies, the services that they provide or the standards that they impose.

A good example of this limited type of operation is provided by the Vietnamese 'Ring'. This was an exceptional operation, made possible by the opportunity to remove the city's foreign population and make use of the resulting space. It does not appear to have influenced the city's routine community management, and to have led to broader perceptions of the expansion problems of the city as a whole. In the 1970's, for example, the building regulations were quite enough to permit the erection of blocks of flats in which some of the rooms had seriously inadequate daylight. To evaluate the achievement of the planning of the Ring it needs to be seen against this lack of progress in routine community management.

However, certain studies of urban architectural style are largely unconnected with community management. These stylistic questions are usually felt to be of greatest interest where,
as in Edinburgh or Bath, they reflect a prevailing fashion, so that areas grow up with an underlying visual harmony which is not due primarily either to management policies of public authorities or to the dominance of a single architect. One reason why such areas of stylistic harmony are interesting is that they reflect interaction between the genius of individual designers and the taste of the designer's clients, both of which influence also the work of lesser designers, possessed of small originality. In such areas the contemporary building regulations may have a limited influence on the result, but this is not always so. Some of the most famous architectural set pieces of Bath do not, in one sense, amount to good planning, because they created difficulties in designing a satisfactory layout for the areas around them. On the whole, however, the interest of stylistic studies would, it is suggested, be enhanced if comment in them was related to contemporary standards of routine management.

Community management, of course, is normally a function of local government and reflects two sets of concepts: first the views of the governing group as to what towns should be like and, secondly, their views as to the functions appropriate to and practicable for local public authorities. Local government historians have often been written in an unnecessarily dull manner through concentrating on the nature of authorities and their legal powers rather than on how the functions of the authorities were conceived at different times. Even a more penetrating history of local government would, however, have its depressing sides, because it would have to record many mental blocks and failures to realize the importance of certain subjects.

A somewhat neglected theme in the history of planning is that of the changing relations between the community management agency and the developer, who may be a private individual, a private organization, or some form of public organization. This relationship is more than is sometimes realized because, at any one moment, only certain aspects of the relationship are usually controversial. A particular proposal for development may touch on three different 'levels of sensitivity' as follows:

1. It may touch on certain controversial preservation questions;
2. It may involve building regulations which are broadly accepted, though their complexity may cause grumbling;
3. It may involve other issues which are so completely accepted that they are not always recognized to exist, such as prohibition of building on the public highway.

This relationship with developers is crucial, because it determines how far a well meant plan will become a reality. In developing countries the biggest trouble is often failure of the relevant community management agency to understand and to cope with this particular point of implementation, namely ensuring that the prospective developers will build in accordance with whatever plan is adopted.

Effective control of developers raises another aspect of the history of both planning and local government: the need to invent practical devices for carrying out certain measures. An interesting case is the invention of turnpike gates in eighteenth century England as a means of financing road improvements. The addiction of the people of the USA to the gridiron street plan may also reflect concern with this question of devising simple machinery.

It would be valuable if the question of the need for and usefulness of administrative devices could be discussed more in international comparisons. As far as France is concerned, for example, one wants to know, not merely that regional prefects were appointed, but how useful they proved to be. Some regional innovations, such as the regional grouping of statistics, have sometimes been counter-productive, since they tend to obscure, rather than illustrate, interesting local characteristics.

At a different level, how successful have 'syndicate de commune' been in overcoming the limitations of the very small French communes?

As far as Germany is concerned, most British people have a general idea that German local government is efficient, but they have little idea, for example, of how German land use control is carried out, and whether the Germans, like the British, have recently been concerned to develop a more flexible instrument of local policy. In the USA documents about regional planning tend to deal with such large areas that they obscure the interesting local developments. For example, the variety within the urban belt which Gottmann christened 'Megalopolis' is far more interesting than its physical continuity. As a result of too much attention to broad sweeps little is known outside America - and perhaps not much within it - about the nature and quality of day to day community management. The USA appears to be a country where there is a wide difference between 'planning' and the way communities are actually managed from day to day.