Chairman's Note

1981 has seen no diminution in the number of planning history publications now flowing from so many pens. The 1,400 titles listed in Anthony Sutcliffe's annotated bibliography (The History of Urban and Regional Planning, Mansell, 1981) offers an international benchmark of endeavours, but the appendix of additional entries largely covering the last two or three years shows the near impossibility now of ever keeping such a compendium inclusive or up to date. The Planning History Group will be indebted to the editor of the Bulletin for bringing to our attention new titles either as notes or lengthier reviews. The Group will have noted developments in the Bulletin towards this end.

The steady literature flow reflects the growing field of planning history from various disciplinary perspectives. If this were just a matter of a contribution to academic scholarship it might be regarded (albeit unfairly) as rather self-indulgent, and, with no great obvious consequences to be foreseen, dismissed as a passing whim. But there is an important additional dimension to our collective research and writing: it is that we can observe grave deficiencies in forms of planning education where history is absent or poorly developed. Too many practitioners of planning in its various aspects are simply not aware of the past and its significance for understanding the present. In Britain at least we can note the quite extraordinary rise of planning as a State activity this century as a response to a range of economic, social, political and institutional forces; it developed because there was a demand for it and it proceeded to take certain forms, shaped by broadly cultural determinants. Many things about it could have been different; the unfolding of 20th century planning was not pre-ordained. The way the planner and his institutions react today to the problems they have to face has a historical context. Problems have origins; solutions have consequences. Planning education, unless firmly rooted in contemporary historical knowledge and understanding, is unlikely to produce practitioners of great perception.

This is the last Bulletin prepared by Dr Michael Naslas. He is expecting to take up a new appointment shortly and does not feel able to continue with the editorship. I should like to take this opportunity of placing on record
the Group's appreciation for his work over the past years in getting the Bulletin off the ground in its present form. This has been a tremendous achievement.

I am happy to welcome Dr John Sheail as our new Editor. Author of Nature in Trust: the history of nature conservation in Britain (Blackie, 1976) and Rural Conservation in Inter War Britain (Clarendon Press, 1981), he is a historical geographer serving as a Principal Scientific Officer, Monks Wood Experimental Station, the Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, Abbots Ripton, Huntingdon. He looks forward to hearing from members of PHG with a view to having a steady flow of copy.

Executive Committee Elections, 1982-84

The annual election system, which commenced in 1981 on the basis of a postal ballot, satisfactorily produced an Executive, half the membership of which will serve for a period of two years. Our Constitution determined that half the Executive retire annually (half UK members, half non-UK) though the neatness of this arrangement was immediately complicated by the fact that Officers of the Executive are elected (by the Executive) for three years. Hence we are now somewhat out of phase, but the spirit of the annual turnover is being maintained.

Listed below are the names of those members of the Executive due to retire in 1982; they may of course offer themselves for re-election. The submission of new names for the 1982-84 Executive is now invited. If there are more than a required number there will be an election, and slips for a postal ballot will be included in the April 1982 Bulletin. The August 1982 Bulletin will announce the result of the election and the new Executive will assume its duties.

Will those PHG members wishing to offer themselves for election, or re-election to the Executive, 1982-84, please indicate this in writing to me not later than 1 March 1982. There are no requirements for proposers or seconders, simply a statement that you are willing to serve, if elected. Up to six UK members and seven non-UK members are required to fill the vacancies.

The following Executive members are due to retire in 1982 (but may offer themselves for re-election):

U.K.
Mr P.A. Booth, Dept of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield
Professor G.E. Cherry, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham
Mr A.D. King, Dept of Sociology/Building Technology, Brunel University

Dr. M. Naslas, new appointment to be announced
Dr Helen Meller, Dept of Economic and Social History, University of Nottingham
Dr A.R. Sutcliffe, Dept of Economic and Social History, University of Sheffield

non-U.K.
Professor F. Marcus, Division of Urban Planning, Columbia University, New York, USA
Professor M. Rose, Dept of Social Sciences, Michigan Technological University, Michigan, USA
Miss Lorette Russenberger, Wisconsin, USA
Professor J. Salazar, Architectural School of San Sebastian, Bilbao, Spain
Dr I.C. Taylor, Dept of Social Sciences, Athabasca University, Alberta, Canada
Dr S. Watanabe, Building Research Institute, Tokyo, Japan
Professor W.B. Wilson, Dept of History, North Texas State University, Texas, USA

I extend all good seasonal greetings to our far-flung Group. You will see (page 22) the names of new members and institutions, and we welcome them to the fold. No doubt 1982 will have much in store for us!

Gordon E. Cherry
Treasurer's Note

I am pleased to say we have been able to hold subscriptions at £4.00 for 1982. This means that for many of you from overseas the subscription is now actually lower than last year! Perhaps that will be an incentive for you to seek to expand membership.

Methods of payment are the same as last year and are spelled out on the form enclosed with this Bulletin. I hope as many of you as can will choose to pay by standing order. But however you pay, please pay promptly.

You may be pleased to know that the British Inland Revenue have confirmed our status as a learned society, and income tax relief may be claimed on subscriptions from 6th April 1980.

Philip Booth
Treasurer

Planning History Group
Meetings

Tony Sutcliffe is pleased to announce that arrangements are being finalised for a meeting of the Group in Dublin on 24-25 September 1982, as part of our bi-annual series. The organiser is Dr Michael Bannon of the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University College Dublin, Earlsfort Terrace, Dublin 2. Papers will include:

Mary Daly, 'Dublin housing conditions and policy up to 1921'

Michael Gough, 'Urban conditions and the genesis of planning in Cork'
Evidence of extensive historical antecedents for the post war phase of high density development, providing a much needed perspective for the short lived period of high rise which constitutes only a small fraction of modern building.

What were the factors which led eventually to the adoption of high density solutions for slum clearance programmes of the 1930s and subsequently to the era of high rise in the fifties and sixties? Dr Sutcliffe's paper, and the contribution from George Atkinson on technological aspects, indicated some of the more general factors, while Patricia Garside on housing policies of the LCC, and by Michael Ryan and Alan Geeson on Birmingham, traced the interweaving of these factors within the more specific context of decision making by two large authorities. With comments from the audience, including those by William Ogden who presented George Atkinson's paper, an intricate picture emerged.

Dr Sutcliffe emphasised the cyclical character of British urban development with certain "modal types" occurring again on different periods. The back to back houses before 1870, and the bye-law house 1870-1914, were responses to growing demand for accommodation which had been demolished should be replaced on the same site. As a result,.

building by Peabody and later the LCC at Boundary Street and other sites was inevitably at high densities. Walk up flats at Boundary Street rose to five storeys but Queen Anne Mansions, built in 1873 as luxury accommodation for the middle classes, was as high as thirteen storeys. Numerous blocks of "mansion" flats for the middle classes were built during the latter half of the nineteenth century in London during the building boom of the eighties and some of these contained the earliest examples of lifts. Although this latter invention was a prerequisite for high building, luxury blocks of flats, which enjoyed another boom in London during the 1930s, were limited for the most part to eight storeys until regulations concerning building heights were changed in 1939.

Though a small part of the total housing stock, medium rise flats were a well established building form before World War II. It is interesting to note that, while the technology for higher building already existed and was being exploited for offices in cities like Chicago, housing and building heights were restricted in Britain, for reasons connected with fire risk. One wonders, however, whether there were deeper reasons, rooted in British culture, which rendered what Dr Sutcliffe called the "vertical image" less acceptable here.

Some outstanding examples of flat developments for workers in Europe, such as the early Karl Marx Hof in Vienna (1923) and designs by Walter Gropius in Germany influenced thinking in Britain when, after the Greenwood Act of 1930, the attention of the public sector was again directed to slum clearance. For example, Birmingham councillors undertook a study tour on the continent in the early thirties, and subsequently recommended that a large flatted estate should be built to replace the slum property in the city centre. Quarry Hill in Leeds was a direct outcome of continental influence both in design, layout and the system of construction which was used.

To some extent a wider public grew accustomed to the "vertical image" through the examples of non-residential development in the thirties, and exposure through the cinema to scenes of American cities. The potent influence of new designs from the continent was, however, transmitted via the architectural profession. A small group, Modern Architectural Research (MARS), founded in 1931, was the spearhead of the Modern Movement in Britain, exercising a formative influence over a new generation of young architects, trained in the late thirties and the forties, who subsequently formed the architectural departments of some of the major local authorities. In the inter war years, it was often the borough engineer or surveyor who was responsible for design of public sector housing and in both the City of Birmingham and the LCC at Boundary the design of flatted blocks, to use Michael Ryan's words, was ponderously formal and institutional.

Herbert Manzoni, who was favourably impressed by the design of flats by Tecton and other protagonists of the Modern Movement in Britain, became responsible for Birmingham's housing in 1935 and the way was open for innovation in the design of flats in that city. A broad parallel may be drawn with the LCC when, in 1950, responsibility for house design was transferred from the Valuer's Department to a newly created Architect's Department, under Sir Leslie Martin's dramatic new approach to the design of the Alton estate at Roehampton was instrumental in winning over the residents of a large council estate in a hitherto exclusive
area. The career opportunities which building housing has offered architects in the post-war period brought an unprecedented rate of innovation in dwelling design, all of it successful in social terms. Garside suggests that their own professional interests encouraged designers and planners to accept higher densities as a practical response to shortage of land, rather than consider a more rational redistribution of land resources.

On the more technical side of building the Building Research Station’s study in the thirties of daylight in buildings in relation to density and storey height gave rise to the “floor space index”, a tool for planners which was to have a marked effect on the form of post-war office development. In the thirties the LCC, analysis of design and costs pointed to the need for cheaper and more efficient methods of construction and there followed further research into the use of tower cranes, ventilation of internal bathrooms, single skin glazing and the development of site casting of large concrete panels. By 1958 central government was sufficiently convinced that high rise offered a solution to land shortage in the larger cities to attach a special subsidy to this form of development. In 1964 the National Building Agency was established to advise the industry on industrialised methods of building. The objective of the NIA was to promote efficiency rather than high rise as such, but nevertheless the establishment of this group appeared to add further official backing to the trend towards high building.

Meanwhile, evidence against high rise was accumulating. Stone's work at BRS showed that overall savings in land which were achieved by building up were fairly marginal; moreover, management and maintenance costs associated with high rise, including care of public spaces around buildings was considerably higher than those incurred on low rise estates. It was the introduction of mandatory cost yardsticks in 1967 which effectively halted high rise development in the public sector, to which the collapse of Pont Point added a dramatic postscript in the following year.

One must agree with Patricia Garside that competition for land was of overriding importance in ‘expansion’ concerning the location and consequently the density of public sector development. In London, the problem of land resources itself was solved by a two-tier system of local government. In the early inter-war period, the LCC acquired large tracts of land outside the area of authority, as for example at Becontree and Edgware which were developed as “cottage” estates. Apparently the private sector could more easily find land closer to London, and house building expanded at a remarkable rate there, but the “invasion” of low density institutional housing was by the LCC met with strong resistance by the authorities concerned. As a result, well before thedrift on slum clearance in the thirties, the LCC was forced to cultivate those London Boroughs who were least hostile to the idea of public sector building in their midst by another authority. With the supply of suitable land thus limited, flatted development was an obvious solution, with continental examples as a convenient justification, rather than a precedent.

After World War II the LCC continued to build mainly in the more amenable (usually Labour controlled) boroughs and the shortage of housing land was further underlined in public debate by a strong lobby against encroachment on productive agricultural land, the introduction of green belts and a birth rate which, contrary to all expectations, continued to rise until the mid-sixties. With higher densities already established for inner London development, the further step of high rise seemed, at least to its protagonists, inevitable.

Similar problems over land occurred in Birmingham but, lacking the unvaried scale of London, a severe shortage appeared at a later date. During the inter-war period, various boundary extensions were obtained to accommodate low density council estates on the periphery. Land shortage only emerged at the end of the thirties when plans for clearance and redevelopment of central areas revealed that some proportion of the residents would need to be rehoused. After World War II, with an estimated need for 69,000 new dwellings resulting from redevelopment alone, and Sequencing Counties firmly resisting further ‘invasion’ by council estates, higher densities were adopted for all housing developments, but the high rise era tall blocks appeared even on the boundaries of the town. An additional factor governing decisions of one generation, in the public sector, was the collapse of Ronan Point which were pragmatic responses to land shortage, and that this shortage itself was rarely seen as the product of institutional controls which could presumably be changed. But it must be remembered that the size of council waiting lists in the fifties, and that the clearance of slum property, much of which still bore the scars of war damage, and the vision, as yet untarnished, of a new Jerusalem under public ownership were still compelling reasons for immediate action on a scale hitherto unprecedented in the public sector. In an atmosphere of emergency decisions are bound to contain an element of pragmatism. This does not of itself discount the innovatory step of high rise, which originated from a new stream of architectural thinking and a developing technology. It is perhaps unfortunate that this innovation occurred at a time when high completion rates were a primary
target of central and local government. Although some research evidence concerning high costs, management problems and difficulties experienced by young families in high flats appeared at a relatively early stage, it was unheeded in the drive to increase output. Systematic appraisal of the physical, social and economic aspects of a new building form requires a complicated series of research projects followed by an additional stage to integrate the results of these separate investigations. Perhaps one of the lessons to be derived from the high rise phase in Britain is the need for a more cautious approach to radical innovations to allow time for appraisal before its widespread adoption.

Even in the eighties the popular view of the high rise phase is one of unmitigated disaster whereas the more thorough-going studies show that, for certain types of households and under certain conditions, high rise blocks offer satisfactory homes, often with the advantage of easy access to other facilities. High density estates in the post-war era are at a level in which innovations in layout, including experiments with Radburn type arrangements for low rise developments at higher densities, and a general improvement in the standard of landscaping. Some of these innovations were to have a considerable impact on the private sector.

The interest provided by the papers dealing with high density housing policies suggests that at least one further meeting might be devoted to other aspects of post-war policies. This further meeting might consider low density development (where comparisons between the public and private sectors might more readily be made), overspill and new town development, all of which were pursued concurrently with development at higher densities, about which we are now better informed.

Vere Hall
Building Research Establishment, Watford

Meetings and Conferences

Urban Morphology: Research and Practice in Geography and Urban Design
5-6 July, 1982
University of Birmingham

This meeting of the Urban Geography Study Group of the Institute of British Geographers aims to provide a forum for urban historians, urban designers and urban geographers interested in the historical development and management of the urban landscape.

Further information is available from T.R. Slater, Department of Geography, University of Birmingham, P O Box 363, Birmingham B15 2T7.

History of Planning Methodology Workshop
Two further Workshop sessions are planned for January and March, 1982, probably at the London School of Economics. The themes will be "The New Planning Process, 1: The 1940s" and "The New Planning Process, 2: The 1960s".

Further details are available from Michael Breheny, Department of Geography, University of Reading, Reading RG6 2AB.

The Political Economy of Canadian-American Urban Development

The conference will focus on the political economy of urban development in Canada and the United States, with particular focus on the nature of social, economic, and political power at both the theoretical and empirical levels. Those with suggestions for papers should contact one of the area co-chairpersons listed below, or the Conference Co-ordinator, Gilbert A. Steiger, Department of History, University of Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1, from whom further information about the conference as a whole can be obtained.

Area Co-chairpersons

Economic Growth: systems and their evaluation; industrial/corporatization; role of the State/government; entrepreneurship and urban growth.
Larry McCann, Department of Geography, Mount Allison University, and Blaine Brownell, Centre for Urban Affairs, University of Alabama.

Social Structure and Action: workplace democracy; neighbour-hood and other community groups (including ethnic); home and housing; health, education and welfare provision; local social planning.
James Lemon, Department of Geography, University of Toronto, and John Ingham, Department of History, University of Toronto.

Form and Spatial Organization: internal transportation; housing; land development; morphological change; architecture; frontier and resource towns.
John Weaver, Department of History, McMaster University, and Michael Conzen, Department of Geography, University of Chicago.

Government and Politics: structure and relationship to other levels of government; who governs?; reform movements; services (public and private).
Alain Artibise, Department of History, University of Victoria, and Michael McCarthy, Humanities Division, Gwynedd-Mercy College, Pennsylvania.

Although this note will appear too late to be of immediate use, members will be interested to know that the Institut Francais d'Architecture is organizing an international colloquium on the theme 'Architectures and Social Policy, 1900-1940'. To be held in Paris on 3-5 December 1981, the colloquium will include contributors such as Henri Guérard, Donatella Calabi, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Marco de Michelis, Piero Rosso and Teyssoz, Lionel Murad, Patrick Zylbermann, Hartmut Frank, and many others. The event is intended to reinvigorate the debate on the political economy of housing, and to take due account of the social significance of the Modern Movement, mainly by broadening the frame of reference to include sociological and social anthropological contributions, and to take due account of the nature of social, economic, and political power at both the theoretical and empirical levels. Those with suggestions for papers should contact one of the area co-chairpersons listed below, or the Conference Co-ordinator, Gilbert A. Steiger, Department of History, University of Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1, from whom further information about the conference as a whole can be obtained.

Area Co-chairpersons

Economic Growth: systems and their evaluation; industrial/corporatization; role of the State/government; entrepreneurship and urban growth.
Larry McCann, Department of Geography, Mount Allison University, and Blaine Brownell, Centre for Urban Affairs, University of Alabama.

Social Structure and Action: workplace democracy; neighbour-hood and other community groups (including ethnic); home and housing; health, education and welfare provision; local social planning.
James Lemon, Department of Geography, University of Toronto, and John Ingham, Department of History, University of Toronto.

Form and Spatial Organization: internal transportation; housing; land development; morphological change; architecture; frontier and resource towns.
John Weaver, Department of History, McMaster University, and Michael Conzen, Department of Geography, University of Chicago.

Government and Politics: structure and relationship to other levels of government; who governs?; reform movements; services (public and private).
Alain Artibise, Department of History, University of Victoria, and Michael McCarthy, Humanities Division, Gwynedd-Mercy College, Pennsylvania.

Although this note will appear too late to be of immediate use, members will be interested to know that the Institut Francais d'Architecture is organizing an international colloquium on the theme 'Architectures and Social Policy, 1900-1940'. To be held in Paris on 3-5 December 1981, the colloquium will include contributors such as Henri Guérard, Donatella Calabi, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Marco de Michelis, Piero Rosso and Teyssoz, Lionel Murad, Patrick Zylbermann, Hartmut Frank, and many others. The event is intended to reinvigorate the debate on the political economy of housing, and to take due account of the social significance of the Modern Movement, mainly by broadening the frame of reference to include sociological and social anthropological contributions, and to take due account of the nature of social, economic, and political power at both the theoretical and empirical levels. Those with suggestions for papers should contact one of the area co-chairpersons listed below, or the Conference Co-ordinator, Gilbert A. Steiger, Department of History, University of Guelph, Ontario, N1G 2W1, from whom further information about the conference as a whole can be obtained.
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Economic Growth: systems and their evaluation; industrial/corporatization; role of the State/government; entrepreneurship and urban growth.
Larry McCann, Department of Geography, Mount Allison University, and Blaine Brownell, Centre for Urban Affairs, University of Alabama.

Social Structure and Action: workplace democracy; neighbour-hood and other community groups (including ethnic); home and housing; health, education and welfare provision; local social planning.
James Lemon, Department of Geography, University of Toronto, and John Ingham, Department of History, University of Toronto.

Form and Spatial Organization: internal transportation; housing; land development; morphological change; architecture; frontier and resource towns.
John Weaver, Department of History, McMaster University, and Michael Conzen, Department of Geography, University of Chicago.

Government and Politics: structure and relationship to other levels of government; who governs?; reform movements; services (public and private).
Alain Artibise, Department of History, University of Victoria, and Michael McCarthy, Humanities Division, Gwynedd-Mercy College, Pennsylvania.
d'Architecture, 6 rue de Tournon, 75006 Paris (tel. 633-9036). It is hoped to secure a report on the meeting for FNR.

Publications


This major reference work containing more than 7,000 entries brings together for the first time virtually all the material that exists in the field of Canadian urban studies - up to 1980. It includes material from a broad range of the social sciences - historians, planners, political science, geography, architecture, sociology, and public administration.

The Bibliography includes general works on sources and methodology as well as growth and economic development, population, urban centres has rapidly increased at the expense of the "megacities". In this analysis by a leading authority on urbanisation, the reasons for this reversal are explored and the problems of the areas undergoing rapid, slow or zero growth are identified.

In addressing these problems Robinson advocates the adoption of a settlements policy at the federal level. While defining the difficulties involved in developing a federal policy, he examines urban demographic trends, predicts future settlement patterns, and describes the relationship between spatial distribution of population and economic energy.

This is a valuable study with both national and international implications. The urban trends and problems it describes are not only apparent in Canada but also in most of the countries of Western Europe, the United States and Japan.

The United Nations Habitat Conference focused on this issue in its Belem Declaration, expressing the need for each country to develop an integrated national policy governing human settlements and the environment. The purpose of this study is to encourage debate among all those responsible for or concerned with urban development regarding the urgent need for such a policy in Canada.


This collection of papers from the Urban History Symposium of the Congress of Americanists held at Vancouver, British Columbia, in August, 1979, provides a multidisciplinary approach to urban development in Latin America, the Urban Setting. The authors, distinguished scholars from around the world, address themselves to questions of economic growth and regional development, demographic and social change, and the process of city-building.

Book Reviews


A cynic might be forgiven for detecting a connection between the growing interest in planning history and the current disaffection with the process and profession by public and politicians. As Tony Sutcliffe observes in his introduction, planners are now required to short-comings in urban life far beyond the need for each country to develop an integrated national policy governing human settlements and the environment. The purpose of this study is to encourage debate among all those responsible for or concerned with urban development regarding the urgent need for such a policy in Canada.


Such swift advancement was virtually unthinkable in the formative years, 1880-1920, selected for analysis by Sutcliffe, although the analytical frame of reference had been provided by Creese's work. The elevated position of planning in the post-1945 period provided the stimulus for one of the first major initiatives in planning historiography - Ashworth's The Genesis of Modern British Town Planning, in which the activity was viewed as a logical culmination of public intervention initiated from the 1830s through national concerns, notably public health.

Walter Creese provided an alternative view in The Search for Environment (1966) which united analysis of utopian idealism culminating in Howard's Garden City with the emergence of the model housing settlements. Creese presented the planner, in this case Raymond Unwin, as a generalised generaliser and a social artist. Sutcliffe discusses the individual contributions to the current collection in terms of these two approaches. Each originated as a thesis presented between 1972-5, itself a significant factor for planning history, which has developed as a more co-ordinated and collective activity in the intervening period, not least through the advent of the Journal of Planning History.
omissions which will be noted below. There are also occasional travesties of coherence, resulting from adapting the material to its new format: those familiar with the originals may regret the editor's analytical study of professional ideology or Day's evident detailed account of Wythenshawe. Whilst the attempt to outside the chosen period, it represented a logical updating of garden city planning and layout principles and transition towards a post-1945 nation of new towns. Regrettable too is the paucity of illustrations, given which one serious doubts as to whether Harrison's inclusion of three plans of Burnage was really justified. By contrast Day has chosen judiciously from the rich material available to the Parker and Unwin enthusiast, though the lack of the classic block diagrams (1912) is perhaps surprising in view of its seminal significance.

In the introduction Sutcliffe notes the dangers of the biographical approach to planning history, the over-emphasis of the individual at the expense of the urban or political context. Three of his contributors attempt to avoid the overt biography, and even Day's paper on Parker and Unwin originated in an analysis of the evolution of their technical role, though happily his well-researched account of their formative years is included. It is a tenable view that the definition of planning itself, its adoption as a statutory function of government, and above all the foundation of its professional institute in 1900; was the achievement of a handful of individual leaders. Adams, Horstfall, Geddes, Parker and Unwin, and to a lesser extent Howard, Nettelford, Mawson and others, stalk through these pages, often, it is true, seen obliquely, but with their achievement as individuals undiminished in the process. Each generation has need for hero-figures with whom the ideology of common causes can be identified, and planning was the beneficiary of the breadth of vision and commitment of those mentioned above. The present volume does not present such a striking contrast with Goodchild's recently published Pioneers in British Planning as might at first be supposed.

Turning to the individual papers, Gaskell focuses on "the suburban salubrious", the most characteristic feature of planning in the early years of the century, and that codified by the 1909 Housing and Town Planning Act. By 1900 the suburban ideal had filtered down to the more prosperous levels of the working class, and through the workings of the bye-laws even speculative housing was beginning to attain a more open pattern of development. The extension of five per cent philanthropy to co-partnership schemes, the growth of society houses, and the striking examples of Bournville and Port Sunlight were fused into the new model suburbs. Unwin's appointment as consultant architect to the CoPartnership Tenants in 1905 represented a logical extension of his work at New Earswick and note of the co-partnership schemes were widespread, as indicated by Culpin in The Garden City Movement. If the plots of such projects were inevitably restricted to the artisans for tenants were required to invest in the society responsible for the buildings, Gaskell describes a number of suburbs in Lancashire, bringing a degree of overlap with Harrison. Given the relative popularity of the model, and its appeal to a wide political spectrum, it is perhaps surprising that the co-partner role was so totally eclipsed by the state/local authority partnership in 1919. Gaskell's northern perspective has included his examination of this point: a partial answer seems to lie in a confidential and highly critical report of the activities of Co-Partnership Tenants, preserved in the Ministry of Reconstruction files at the Public Record Office. Another Gaskell's account lies in his treatment of statutory planning. The permissive emphasis of the legislation incidental to the preparation of schemes being related to local initiative and enthusiasm. Planning proposals in the north were related to precise and limited aspects of suburban planning on garden city lines, in contrast to the broad brush approach adopted by Nettelford in Birmingham. The ambitious Ruislip Northwood UDC scheme merits only a single mention in the whole book: even Day was possibly unaware of Unwin's extensive involvement as consultant to the major landowners, King's College, Cambridge, and his direct approach to Burns, who overruled Adams' reluctance to include provisions for aesthetic control, and included by Gaskell are discussed purely in terms of local activity, and the crucial role of the Local Government Board inquiries is ignored. The reports of the Board's Inspectors - Adams, succeeded by Pepler and Unwin - form a basic and essential reading to complete the picture and are fortunately preserved in the Public Record Office.

Hawtree takes a broader perspective and a survey of the evidence of town planning through a discussion of the developing and overlapping ideals of the reformers, the outlook of the major land-based professions, and brief biographies covering the core of individuals who shaped town planning and the Institute. The importance of the 1909 Act as a catalyst is well brought out: architects, municipal officers and surveyors had all carried out planning-related activities and laid claims as the co-ordinators of the newly defined process. The architects could point to a heritage of urban design in the Woods of Bath and Nash, and they now convened a town-planning committee, and embarked upon the organisation of an International Conference held at the Royal Academy in 1910. Unwin, although not a member of the RIBA, was a key figure, and unlike most architects had broad experience of the type of planning encouraged by the Act. Engineers were quick to detect a threat to their role and local authority jack-of-all-trades, which they were eager to extend to include planning as part of their "urban gathering of skills", and were the first body to organise town-planning examinations. Surveyors maintained a more detached stance, secure in their position as advisers to the major urban and rural landowners.

From his discussion of the professional bodies, Hawtree turns to Adams, Geddes, Unwin and Mawson who were each well equipped to promote inter-professional cooperation. Of these it was Adams (who had not completed his examinations for the Surveyors' Institution) who conceived the idea of an annual gathering of planning (interesting not town-planners) as a forum for the members of other bodies who were practicing the profession. Hawtree makes the telling point that as individuals they were unknown to each other in 1900; a decade later acknowledged leaders of particular aspects of planning who in its broadest form embraced their varied skills.

Harrison returns to a precise geographic context pre-1914 Manchester. His presentation is the most precise of the four, with a laudable attempt to analyse key factors such as rental and class structure in suburban and co-partnership housing. The environmental dimension of Manchester's reform tradition was
encompassed by the widespread foundation of Healthy Homes societies in the late nineteenth century; educational and sociological aspects were represented by the Ancoats Brotherhood and Manchester University Settlement, whilst the Northern Artworkers Guild, founded in 1896 by Walter Crane, matched its national counterpart in stressing the relevance of good design from the individual object to the community level. Much more than these examples represents Manchester as a rounded microcosm of trends in the national scene. Within this context Horstall emerges as a dynamic and pervasive influence, presenting his proposals for local government reform, the incorporation of suburban land and its development by town-expansion plans following 'The Example of Germany' in 1895, a decade before his recognition. His work was complemented by the sociological approach of Marr, who had assisted Ganneau at the University of Paris under appointment as warden of Manchester University Settlement in 1901. Marr's study of housing conditions in Manchester, service of the contributing paper to the collection, was involved with the Fairfield Tenants estate from 1913-22. Altogether Harrison's presentation confirms the richness and diversity of an approach based upon the study of a key urban centre.

Day's analysis of the contribution of Parker and Unwin to the evolution of site planning theory and practice benefits from his rounded approach to the theme. He points out the possibility of separating Parker and Unwin from each other, so complete and complementary were their skills in the period under review. Neither can their work be separated from their lives, particularly their own formative years which coincided closely with the emergence of British socialism, notably Morris' Socialism, the Fabian Society, and the Arts and Crafts movement. Their emphasis on the fundamentals of design in relation to function, materials and aesthetics soon led them to define a continuum which extended from the individual object to the community, a point first perceived by Crewe. The lineage of New Earswick, Netherton and Hampstead is soundly investigated by Day - although developed by an extension of the reform movement, the first prototype for more general application through planning. The early Earswick housing illustrated by Day formed the basis of a kit of parts, readily applicable to individual sites, and reaching the most consistent level of achievement in Unwin's 70 acre 'artisans quarter at Hampstead. Unwin, peckham's mentor, represented a pivotal figure between nineteenth century reform and the twentieth century strategy of public intervention. His appointment to the Local Government Board, wartime work for the Ministry of Munitions, and his membership of the Tudor Walters Committee (1917-18) personifies this. Rowntree had originally suggested that Unwin be appointed to the Unwin's Interim Committee, and the Report bore the detailed imprint of his techniques and philosophy. Day's account ends with a brief evaluation of the wartime communities - Gretna has strong claims to be the first State-developed town and their international influence, notably upon the US Emergency Fleet Corporation, through the propagation of P.L. Ackerman, who had attended the first Garden City Conference at Bournemouth in 1901. Indeed, Day is the only contributor to give consideration of the housing-dominated British brand of planning, a weakness in the overall structure. Unwin, more than any of the pioneers, could have made good with material drawn from his paper "Urban Planning in England before 1919: International Aspects of a Prophetic Movement", given at the Planning History Group meeting at Cambridge in November 1980. Taken as a whole the collection does not fully cover its subject. The Renaissance of Civic Design is covered, and virtually nothing is included on Aston Webb, a seminal figure whose activities ranged from re-modelling Buckingham Palace and the Mall in the City Beautiful tradition through leadership, with Unwin, of the London Society for Surveying and Development, a pioneer attempt to set the metropolitan region in its overall physical context, to his editorship of London of the Future (1921) which contained perceptive papers on the planning of Greater London. Apart from the commitment of the Liverpool University Department of Civic Design, there is little on planning education in the formative years. The evolution of a literature of town planning gets short shrift - even Unwin's Town Planning in Practice is not fully discussed. No doubt Sutcliffe was guided by material available for certain aspects in this exciting period still need detailed investigation. We are left remarking on the incompleteness of the subject area: as Sutcliffe concludes, "If British planning history, at the very least, can remain an open debate, it can scarcely fail to evolve." This volume will contribute both to the debate and evolution.

Mervyn Miller

Notes and Articles

British members of the Planning History Group will be interested to note that the Committee on Modern Public Records: Selection and Access, appointed by the Lord Chancellor in 1978 under the chairmanship of Sir Duncan Wilson, has now reported (Cmd 8204), March 1981).

The Wilson Committee consider that the present system (established by the Grigg Report of 1954) of two-in-an-erosion and selection is as good as can be reasonably devised. In this system, the first selection is made by the department holding survey and the second five years after its creation and the third by an inspecting
Officer of the Public Records
Office about 25 years after,
_prior to its transfer to the PRO.
The Wilson Committee recommends
the greatest vigilance and effi-
ciency in this process.
Gordon E. Cherry

History of Planning Methodology
Workshop

Michael Breheny reports that sub-
ject to confirmation, the Social
Science Research Council in
British has agreed to fund the
activities of the Workshop during
1982. This is to be used to help
administration and travelling
expenses for four/five Workshop
sessions for British members
during the year, and pay some of
the travelling expenses for one
small international Workshop.

Breheny also reports that consid-
eration is being given to the
establishment of a H.P.M. ar-
chive at the University of Read-
ing and to the award of a grant from the Social
Science Research Council to help set up
the archive. This will pay for
a part-time clerical assistant
who will gather and record the
material, and for certain admin-
istrative costs. The award is
for the calendar year 1982.

Sir Graham Vincent: An Apprecia-
tion

The 1940s were a turning point in
statutory planning, when the role
of both central and local govern-
ment in land-use planning was
transformed. Clearly, the war
had a profound, catalytic effect
on attitudes, and politicians
responded to the unprecedented
demand for more centralised forms
of planning. In a remarkable
burst of energy, legislation was
promoted, ministries restructured,
and fresh prescriptions for the
future written. Whilst the lead-
ing politicians took the credit,
their lines were frequently writ-
ten by skilled administrators and
professionals whose obscurity is
testament to their acceptance of
their role. In the words of
Professor Cullingworth, the
achievements of those years owed
much to 'a relatively small group
of visionaryaries in the civil ser-
service' (Cullingworth, 1975).

One of these shadowy figures was
(Harold) Graham Vincent, who
died at the age of 89 on 5 Nov-
ember 1981. His brief obituary
in The Times recounts how he took
a first in the Mathematical
Tripos at Cambridge and how,
after military service, he en-
ered the Treasury, where he
became Private Secretary to the
Parliamentary Secretary in 1924.
He acted as Private Secretary to
successive Prime Ministers be-
 tween 1928 and 1947. From the
biographies of Stanley Baldwin,
it is clear that his gifts were
much appreciated by the incumb-
ents of that high office (The Times,
7.11.81). Vincent's consider-
able involvement in planning
began in 1940, when Winston
Churchill appointed as Minister of Works and Build-
ings, primarily in order to de-
ploy his outstanding managerial
talents in repairing blitz dam-
age and constructing munitions
and other public works. These
terms of reference were too
narrow for Reith and, after some
considerable inter-departmental
wrangling, Sir John Anderson
secured him the personal respon-
sibility for planning the phys-
ical reconstruction of post-war
Britain (PRO, CAB 67/9). Vin-
cent accepted an invitation
from Reith to take charge of
this aspect of the minister's
duties. Reith later recorded in
his autobiography: 'No one
could have shown greater assid-
uity and devotion ... the credit
for what was accomplished was in
large measure Vincent's' (Reith,
1949).

Vincent's aim was to set up a
central information service on
physical planning, taking as his
model that for statistics and
defence. ForVincent, the only course was
to identify those major issues
which were not the primary concern
of other ministers. Two were
identified: the stabilisation of land values, the
Agriculture, R.S. Hudson, had
written to Churchill, persuading
Reith of setting up a Ministry of
Cranks. He wrote, 'My fear is
that while we are busily engaged
in trying to win the war, these
cranks will be concocting all
sorts of schemes, and when
the war is over and we have the job
of putting a sane agricultural
policy into operation we shall
be faced with a whole series of
theoretical plans and vested
interests which will make our
task quite impossible' (PRO, CAB
67/8). Through correspondence
and meetings with individual
officers, Vincent persuaded the
Ministry that it was in their
own interests to assist in dis-
covering what industries might
be appropriately located in the countryside so that everyone would appropriately respond to the drift of population to the towns and the disturbance of agriculture generally after the war. In response to criticisms from Arthur Greenwood, the Minister without Portfolio, who had a general responsibility for post-war reconstruction, Vincent insisted that nothing was being done to usurp the prerogative of others. The Committee of Inquiry into National Parks and their Special Areas was not set up to steer a countrywide policy, which could be reconciled with the adequate planning of amenities areas in the country (PRO, HLG 92,1).

Vincent subscribed to the view that a central planning authority should be created to collect survey data and collate government policies they related to land use. It would prepare a central plan of national requirements, and recommend improvements to legislation and the central administration of planning. This was not, however, enough for Reith. He wanted to intervene in every area to ensure that planning authorities were conforming with the national plan. Vincent believed this could only be achieved, particularly in wartime, by working through the government departments which held the relevant powers and duties. This was not enough for Reith, who wanted to be his own chief planner, despite his lack of executive powers. An inexperienced speaker in debate, he strove to display activity and achievement where there was in reality none. With increasing stridency, Reith advocated the transference of all (physical) planning responsibilities to his own Ministry.

Such a transfer of statutory powers was eventually approved by the Cabinet in February 1942, with the creation of the Ministry of Works and Planning. The appointment to carry out a factual enquiry in 'the practical needs in certain potential (park) areas'. By December 1942, it was possible to broaden his terms of reference to 'a report on the general issues raised by the concept of national parks' (Cherry, 1975; Sheail, 1975). In order to give the committee more relevance to coastal planning, a coastal physiographer, J.A. Steers, was appointed as 'adviser to the Ministry on scientific matters connected with the preservation of the coastline' (Sheail, 1976).

As Vincent told Pepler in June 1942, these would be the first imitations of a rural amenity survey, which would 'lead up to proposals which will ensure the adequate planning of all amenity areas in the country' (PRO, HLG 92,1).

Lord Portal replaced Reith as minister. A year later, the planning sector of that ministry was again reconstituted - the new Ministry of Town and Country Planning under W.S. Morrison. Throughout the structural changes, Vincent remained not merely Assistant Secretary, continuing to promote research and information services. He became increasingly disenchanted with the trend towards an executive central planning authority, which he later described as 'pitiful'. There was increasing disenchantment with the idea of a 'national planning administrative authority'. As Professor Cullingworth has commented, 'the more political success' (Cullingworth, 1975). For this reason, the interpretative role and personal calibre of individual civil servants and their advisors can have a considerable bearing on how far success is achieved. Unfortunately, many of the key figures in wartime planning slipped into comparative obscurity, and those exciting years consequently lost much of their sharpness (Cherry, 1981, pp. 257-273).
provides a natural home, which
architects and historians have a rel-
ance to reach within the
University; and that, in partic-
ular, initiatives be taken in
these areas already identified as
important to research in the
University:

(a) records relating to children
and records of charitable
bodies, complementary to the
Barnardo archive;

(b) records of bodies in the
field of town planning, com-
plementary to the collection of
papers already deposited in
the University Archival
repositories.

This archives acquisition policy
was agreed following the deliber-
ations of a Working Party on
Archives which was chaired by
Professor E.P. Hennock of the
Department of Modern History.

The University Archives already
holds the papers of the late Lord
Holford (inter alia Lever Profes-
sor of Civic Design at the
University of Liverpool, 1936-47)
of Professor Sir Charles Reilly
(Roscoe Professor of Architect-
ure at Liverpool 1904-33), and of
another one of Professor
Reilly's distinguished students
Mr J.H. Forsaw (inter alia Chief
Architect and Housing Con-
sultant to the Ministries of
Housing and Local Government
and Health 1946-60). The Uni-
versity Archives hopes to re-
ceive the papers of Professor
Sir Patrick Abercrombie (inter
alia Lever Professor of Civic De-
design at Liverpool 1915-35)
dow Professor G.B. Dix, the
present Lever Professor of
Civic Design, when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
versity of Liverpool, 1936-47),
when he has com-
pleted his studies at the Uni-
vertices of national bodies in the
planning field which are at risk,
are asked to contact the University
Archives, P.O. Box 147,
Liverpool, L69 3BX (tel. 051-709-
6022 Ext. 2315 or 3048).

In this context, we are pleased to reproduce, with the kind per-
mission of the University Archi-
vist at Liverpool, a note on the
papers of Sir Charles H. Reilly
(The University of Liverpool Recorder,
No. 81, October 1979). The article
was written by Adrian R. Allan,
Assistant Archivist, and Sheila
M. Turner, a member of the University
Archives' STEP project staff.

The Papers of Sir Charles Reilly

The papers of the late Emeritus
Professor Sir Charles H. Reilly
(Roscoe Professor of Architecture
1904-33) have very generously
been deposited with the University
Archives by his son, the Lord
Reilly. These papers mainly relate to the period after
Sir Charles (who received his
knighthood in 1944) retired from
his Chair at Liverpool, but there are
some early papers relating to his
first period at Liverpool, notably
nine of his Letter Books (1904-16,
in the University Archives), which
illuminate his work both as head of
the School of Architecture and as
a practising architect (in
Liverpool the University's
School of Architecture). In addition,
Reilly's autobiography has long been
acknowledged as one of the major
sources for portraying the feel of the
University in the first three
decades of the 20th century. Inaccurate
parts, and 'goss-
ipy', as Sir Charles himself
admitted it to be, it stands out as
a brilliant portrait of
the University and those personal-
ities who played a major role in its
development. The comments of friends and
were quoted in a Times review, commented that 'you
will find that most of his old
students still carry with them,
on the campus and in the local
community, a sense of the tech-
nical proficiency and flair, an
abiding freshness of mind, a
social conscience, and a phi-
losophical outlook that are the
honourable stigmata of 'Professor
Reilly's Young Men'". The Journal
of the R.I.B.A. devoted two whole
pages to its review, commenting
that 'perhaps it would be safe to
say that no living professor and
no living architect is better
known to the School of
Architecture than the Emeritus
Professor Reilly, and the enormous
success of his school, due entirely
to his consistent energy and
progressive methods, has resulted
through the agency of innumerable
successful students in the adorn-
ment of every town of importance
in this country, and indeed
throughout the British Empire,
with examples of modern archi-
tecture which will remain land-
marks of a great movement that
has come to stay'.

One of the large number of letters
Professor Reilly received in re-
response to his autobiography was
from Mr T. Alwyn Lloyd, a Cardiff
architect, who wrote in 1939:
Liverpool was Mr Lloyd's native
city, and he states that during
his period at the School (of
Architecture and Applied Art) he had previously been the mortuary
of the Infirmary, where I made
friendships with architectural and other students which have lasted
until now'.

Of his former colleagues at the
University, Sir Alfred Dale, the last Principal and first Vice-Chancellor, whose
'natural kindness' he had commen-
ded, Elton felt this was not
good enough; Dale was 'fond of our
natives'; Miss Dorothy Chapman,
Principal of Westfield College,
University of London, 1931-39,
achieved the feminine charm of
University Hall, Liverpool (1911-
Sir Charles had abstracted by a Press Cuttings Bureau from professional journals, the national and local press chronicling his work from his 'retirement' in 1933 right up to a year after his death in 1948, aged 73 years, and related correspondence. Of Reilly's ideas for town improvement, the 'Reilly green' lines which were popularly known, may perhaps emerge as one of the more enduring and influential of his concepts. It is in these post-1933 papers that his visions of communities planned around 'village greens', and with immediate access to a community centre and other amenities required by community life such as clinics, schools, etc. are expounded, and their realisation chronicled, particularly in the aftermath of the Second World War and in the climate which produced the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947. Articles such as 'My Ideal Town', written in 1945, set out his ideas of communities with all the necessary amenities for a satisfactory and orderly communal as well as domestic life provided within them.

The principles of community planning, of small houses grouped around village greens, were incorporated in the scheme (details in the 'Outline Plan for Birkenhead', published in 1947) which Sir Charles Reilly and one of his former students, A.A. Aalen, proposed for the Woodchurch Estate, Birkenhead in response to Birkenhead Corporation's commission to produce an outline plan for Birkenhead. However, this scheme, 'the Hexagon Plan' - the planning of housing together with communal facilities as a series of hexagonal courts with a garden and front door to each residence and a large open space for common use - the fate of being severely criticised by Conservative councillors, and supported by Labour councillors, and was finally rejected. However, the ideas embodied in this plan were not laid to rest, Bilston (in Staffordshire) and Dudley (in Worcestershire) in particular showing an interest. Acquiring special powers under a Local Act of 1947, Dudley Corporation envisaged using the area for providing cultural and communal amenities in the older parts of the borough. Already, in 1946, Sir Charles Reilly had been invited to prepare an outline scheme for the development of Dudley's Old Park Farm site of approximately 90 acres in accordance with the Village Green principle of layout', Mr Derek Bridgewater (another of Sir Charles' former students) being later nominated to carry out the detailed work in connection with this development scheme. The scheme provided for two- and three- and four-bedroomed houses and flats and incorporated, as basic essentials, a community centre or 'Club house' and nursery school, and the incorporation of district heating for the individual houses. The Council at the same time in 1947 agreed to invite a former colleague of Sir Charles, Professor Simey; (late Lord Simey; Charles Booth Professor of Social Science 1939-69, Lecturer, later Senior Lecturer, 1931-39), of the University of Liverpool, to advise on the social problems which it was felt would inevitably arise in an estate developed on a community basis. It was unfortunate that Sir Charles Reilly did not see work commence on the new housing estate at Dudley on modified 'Reilly green' lines in 1950, a year after which the University Press of Liverpool published the Social Science Department's study of Dudley, Social aspects of a town development plan.

The latest papers in date relating to Sir Charles Reilly which Lord Reilly collected are the obituary tributes and articles which appeared not only in the professional journals but also in the local press, reaching perhaps as wide an audience as his own reported speeches and comments, books and articles, published Letters to the Editor, and news of his activities in the provinces in his lifetime. Writing as a former student, later a colleague and friend of Sir Charles, Professor W.G. (later Lord Reilly in Architecture 1933-36, Lever Professor of Civic Design 1936-47) opined that this finest monument maintains his own works of architecture but those of his many students and disciples ... Professor Reilly's school was not only at Liverpool, but wherever architectural students happened to be, and his are now distributed about the world' (as indeed the press cuttings Sir Charles collected bear witness).
played in architectural education, and in particular, the establish-
ment of the Liverpool School of Architecture as a School with a
reputation and influence which reached far beyond these shores.
It is to be hoped that the deposit of Sir Charles Reilly's papers
with the University Archives, together with the other primary and
secondary sources that are already available in Liverpool and an
examination of the buildings he and his students erected, will
courage research and the publication of several studies where-
by his true significance may be revealed.
The papers of Sir Charles Reilly together with the list of the
same, may be consulted in the University Archives, University of
Liverpool, Arts Reading Room, Bedford Street South, Liverpool
L69 3BX (tel. 051-709 6022, ext. 3048) during normal office hours
by prior appointment.
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