Chairman's Note

This number of the Planning History Bulletin has been unavoidably delayed, by four weeks, but the full editorial arrangements of your Planning History Group Executive remain unchanged: three numbers in both 1980 and 1981 with every hope for interesting contents in each. We will then see whether the format arrived at meets members' requirements. Certainly we regard the Bulletin as a most important vehicle of communication, serving to put people in touch with each other and to spread news of research, publications, seminars and conferences. A number of libraries now subscribe to PHB; if you can encourage your Department to take out a subscription, this greatly helps our income and helps to disseminate an awareness of the Group's existence and activities to a wider readership.

As we go to press, the Second International Conference is being held at the University of Sussex. More of this in the next Bulletin, but this event helps us to believe that the Group has now attained a certain organisational coherence. A hundred people will assemble at Brighton to replicate the enthusiasm recorded at London (1977); there is a hard core of over 200 members and Group 'cells' are taking root in countries other than Britain; the Bulletin is in capable hands and is increasingly being used for members' purposes; the annual subscription rate is stabilising; the Membership Secretary and the Treasurer are geographically separate but work in close harmony; the international Executive Committee is at least in postal contact; the first General Meeting of the Group will be held at Brighton; there is evidence of research interchange at conferences; the first titles in the new series 'Studies in History, Planning and the Environment' are now published; and so on.

This is in no way to be complacent or smug (your chance to elect a new Executive will come next year!) rather to say that we believe the time has come when anyone working or with an interest in our field cannot afford not to be a member of the Group. In purely monetary terms please note the discounts to be obtained from Mansell for the first titles in their series; also that attendance at PHG Conferences costs less with Membership status. We hope this attraction will help to increase our membership numbers. With this Bulletin is enclosed a list of current members: please mention the Group to anyone you find not listed, and your encouragement to them to join would be much appreciated. Do check your own recorded address; please inform me if it is incorrect.

Gordon E. Cherry
Editor's Note

In 1981 we shall continue to publish three issues of PHB, rather than aim at four. However, as the present issue already demonstrates, each PHB will be rather more bulky than in the past. We came to the conclusion that three issues in 1981 is a realistic target, and that all things considered - especially extra postal charges - four issues might be beyond us organisationally.

In order to attract more material - to make for fatter editions - we must have a rather more forceful editorial policy; that is to say, rather than wait for material to come to me, I will try to identify a number of colleagues around the world, and invite them to contribute a thousand words or so on specific themes. This, I feel, also answers some of the comments on the future of the Bulletin which I have received in the last two or three months: questions like: would it be possible to have an international piece in every issue (a piece from a non-British contributor)? And could this be done by inviting various of our overseas members to write a piece on the 'state of the art'?

I am glad to say that most of those who have sent their comments find the Bulletin extremely useful. It is, they say, the only source of up-to-date information on the work that is going on in this field at present. According to them, the PHB format is most attractive and sensible, providing a rich source of information and news. As the subject area appears to be very inter-disciplinary, some members feel that the Bulletin should remain as a news/information source, rather than devote itself to lengthy papers, although "there is a danger that it could, if not carefully managed, become a duplicate of the Urban History Yearbook".

I have been requested by the Executive Committee to invite...
Parsons School of Design, she is involved in the organisation of the exhibition referred to above, which is part of a year-long programme on the theme 'The Twenties in Germany: the Artist as Social Critic' under the guidance of the University of Minnesota with grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and private sources.

Mark H. Rose has been appointed associate professor of science, technology and society in the Department of Social Sciences, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan 49931, (906) 487-2113.

Planning History Group Meetings

PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS
8 November, 1980

'The Example of Germany' - a day seminar on German influence on British urban policy and planning in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Venue: King's College, Cambridge.

Further details should be sought from the organiser, Dr N. Bullock, King's College, Cambridge CB2 1ST.

27-28 March, 1981
Seminar at the University College of Swansea, organised by Michael Simpson, with papers on planning in North America. There will also be a tour of planning-history sites in South Wales. Further details from Mr M. Simpson, Department of History, University College, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP.

Autumn 1981
Seminar at the University of Birmingham, organised by Professor Neville Borg, on planning and residential design in Britain since the war. See Professor Borg's note in this PHB.

Plans for further meetings, still being finalised, include Hull (spring 1982?) and Dublin (autumn 1982?). More precise information will be provided in PHB as it becomes available.

PLANNING HISTORY GROUP MEETING, LONDON, 28-29 MARCH, 1980

Report by Bernard Zumbthor

At a time when on the one hand, Western expertise still plays a major role in development planning, while, on the other hand, geopolitics and a generalised economic recession compel Western experts to reckon with the indigenous qualities of planning in developing countries, it has become crucial to assess the role planning has played and the shapes it has assumed in the relationships between 'central' powers and their colonial, neo-colonial or independent 'periphery'.

The theme proposed for the last PHG meeting, 'Exporting Planning: the Imperial, Colonial and Independent Experience' proved, therefore, particularly topical, albeit modest in its objectives. The aim was indeed to point to an area of historical research which is still in its infancy and which, as the diversity of papers presented showed, is promising a wealth of fascinating multi-disciplinary and cross-cultural approaches.

However, the potentials of such studies are not merely academic, as both Tony King and Michael Safier stressed in their introductions: there is a real urgency for the teaching of planning to students of the planners and consultants operating overseas to develop a serious knowledge of the historical processes leading to the contemporary
situations they are working in. The meeting was held in the premises of UCL's Development Planning Unit who must be thanked for their kind hospitality.

In the first paper presented, 'Organic Growth and Planned Development: The Case of Pre-Industrial Isfahan', Paul Oliver made a detailed morphological analysis of the Safavid capital, contrasting its original growth as an 'organic' conglomerate of caravanserais and surrounding villages with the vigorous formalising principles of sheik's 16th century extension plan. With the help of photographs and maps, he demonstrated the subtlety of the integration between two apparently antagonistic urban fabrics by means of physical 'hinges' such as gates, squares, axes and religious monuments (a subtlety which the recent grandiose 'western-like' renewal operations undertaken under the Shah have significantly ignored).

The discussion was a bit frustrated due to the lack of time. On the basis of Paul Oliver's strictly documentary approach, it would have been interesting to question further the concepts of 'organic' vs 'planned' and to find out how much this type of planning belonged to a characteristicly Islamic tradition (one thinks of the work of geographers since the tenth century, of course famous plans such as that of Baghdad, or of the role of the Koran) or rather to idiosyncratic Persian traditions.

In 'Tunis and the Natural Rights of Europeans', Jerome Woodford accounted for physical changes from a socio-economic and political point of view. Its historical originality lies in its thinking with Europe, dating back to Carthaginian times. Roman colonisation, the contradictory 'golden age' of the Ottoman period, when economic prosperity was not matched by political independence, and finally the progressive establishment of European superiority from the 1870s onwards, were economically and politically articulated in the same links. Eventually, some 20 years before Tunis' annexation by the French in 1881, a new European town was built, independent of Medina. It was planned on a grid of through streets lined with buildings with external lights, the very antithesis of Medina's labyrinthine network of blind walls, writes J. Woodford. But this antithesis was only morphological. The long list of colonial administrators so that independent Tunisia inherited the weaknesses of the British planning system, viz., the conflicts of interests between local and central administrations. In recent years, these have been further complicated by the problems of uneven regional allocation of resources and development.

In a very dense paper, 'Colonialism, Urbanisation and Planning in the Caribbean', Dr Malcolm Garside attempted to piece together the specific traits of the Caribbean mosaic. The base of the colonial system is the plantation economy which implied the dominance over the rural sector preceded urbanization, a reverse of the usual social process. The cities were indeed never places of production but of trans-shipment, residence and administration, serving the needs of a rural elite, a 'plantocracy'. The plantation economy, resting on monoculture, needed the flexibility of labour structures that slavery provided. In addition it was an economy entirely integrated into a global circulation and consumption structures. Therefore it did not need to promote local market potentials which depend on underpayment of rural labour after the abolition of slavery. The modernisation of agriculture in the 19th century and the emergence, in the 20th, of western-style agro-business further deteriorated the conditions of rural workers and resulted in massive migration in order to escape endemic poverty on the plantations.

Structurally, the result of all this (especially since the 1960s) has been a phenomenon of macro-urbanism; primacy of one city, imbalance and resulted in massive distribution, with the attendant problems of serious urban unemployment, lack of adequate planning machinery and of measures to cope with migration.

The political strategies adopted towards planning policy have varied according to colonial traditions; the hinscape Caribbean having shown a greater sense of national purpose than the French or British areas which have remained aligned on centralised or metropolitan models. The exception is, of course, Caribbean, which has managed to alter the pattern of unplanned urban growth through a drastic agrarian reform.

The last paper of the day, 'The Heart of Empire: Imperialism and London Planning 1850-1945', was presented by Patrick Cross who replaced Professor McAuley, called on urgent duties. She took her audience back to the Metropolis, examining the linkages between the fortunes of British imperialism and Central London's physical structuring, with particular emphasis on the emblematic role of architecture.

Her argument was that, with characteristic British pragmatism, it was only at times when the Imperial system was in economic or political difficulties that an Imperial urban image was forced onto London. London's fabric (mostly grandiose neo-classical schemes), these emblems being expected to reflect an imperial morale boosters whereas periods of 'buoyancy' did not need the support of an architectural and planning symbol and are therefore characterised by incoherence and eclecticism.
seemed unfortunately to ignore the aesthetic debates of the 1980s and inter-war periods, debates which necessarily, consciously or not, revolve around the 'colonial metaphor' issue.

A general discussion followed. Some misgivings were voiced about the academic nature of the papers presented; the need to investigate what mechanisms should exist for planning development in each specific developing country was stressed. The importance of the theme of our meeting was reiterated as giving an opportunity to understand the historical and methodological assumptions and presumptions with which Western planning operates and which too many experts take for granted when applied to non-Western situations. Hence the hope was expressed that it would be possible to organize future conferences on this theme.

The Saturday session was opened by Dr Lawrence (based on 'Agrarian Decolonisation, Rapid Urbanisation and the Functional and Social Transformation of a Colonial Urban System: a Planned Economy'). In spite of urban traditions stretching back to classical times, pre-colonial Algeria remained weakly urbanized and the economic disruptions which accompanied the French conquest in the 1830s generated a massive deurbanisation of the Muslim population. Originally, therefore, urbanization was exclusively colonial in function (cities were relays in the tapping of the colony's agricultural and mineral products as well as places of European settlement and civil-military administration) and European in character, producing distinctive townscapes; 19th century orthogonal grids with 2nd Empire architecture; inter-war garden suburbs; post-2nd World War peripheric high-rise housing estates.

The agricultural crisis of the 1930s generated the first Muslim rural migration resulting in the overcrowding of the traditional Muslim quarters (the Medina) and in the formation of shanty-towns on the outskirts of the main cities.

This influx was accelerated after independence in 1962 and the consequent massive exodus of European population. The official policy was then to 'algerianize' the urban colonial heritage and to consolidate this through industrialization. However, the lack of traditional Algerian urban values to refer to, the poor equipment of the new republic and an economy which remained heavily dependent on France frustrated this objective; the urban population experienced increasingly high rates of unemployment, tertiarisation, overcrowding and environmental decay.

After 1965, the Boumedienne government tried to correct the situation by programme of nationalisations, planned development strategies articulated around the linkage between agriculture and industry (development of agriculture and decentralisation of industry), and administrative reform. The successes have been undeniable but many problems remain: reform programmes are behind schedule; housing suffers from under-investment; opportunities, on the basis of education, are still unequal; urban unemployment remains acute.

In 'From Master Plan to Development Programme: the Case of Calcutta', Professor C. Rosser outlined the Bengali capital's planning disaster. Here again, both planning machinery and administrative structure have been inherited from the colonial period, a legacy which has created crippling contradictions, the major one being the dichotomy between the multiplicity of local authorities and development planning powers and an inadequate metropolitan authority.

In 1961, a Metropolitan Organisation was set up to tackle Calcutta's worst social and environmental problems within the framework of a Metropolitan Plan. The objectives of the Organisation were 1) to gear up for economic development, 2) to provide immediate planning action programmes, and 3) to provide for the institutional setting up of its implementation. But political and financial pressures and resistances reduced it to a conventional land-use plan of little more value than a documentary exercise.

The same pattern repeated itself after the creation in 1971 of the Calcutta Metropolitan Development Agency whose task it was to find a framework able to accommodate economic, political and social rationalities. Although this time it had a budget and in spite of help from the World Bank, the CMDA, in practice, became something of an improvement trust due to the short-term investment policies opposed by politicians eager to capitalise on immediate visible results. Thus Calcutta's planning suffered from a 'time dilemma'; action being determined by a political time-scale rather than by long-term strategic planning, one which would have allowed progressive structural improvements affecting employment and social development.

In the extensive discussion that followed, parallels were drawn between Calcutta's 'circular' planning and similar situations in Nigeria and Latin America. The bureaucratic inertia of planning machineries was also discussed.

The meeting was aptly concluded by Alistair Sutherland who has been a planning educator since 1950. In his paper 'Types of Planning Education for Developing Countries' Professor Sutherland highlighted the need for an account of his own extensive experience with overseas planners, the evolution of planning education for developing countries from practical studio-based courses for architects, civil engineers or surveyors to highly specialized theoretical courses for researchers, through all the shades of part-time, mid-career, extension courses, crash courses in urban design, etc.

In his conclusion, he expressed worries about the formation of planning elites covered with Ph.D.s but not prepared to work in the field through an inability to recognize the real needs of the people.

This last point was developed in the general discussion which followed, centering on the relationship between training and professional structure. The following comments were made: by exporting an inappropriate structure of professionalism, we are practising a form of cognitive colonialism. It is therefore urgent for work of Western experts to become one of cooperation rather than teaching, one of cooperation with agencies in developing countries - not only in physical planning but also in the political and economic fields - rather than one of perpetuating Eurocentric, patronizing attitudes. It must be realised that in the UK tradition, the drawn plan has been used as a mechanism of social policy, a commodity which is not easily exportable as the historical specificities discussed in this meeting have shown. The Western expert has assumed that his competence, being technical, has been value free and that the overseas agencies he has been working for would create an appropriate economic conditions for his schemes to be implemented. This has proved wrong and has led to disastrous results. Thus the meeting ended with this double recommendation that "the planner must be on tap, not on top" and that our message to those creating inappropriate economic conditions for his schemes should be "to learn from our own problems and difficulties". After all, in the present world crisis, we may well be in the same boat as them.
Meetings and Conferences

In its April 1980 Circular, the Institute of British Geographers Urban Geography Study Group has announced the following conferences:

Autumn Conference, 19-21 Sept., 1980, in Dublin

The themes for the paper sessions comprise Irish urban geography, young researchers' forum and general papers. The programme also includes two excursions and an optional Conference dinner.

IBG Annual Conference, 5-8 January, 1981, at Leicester University: call for papers

The Study Group will be involved in several sessions, one of which is open to the offer of papers by members. Its theme is 'The monitoring of urban change'.

Anyone who would like to contribute to this session should contact the convenor, Dr. A.G. Champion, Department of Geography, The University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, as soon as possible.

Publications

The Division of Urban Planning, Columbia University, publishes papers by its members and guests in a lower-priced series (Papers in Planning). It also reprints articles published by its members in planning journals, some of them fairly inaccessible outside the United States. Several titles on the current list are of interest to planning historians, e.g. papers by P.V. Ruck on architecture and planning in China before and after the Cultural Revolution, and articles on British planning history by Peter Marcuse. A list and order form are obtainable from:

Ms Jane Bobbe
Graduate School of Architecture and Planning
406 Avery Hall
Columbia University
New York, N.Y. 10027
U.S.A.

A similar series, Papers on Planning and Design, is produced by the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto. A.J. Dekin, A.J. Scott, S.T. Roweis, H. Blumenfeld, D. Hulchanski and others have contributed papers on aspects of planning history. A list and order forms are obtainable from the Editor:

Professor David Hulchanski
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Toronto
Canada M5S 1A1

Members of the Group will already be aware that Gerhard Fehl, Professor of Planning Theory at the Technische Hochschule, Aachen, is building up a strong planning-history branch in his department. In January 1978 Professor Fehl held one of the seminars at Aachen on the theme of the History of Modern Town Planning, and the proceedings have now been published as Gerhard Fehl and Juan Rodriguez-Lores (eds.), Städtebau und die Jahrhundertwende: Materi a lien zur Entwicklung der Disziplin Städtebau (Cologne: Deutscher Gemeindeverlag/Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1980). The main aim of the meeting was to trace some of the characteristics of contemporary planning back to its foundation period in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The resulting debate is fully reflected in the book which, supplemented by two additional papers, has an almost symmetrical structure.

G. Piccinato establishes theoretically the limits of capitalist town planning arguing that it could never do more than moderate the underlying operations of the land market. J. Rodríguez-Lores provides a lengthy study of the Cerdà plan for Barcelona, based partly on the recent Cerdà exhibition which Professor Fehl brought to Aachen. G. Cherry and W. Hofman examine, respectively, the origins of the town planning movements in Britain and Germany, while A. Sutcliffe analyses the links between them. Finally, J. Weiler (Patrick Geddes) and G. Fehl (Camilo Sitte) investigate the work and influence of two founding fathers of modern planning ideology.

Professor Fehl has also sent us a copy of the March issue of Städtebauwelt, (65, 28 March 1980). This is devoted to the subject of planning history and deals with regional, social and cultural aspects of the city (England, Spain, Germany) since the second half of the 19th century.

The Athens Charter and its relevance today

During the last five years an important effort has been undertaken amongst a group of continental planners, architects and historians, based principally in France, to reassess the Athens Charter. Originally a prime aim of the programme was to generate new understanding of Le Corbusier's role in the history of the world planning movement. Recently, however, the ambitions of the group have broadened to encompass the whole of the modern history of the built environment in Europe.

The guiding force in the proceedings is now Stephan Jonas, director of the Institut d'Urbanisme et d'Aménagement Régional at the Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg. In 1978, Jonas' Institute published Acht et-Seminaire d'Aménagement et de Planification, the proceedings of a conference held at Arc-et-Senans two years previously. Now, in 1980, Jonas has entitled Circulaire des Sciences Humaines, based primarily in France, and the proceedings of a meeting held in 1979. The volume contains papers on housing in Europe 1900-19, the problems of public housing, post-war reconstruction, and conservation.

Both volumes may be obtained from Stephan Jonas, Institut d'Urbanisme et d'Aménagement Régional, Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, Cedex, France. Dr Jonas will also be pleased to provide information on a colloquium on the history of single-family housing, to be held at Strasbourg in October, 1980.


This third Volume of the official history of environmental planning traces the evolution of new towns...
policy from its beginnings in the war years, up to the end of the 1960s. The focus is on policy-making by central government.

Professor Cullingworth is at the Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.

PHG members may also like to be informed about the appearance of the following publications:

Barbara Sanford, "A Social Historical Approach to the Planning of Urban Residential Environments", Papers on Planning and Design, 23, 1979, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Toronto.


Informationen zur Modernen Stadthgeschichte (IMS), 1986, 1, Deutsches Institut für Urbanistik, Strasse des 17. Juni 112, Postfach 126224, 1000 Berlin 12. (Members of the Group will already know that this publication is an equivalent to our PHG, and is edited by Christian Engen.)

The first titles in the Mansell Series 'Studies in History, Planning and the Environment' are published this month. A leaflet from the publishers is circulated with this Bulletin. The editors have negotiated this Series with Mansell, with the Planning History Group particularly in mind. In the first place the Series will be international in scope and will cater specifically for contributions to planning and environmental history. In the years ahead it is hoped that an impressive list of titles will emerge, capturing the subject field. Secondly, it will be observed that PHG members can obtain a useful discount on purchasing the publications direct. The academic editors (Gordon Cherry and Anthony Sutcliffe) will be pleased to hear from interested contributors.

Notes and Articles

The History of Planning Methodology: a proposal by Michael J. Breheny

What links are there between the ideas of Patrick Geddes and current wisdom on planning methodology? What methodologies were adopted following the 1947 Act? Did they differ in practice? Were they documented? To what extent have prevailing views on epistemology affected thinking on planning methodology? Which views/literature/arguments influenced the Planning Advisory Group? To what extent was the systems approach applied comprehensively in practice? Do early Structure Plans differ in methodology to later ones?

These, and many other related questions concerning planning methodology, go largely unanswered in our study of planning history. We are familiar with the attention given to the substantive aspects of urban development and planning, to prevailing problems and to the outputs, the products of planning. A great deal of effort goes into the study of planning history in this area, and papers and papers have been written, much teaching concentrates on this, and groups such as the Planning History Group provide a focus for study. In addition, the ideological and political imperatives involved in planning are occasionally considered from an historical perspective.

However, save for a few isolated examples, we do not study the historical development of planning methodology in any comprehensive and sustained fashion. In our efforts to understand and learn from past ideas and efforts, and to provide a 'rounded' view of planning history, this is surely a serious omission. In neglecting its history of thought and approach, planning shows itself as insufficient as a field of study. Other disciplines, albeit more mainstream academic ones, such as sociology and economics, have a much greater concern for the historical development of their procedures and methods. What is needed in planning is the establishment of methodology as a valid subject for historical study.

If anyone has any views on this, or would be interested in forming a group to study the history of planning methodology, I would like to hear from them at the Department of Geography, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading RG6 2AB.

The Origins and Development of High-Density Housing Policies, 1945-1970: Proposal for a Seminar By Professor Neville Borg

The Executive Committee recently approached Neville Borg with a view to holding a PHG seminar at Birmingham in the autumn of 1981. In order to stimulate interest and offers of papers, Professor Borg has provided the following introduction to his chosen theme:

It is not too late and it is certainly not too early to put on record the factors that established the policy of high density housing that we followed for 20-odd years after the war of 1939-45. Already, a new generation is looking at the physical results and making judgements which, accurate to some degree on physical performance and environmental effects, nevertheless cannot recognise or take into account the political and social climate of the time, nor the physical constraints in which early policy decisions were taken.

Some of the facts that should be extracted and collated exist in the form of statistics: it is true that there may be identified relatively easily after a period of many years so that a social historian will be able to say "High density housing (or demand) was so much and estimates made by different political or technical groups varied by such-and-such". The human realities, however, were transient and not easily reproducible; nor are the expressions of political and social pressures that influenced decisions. Although some of these pressures were formed by opinion and emotion (and some as the result of other pressures) they operated as 'facts' affecting the decisions of elected members of local authorities and of Parliament, as well as the judgments of officials having technical responsibilities for planning and housing proposals in those times. Related influences were the relative speed and timing of development in New Towns, Expanded Towns and redevelopment of slum areas. Would it not be very interesting and valuable to collect such a definitive history of the subject and of the times by assembling statistical information, in collaboration with quotations from newspaper report and opinion, extracts from local authority proceedings and from Hansard, and digests of the evidence given in major planning inquiries? It seems to me that it would be salutary for most of us to see such records. Whether we lived and worked in those days or, without actual experience, may be compelled to regard them with a more detached position. A narrative version, so soon after
the events, must tend to suffer from an author's partiality - conscious or unconscious - or from a diffuse and unselective form of the kind, for instance, that made it virtually impossible for a schoolboy in the 1920s to comprehend European 'strategic' history of the period before and during the 1914-18 war.

The Planning History Group often breaks new ground and it might be thought useful to follow its recent progress in catching up on planning history by arranging a seminar to concentrate on this subject, on housing policy, in a spirit of enquiry and for the purpose of establishing an accurate record of events. Perhaps one of the events could be a presentation of the "statistical facts" of the recorded "emotional facts" - in counterface, as it were, by a kind of double entry system of printed pages. On the one side there would be abstracted statements facing some stark figures, standing in a great deal of white paper, on the opposite page. No doubt such a technique exists, and is practised, and has its own kind of defects. Nevertheless, it seems to me that it would be a valuable way to create a kind of journeymen's day-book for reference by a later generation and would be useful in monitoring excessive swings of opinion during the formation of necessary policies. If there were to be such a seminar, perhaps this technique could be used for a verbal presentation, some parts of which would certainly be interesting, some ironic, and some even dramatic. Perhaps the proposal for such a comprehensive seminar is too ambitious at the present time but at least it would be a good thing to quantify the problems that afflicted the housing industry in the early '50s and to establish the variety of reasons for choice of policy.

It is not generally realised, today, how a combination of facts in a particular area imposed a particular solution. Without making judgements prematurely perhaps PHG can help to record some of the situations by discussing not only figures of housing deficiency and productive volume and intensity of demand that existed for a separate dwelling ("Whatever it is!") and the abhorrence of slums ("Get us cut of here!") and the ammunition used in wars of attrition, about planning theories and proposals fought between strong but tactically unequal opponents.

All those interested in participation of the scheme or wishing to comment on its objectives are warmly invited to get in touch with:

Professor Neville Borg
Department of Transportation
Birmingham University
P.O. Box 60
Birmingham B15 2tt

The London County Council Green Belt Scheme - a note on some Primary Sources

Elizabeth G. Sharp, Department of Geography, University College London.

As part of a study of government intervention in patterns of urban growth, the London County Council Green Belt Scheme is being taken as an example of intervention by land purchase. The most widely known version of the scheme is that by Thomas (1970, pp. 80-83). He bases his account on a 1956 London County Council publication, Green Belt around London, which was republished with a revised text and additional appendices in 1961. He attributes the scheme largely to Sir Raymond Unwin in his capacity as Technical Adviser to the Greater London Regional Planning Committee (GLRCP), and to the active Herbert Morrison and Richard Coppern upon the election of the first Labour controlled LCC in 1934.

The explicit aim was to establish a reserve of open spaces and recreation areas, in the form of a green belt or girdle (as it was also then called), that was readily available for the inhabitants of London and the implicit aim, the restriction or control of growth of the Metropolis. The scheme was first published in 1935, initially for three years. The LCC made available a fund of £2m to be granted to the Counties of Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, Middlesex, Kent and Surrey, and the County Boroughs of East and West Ham and of Croydon, for the reservation of land or for its 'sterilisation' in order to meet these aims. 'Sterilisation' normally took the form of compensation for loss of development rights resulting from an agreement between the relevant town planning authority and the owner of a property under whose development the grants, provided the restrictive covenants were drawn up to the approval of the LCC. The scheme was administered by the Valuer, the Clerk and the Comptroller of the Council, with the Chief Officer of the Parks Department specifically excluded to minimise any suspicion of LCC interference in the local affairs of the participant authorities. By 1961 some 27,600 acres had been acquired or sterilised under the scheme (LCC, 1961, p. 7). This is less than originally intended (Dawson (1953), a figure of 70,700 acres) and the shortfall can be attributed largely to the disruption caused by the Second World War and the passing of the Town and Country Planning Act 1947.

In examining the Scheme a number of sources have been traced, and it is the purpose of this short note to explain their contents, availability and significance. Three main aspects of the Scheme are being studied: its physical development - which land was preserved and which rejected; the different policies of participant authorities; the key actors influencing the operation of the scheme.

DATA SOURCES

1. Joint Town Planning Committees (JTPCs), 1923-45: Minutes and Regional Advisory Schemes

These Committees were advisory bodies established under the Housing and Town Planning Act 1919, and with the expiration of London represented the first step towards planning at a sub-regional rather than a purely local scale. Most Committees were established to draw up Regional Advisory Schemes, and once these were prepared, to continue as monitoring bodies. From 1929 onwards the County Councils could also take an active part in planning and from 1932 onwards the County Planning Acts diminished rapidly with the increased participation of the County Councils in the planning process.

In only a few cases have the minutes of these advisory bodies survived, e.g. North and West Middlesex and South Essex, but the Regional Advisory Schemes, which were published for general sale, are available. These were often produced by the Technical Advisers retained by the Committees - normally private planning consultants. In the Home Counties the firm of Adam and Tigar was particularly prominent, producing plans for West Middlesex 1924, South London, 1926, Thames Valley 1925, North West Surrey 1928 and Mid Surrey 1928. The main topics covered included zoning, development and the preservation of amenity. The adoption of these schemes and their use as planning reference documents were of the greatest importance to the evolution of the Green Belt. Both the justifications propounded for open space provision, and the proposals for areas to be reserved (in
some cases in some detail), strongly influenced the pattern of applications made by the participating authorities, as confirmed by the minutes of both the JTPCs and of the County Councils and their Committees. Where minutes do exist, they confirm the importance of the Technical Advisers in guiding the planning system.

2. Greater London Regional Planning Committee (GLRPC), 1931-36, First Report (1929), Second Report (1933)

Initially set up by the Ministry of Health in 1927, this was a large-scale JTPC, concerning itself with the regional implications of London's growth. In its first period, from 1927 to 1933, its Technical Adviser was Sir Paylater, although he was not officially appointed until late 1928; he had attended all previous meetings and in its second, from 1933 to 1936, he was succeeded by Major K. Hardy-Syms. Its discharge and re-establishment brought it into line with the statutory provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1932. Its main activities included discussion of centralisation, open space and recreation provision, traffic, and the control of development and ribbon development.

The findings of the Committee were dominated by the work of the Technical Adviser. The minutes, recently rediscovered in the Greater London Record Office (1931-36) and the Middlesex Archives (1927-33), also located at GLRO, confirm this. The clearest formulations of Unwin's ideas on the Green Girdle (as he usually termed it), exist in the First Report of 1929 (Memorandum on Open Spaces pp. 8-22). The documentation subsequently developed in the Interim Report on Playing Fields (1931) and the Second Report of 1933 (Memorandum by Technical Adviser, especially pp. 78-93). The Green Girdle arose out of the survey of open space provision in London, carried out by the LCC Valuer, Sir Hardysyms who enabled the constituent authorities to translate this theoretical model into concrete form within their town planning schemes. Hardy-Syms also acted as the adviser to a conference of authorities convened in 1931 to consider the mechanics of achieving a permanently preserved 'Green Girdle' and became involved in advising local authorities on which sites should enter the LCC scheme. Examples include Magna Carta Island and Laburnum Castle, and interesting early documentation of these cases exists in the Technical Papers.

The Technical Papers enable the important actors in the evolution of 'Green Girdle' schemes to be identified but the hopes of the GLRPC to set up an independent authority to administer it were removed when the Green Belt Scheme was introduced in 1935.

3. The London County Council

a) London County Council Minutes: 1935-65

The Green Belt Scheme was adopted by the LCC in January 1935, following its approval by the Town Planning and Parks Committees in December 1934, was slightly different from that envisaged by the GLRPC, since it was intended as a "reserve of open spaces" rather than a continuous girdle. The scale of the Scheme can be established from the Minutes, as final approval for each grant was always made by the LCC itself. However, it must be emphasised that the Minutes only give a guide as to the land actually purchased, for although negotiations were likely to be at an advanced stage, the grant was not paid until the restrictive deeds of covenant had been agreed and in a number of cases this does not appear to have happened. Reports presented to the LCC by the Parks Committee normally include details of current use of the property, its location, the Valuer's report, the contributing authorities, distance from Charing Cross, cost of return rail fare to nearest station (and, where relevant, Green Line bus service), amount of grant, acreage and any unusual conditions to the purchase. The Minutes also record general policy development.

b) LCC Parks Committee 1935-65: Minutes and Presented Papers

Initial negotiations with applicant authorities were carried out by the Parks Committee, the concurrence of the Finance Committee, although the Parks Officer was not involved in the consultations (some above). In an application, the Parks Committee, indicated whether or not a grant would be made, and if so, of what order this might be. The level of grant was judged on accessibility, proximity to London, suitability for use, cost, other contributions and likely revenue. Upon conclusion of negotiations, the authority over level of grant, and the presentation of evidence of an advanced stage in negotiations over purchase by the applicant, the successful applicant would then be presented to the LCC with the recommendation of the Parks Committee. These Minutes and presented papers are extremely detailed and well kept. A gross deal of information can be extracted from them regarding the process; the different types of approach taken by the different applicant authorities; and the conflicts within the LCC itself, particularly the different perceptions that the Valuer and the Controller had of the Green Belt. This is the most valuable source.

c) LCC Clerks Papers: 1930-50, 1958-61

Some specific departmental files dealing with the Green Belt Scheme have survived. When considered in conjunction with the presented papers from the LCC Parks Committee, particularly the reports made by the Parks Committee they illustrate the operation of the Scheme at executive officer level. They document how some major changes in policy were brought about and the important changes in the legislation, taken in private by Herbert Morrison and Richard Coppock, and, later, Ruth Dalton. There are also papers dealing with specific topics - notably the development of the Green Belt (London and Home Counties) Act 1938; requisitioned land; and an attempted compulsory purchase by the Ministry of Agriculture of the Lullingstone Estate. The file dealing with the Green Belt legislation is especially valuable showing how the need for the legislation emerged and in particular clauses entered the final Bill.

4. The Participant Authorities: 1925-65: Minutes, Reports and Presented Papers

These sets of documents, held in County Records Offices, relate both to the local authorities' liaison with the JTPCs (including the GLRPC) and to the negotiation of acquisitions made under the LCC Scheme. As for the JTPCs, the quality of records is extremely variable, particularly for presented papers and departmental files. However, in all cases, in preparing the reports examine the Council Minutes, the Minutes of the relevant Town Planning and General Purposes Committees and, where they existed, those of special sub-committees set up to coordinate the selec-
These various sources traced to date have proved to be particularly valuable in establishing the development of the Scheme in policy terms and in identifying the personnel responsible both for the idea of the Scheme and in its operation. The quality of the material is uneven at participant county level, even if largely complete. The main limitation overall is in the accuracy of information on the sites actually purchased. A general idea of their area and location can be gained from the LCC Minutes for the period with the aid of an LCC grant, and for those without LCC finance can be gleaned from the County records. Precision can only be obtained from access to the County Terriers. Even so, these sources provide an excellent base for analysis.
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Source Material Locations

DOE: Ruislip Sub-Library; holds copies of all the Regional Advisory Schemes.

GLC Record Office: In addition to the Middlesex and LCC records, also holds the minutes and papers of the GLRPC (1933-16 in Record Keeper's care, 1927-33 in the Middlesex Collection). Technical Papers references CL/RP/3/18 to /26. Clerk's Department Files on Green Belt, references CL/PK/1/25 to /31. Also complete JTPC minutes for North Middlesex, West Middlesex and Thames Valley in Middlesex Collection.

Records Offices of Participant Authorities: These hold County Council Minutes and Papers; and also the Records Offices, or their complementary libraries, hold copies of the Regional Advisory Schemes drawn up within their area. The following Records Offices hold papers of particular interest:

_Hertfordshire:_ Herts. C.C. Regional Planning Committee Minutes 1925-30; Files of Messers. W.B. Davidge and Partners, Town Planning Consultants, re the Hertfordshire Regional Planning Scheme 1925-35; extensive pre-1945 town planning files.

_Buckinghamshire:_ Central Bucks. and Amersham JTPC's minutes 1939 onwards.

_Essex:_ South Essex JTPC minutes 1923-1945.

Research Register

ABBOTT, Carl, Associate Professor, Urban Studies, School of Urban Affairs, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, Oregon, 97207. He writes:

I have just finished a study of metropolitan growth patterns and politics in the American Sunbelt since 1940 which will be published next year by the University of North Carolina Press. My current project is a history of city and regional planning in metropolitan Portland during the twentieth century, and I would be eager to have my research benefit from the ideas of others working in the same field.

BIRCH, Eugenie L., Division of Social Sciences, State University of New York, College at Purchase, Purchase, NY 10577. Research interests:

1. Development of housing reform in the United States with special attention to American adaptation of European techniques.

2. History of the United States planning movement with a focus on institutional development and ideological heritage.

Publications:


'The seven per cent solution: the case of philanthropic housing, 1870-1980', Jnl of Urban History (with Deborah Gardner) (Forthcoming).

NORRIS, Heather, Department of Geography, University of Exeter. The Removal of Town Defences and Urban Planning and Design in Late Nineteenth Century Provin­cial France: considerations of defence remained influential in French town planning through to the late nineteenth century. The increasingly sophisticated defence systems developed by military engineers, tended to intensify the already worsening environmental and social conditions, characteristic of nineteenth century urban growth. When, at length, the military authorities did permit the dismantling of town defences, an opportunity was provided for large scale public works. This process is being studied in the North French towns of Lille, Douai and Cambrai.

LOTHCHIN, Roger W., Professor of History, Department of History, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Hamilton Hall 070A, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. He writes:

My own research is not exactly located in the mainstream of planning history as I know it, but it is very relevant to the history of planning as defined in the last article that appeared in the Bulletin. I am now working on a history of the interplay of urbanisation and military occupation in California from 1919 to 1953. The focus for the study is on the San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego metropolitan areas. The study seeks to assess in the broadest sort of way the interaction between military and urban development in that American area where these two crucial modern forces have become most intimately and inseparably entwined. This interrelationship has substantially affected planning and the attempts at planning as practiced in California cities. That is particularly true if one considered planning in the broadest sense, as does F.B. Gillie in his discussion of 'Basic Concepts in the History of Planning'. The growing partnership between California cities and the American military services and their ancillary industries has dramatically affected what Mr Gillie termed 'community management' and in some respects has provided some of the most notable examples of community management during the period that I am investigating.
SHARP, Elizabeth G., Department of Geography, University College London. She writes:

My work is linked to a body of research in this department, led by Dr R.J.C. Munton on London's Green Belt. Dr Munton has worked mainly on use and management of agricultural land, and has also (and is still) working on a project with Dr Caroline Harrison and Dr Andrew Warren on Recreation provision in the Green Belt. My work has grown out of the ownership issue connected with both sides of the work - the role of the local authorities.

Against the background of a general model of local government intervention in urban growth, the particular example of the London County Council Green Belt Scheme is being examined. At least 20% of the inner area of London's Green Belt is in public ownership today, and much of this ownership arose out of the LCC scheme of the 1930s. This scheme offered grant aid to the counties adjacent to London for the acquisition of land or development rights in order to achieve a series of objectives. Both the physical and policy development of the scheme are being traced. Of particular interest is the role of the various Joint Town Planning Advisory Committees and their Regional Advisory Schemes of the 1920s and 1930s in influencing the outcome of the scheme, and the conflicting aims of the LCC and the participating authorities and the way in which they were resolved.