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CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

During the Autumn voting took place for the new (1983–85) Executive Committee. You will recall that voting was confined to the non-UK section of the Committee and the following were elected:

Professor A.F.J. Artibise
Dr M. Bannon
Professor B.A. Brownell
Mrs Christiane Collins
Professor D. Hultchanski
Professor C. Silver

Congratulations to all these, but commiserations to Professor Eugenie Birch, to whom we give so many thanks for her services in the past.

The composition of the new Executive is therefore as follows:

U.K.

Mr P.A. Booth (Treasurer), Department of Town and Regional Planning, University of Sheffield.

Professor G.E. Cherry (Chairman), Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham.

Dr G. Gordon, Department of Geography, University of Strathclyde.

Mr J.C. Hancock, College of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham.

Dr M. Hebbert, London School of Economics.

Dr R.J.P. Kalin, Department of Geography, University of Exeter.

Dr A.D. King, Department of Sociology/Building Technology, Brunel University.

Dr Helen Meller, Department of History, University of Nottingham.

Dr J. Sheall (Editor), Institute of Terrestrial Ecology, Monks Wood Experimental Station.

Professor A.R. Sutcliffe (Meetings Secretary), Department of Economic and Social History, University of Sheffield.

Overseas

Professor A.F.J. Artibise, Institute of Urban Studies, Winnipeg.

Dr M.J. Bannon, Department of Regional and Urban Planning, University College Dublin.
Professor B.A. Brownell, Department of Urban Studies, University of Alabama.

Mrs Christiana Collins, Parsons School of Design, New York.

Professor J.B. Cullingworth, College of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, University of Delaware.

Professor D. Hulchanski, School of Community and Regional Planning, University of British Columbia.

Professor D.A. Krueckeberg (Editor for the Americas), Department of Urban Planning & Policy Development, Rutgers University.

Professor P. Marcuse, Division of Urban Planning, Columbia University.

Professor C. Silver, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, Virginia Commonwealth University.

Dr M. Smets, Institute for Urban and Regional Planning, Heverlee, Belgium.

Dr I.C. Taylor, Head of Social Sciences, Athabasca University, Alberta.

Dr S. Watanabe, Building Research Institute, Japan.

Professor W.H. Wilson, Department of History, North Texas State University.

You will find enclosed with this Bulletin your subscription form for 1984. It will be a great help if you would let us have your annual subscription without a further reminder. Also, if you feel you can pay by Banker’s Order, this is so much easier for us to process. It is very nice to record from the Treasurer that annual subscriptions are once again unchanged.

1984 promises to be an eventful year. Looking back through my records, the Group held its first meeting ten years ago, one Saturday in October 1973, when 30 people gathered here in Birmingham to inaugurate our activities. We have come a long way since then, and I hope that in a Bulletin next year the Editor will permit me to reflect on where our work has taken us over the last decade. This may well spark off some interesting further observations from across the world. A ten year history and a very successful Bulletin will not allow us to stand still, and I am very hopeful that during the next twelve months a new international journal in our field will at last be announced. Negotiations for this have taken longer than any of us expected, and no doubt we have been put off course somewhat by an unfavourable economic climate. However, all the indications now are that a commercially viable package, in association with the Bulletin as an irreducible core in the link with our members, will now be possible.

Meetings continue to be held when active participants gather speakers around particular themes. Records of these meetings will appear in the Bulletin where ever possible so that we can all benefit from them. For meetings in the U.K. it is useful for the Treasurer to agree their financial basis, as it is important that the Group attempts to make a little money for its reserves, rather than be put in the position of supporting loss-leaders. The Treasurer is hoping to issue guidelines for prospective leaders of meetings in the future, as this side of our activities needs to have a sound administrative basis. One important conference coming up in 1984 is the Congress arranged by the Dartington Institute, to be held in Liverpool (10–14 July) concerning the renewal of urban parks. The title, ‘Green Towns and Cities’, gives the flavour of what is being proposed. A number of co-sponsors have been recruited, including the Landscape Institute and the National Association of Olmsted Parks. You may like to know that I have offered the Planning History Group as an additional co-sponsor. This Anglo-American Congress will bring together policy makers, landscape designers, park administrators and historians, and I am hoping that a special meeting of the Planning History Group will be held as part of the programme.

There is much to look forward to, therefore, and to all our members I extend every good seasonal wish.

Professor Gordon E. Cherry

Treasurer’s Communications

The Group’s subscription has been held at £4.00 for 1984, and represents increasingly good value for money. Payment is due on 1st January and arrangements for payment are the same as last year’s. As always, prompt payment is important to keep the Group’s finances on an even keel.

Philip Booth
MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

London 1919–1950

The programme of this Planning History Group Conference, which focuses on 'Metropolitan development and planning' has already been circulated. It will be held at Birkbeck College, University of London, on 13 January 1984, and particulars can be obtained from Merle Abbott, Department of Geography, Birkbeck College, 5-15 Gresse Street, London W1. An attempt is being made to track down the COI film on the Abercrombie London Plans for showing at the conference. Further meetings on London planning are proposed for the future.

Regional Cities 1890–1950

The Spring Conference of the Planning History Group will be held on March 23–24, 1984, at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow. The theme will be Regional Cities 1890–1950. A varied programme of 11 papers has been prepared and booking details may be obtained from George Gordon, Department of Geography, University of Strathclyde, Livingstone Tower, 26 Richmond Street, Glasgow G1 1XH.

Green Towns and Cities

A major UK/USA Congress on renewal of urban parks and the greening of cities will take place in Liverpool between 10 and 14 July 1984.

The Congress will bring together policy-makers, planners, landscape designers, park administrators, historians, voluntary bodies and others from Britain, America and Europe, with a view to raising the level of understanding and action on both sides of the Atlantic.

Co-sponsors of the Congress are Dartington Institute, the Landscape Institute and the National Association of Olmsted Parks. Many other organisations have offered their support, including the Planning History Group.

Further details can be obtained from Michael Dower or Sandra Higgins at the Dartington Institute, Dartington, Totnes, South Devon TQ9 6JE.

Development of Planning Thought

Five papers made up a successful symposium, organised jointly by the Geography of Planning Study Group and the Historical Geography Study Group of the Institute of British Geographers, at the latter's annual conference in Edinburgh in January. Gordon Cherry set the theme by reviewing the origins of British planning experience. John Sheall looked at the influence of external constraints on the progress made in land-use planning during the inter-war period. Derek Gunby cited the experience of Teesside during the 1920s to highlight the various perspectives and values displayed by politicians, officials, professional planners and land-owning interests. Mark Long showed how map-making technology and the importance attached by planners to survey and mapping have influenced the process of planning. Andrew Dawson concluded the symposium by outlining how the notion of Transferable Development Rights had been applied to New Jersey.

JOHN HANCOCK
College of St Paul's & St Mary

The Beginnings of Modern Town Planning: the Bad Homburg Symposium

There is, unfortunately, no room to provide a full list of all the eighteen contributors, and the titles of the many papers given, to the conference held in June 1983 as the second in a series on the Growth of Town Planning in Germany organised by Gerhard Fehl and Juan Rodriguez-Lorente of the Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule, Aachen. The theme was 'reformism' in the field of town planning in Europe and North America in the nineteenth cen-
Differences in interpretation also emerged during a related discussion on the theories of urban land-rent. One participant questioned the continuing existence of land-rent as such, claiming that land prices should be seen exclusively as a function of productive investment in land (development and building costs, etc.). This view met with general disbelieve. In view of the empirical data to hand. In a fine historical account of 'Economics and urban development: the theoretical models of urban land rent before the turn of the century', Helmut Brede made some useful connections with present-day developments in Frankfurt which suggested the continuing influence of pure land rent. In this writer's view, he failed, however, to put forward any really coherent theory of urban land rent. A major controversy, arising perhaps partly out of a misunderstanding, touched upon the historical method needed to deal with the subject-matter in question. In discussing his paper, 'The public health movement and its influence on British urban policy, 1875-1914', A. Sutcliffe commented how many of us, coming from different directions, are turning to history, but what are we getting out of it? Sutcliffe seemed to suggest the need for a double purpose, adding that 'we must have a very clear historical method'. He meant by that a structuralist approach, focussing on: (1) rapid accumulation of capital, (2) technological developments, and (3) rising population, as the determining factors of the new developments that were predominantly concentrated in major cities in the nineteenth century. Sutcliffe seemed to imply that the approaches exemplified by Rodriguez-Lorez. Carlo Olmo and Giorgio Piccinato represented an 'idealist theory of city planning'. In this respect, Sutcliffe agreed principally with G. Albers. It is possible that the charge of 'idealism' may be explained as a distorted perception generated by the 'pragmatic' or 'practical' approach, expressed by a considerable number of urbanists both in Britain and the U.S. In his distrust of concepts that reminded him, perhaps, of Fourier's kind of disorder, or chaos, Sutcliffe seemed to neglect the fact that, in his case study of sanitary reform, Rodriguez-Lorez described how the concept of order was derived empirically. All its planning instruments were aimed at the establishment of a kind of order, that of the absence of conflict within the bourgeois and of 'pacification' and 'integration' of the working class of 'orderliness' and 'controlled' growth of the city. It was in an attempt to bring about a stable situation in purely practical terms that solutions for housing shortages, exorbitant rents, ill-health among working class populations, questions of 'social control' in the face of discontent, and the irrational distribution of industrial zones. It seems fair to characterise the actual development of modern city policy as a chaos-limiting process, especially in view of the fact that its nineteenth-century advocates never ceased to describe it as ORDER or, at least, THE BEST POSSIBLE OF ALL WORLDS.

The real controversy between Sutcliffe and the Italian approach (with whom he obviously included Rodriguez-Lorez) seems to be the question of the validity of structuralist approaches to the analysis of urban development in italy during the nineteenth century. Piccinato outlined the importance of an analysis of the distribution of political forces (above all the relations of urban landed property) It was mainly on this premise that H. Bodenschatz (in a paper entitled 'The debate concerning the reorganisation of the historic town pattern: aims, models, instruments. The Berlin example') called into question the 'structuralist' approach of Sutcliffe. It neglected politically-determined factors, and was 'economistic'. In his paper, 'Social policy and urban policy in Turin, 1860-1910', Carlo Olmo underlines the overwhelming impact of the 'industrial bloc' (Blocco industriale - a Gramscian concept) on the formation of the modern city of Turin. Rodriguez-Lorez used this case study, in discussion at the conference, to argue against any consistently 'structuralist' approach that can hold out the possibility of finding 'elemental' or 'structural' laws that will be valid everywhere and under all circumstances, within a given epoch or mode of production. According to Rodriguez-Lorez, the Turin example demonstrated how it is a concrete situation that determines the concrete development of a given city. The strength of the agrarian and urban landowners, and the initial weakness of the industrial bourgeoisie, helped to explain why the circumstances of urban development were different in Germany from those in Turin. And even here, the situation at each epoch was far from being identical. Despite support for the general assumption that the relations of property (particularly in its form as urban real estate) may well have played a key role. It is only by way of concrete empirical research that the actual mechanisms, or 'laws', of urban development can be laid bare. Here, we have a dialectic of the general and the specific. The more we acquire empirical material on different cities, the more accurate our picture will become, and the more valid and complex will our conclusions on the 'laws' governing development of the modern capitalist city in Europe during the nineteenth century. Here is a very clear statement, which is large enough to handle the differences between the 'structuralist' approach, followed by Sutcliffe and his French colleagues, the 'Italian' approach that may indeed be linked. In a way, with the name of Gramsci. The basic question touched upon here is of fundamental importance in deciding the very direction of urban planning-history research. During the conference, it lay behind a great number of empirical case studies that sought to cover the various approaches to reform. Urban planning-historians should become more aware of its 'hidden' existence, and discuss it more openly.

ANDREAS WEILAND

1. A research project, along these lines, is currently being carried out by Gerhard Fehl and J. Rodriguez-Lorez at the Institute of Planning Theory in Aachen.
Hiroshima’s Planning History

The Japanese Planning History Group held its fifth Summer Seminar in Hiroshima on 15-16 July 1983. This year’s theme was ‘Hiroshima’s Planning History: the evolution of a Military and A-Bomb City’, and about 30 members attended the seminar. As is the established pattern of these seminars, the afternoon of the first day was devoted to presentations and discussions followed by an evening party. The second day took the form of a guided tour of the now completely-built city and its suburbs.

The presentations were given by Dr Sugimoto, Associate Professor of Hiroshima University, on ‘The Urban Structure of Pre-War Hiroshima’; Mr Kanezama, a former deputy Mayor of Hiroshima City, on ‘The Government’s War Reconstruction Programme’; and Dr Ishimaru, of Hiroshima University, a PHG member and organiser of the Seminar, on ‘The Physical Changes in the City brought about by the War Reconstruction Programme’.

The basic idea of the Summer Seminar is to spend two days in the ‘case city’ in order to learn and discuss the planning history of the various Japanese cities. The case cities chosen so far have been Tsukuba (1979), Nagoya (1980), Yokohama (1981) and Tokyo (1982). Kyoto and Osaka are possibilities for 1984. For detailed information, please contact Dr Shun-Ichi J. Watanabe, Associate Director, Building Research Institute, Ministry of Construction, Ohashi, Ibaraki-ken 305, Japan (Telephone 0298-64-2151 ext. 421).

SHUN-ICHI J. WATANABE

Recent Urban-Past Records and Research

The Regional Conference of the British Records Association was held at Sheffield on 17 September 1983, attended by a mixed audience of archivists and researchers. It was encouraging that some archivists, recognising the profound importance of record of the recent urban past, had travelled substantial distances to attend.

The lead-off paper, by Allen Chinnery (Leicestershire Museums, Art Galleries and Record Services) highlighted the relatively low revenue and capital expenditure on archive services. Less attention was afforded to urban records than to ‘county council’ and estate records. He reflected on his own pioneer study of the provenance of the archives based on his survey ‘URSA’ in 1970.

Brian Barber (West Yorkshire Joint Archives Service) provided an in-depth analysis of municipal socialism, drawing largely from his published work on Leeds, but in a more general context. He mentioned the general themes: fear of centralisation; financial constraints through unwillingness to increase the borough rates; the Treasury Grant ploy, the inter-relationship between private bill and general legislation; the failure of private companies, leading to an excess of supply and competition. He also analysed in detail the enabling and compulsory legislation: how far permissive legislation had any practical effect; and the introduction of general legislation for each aspect of municipal powers. During discussion Richard Childs (Sheffield Archives) drew attention to the importance of ancillary or supporting papers, namely the files of Town Clerks’ correspondence, draft proofs of evidence, draft and annotated bills - all of which may survive in profusion in Town Halls. This point was supported by Allen Chinnery who commented on the line, continuous series of T. C’s correspondence at Leicester, and by Elizabeth Stazlicker (Surrey Record Office) who remarked to find out what might lie in the offices of the Parliametary Agents of local authorities. It is not enough to rely on the formal minutes and the (potentially biased and inaccurate accounts in newspapers.

Gwynn Rowley (University of Sheffield) illustrated his detailed survey (with a SSRC grant) of the Fire Insurance Plans produced for inner urban areas. The potential use of these plans had been realised in the States, but rather neglected in this country. Dr Rowley has compiled an inventory and distribution map of the availability of the plans. He related how they could be used to show architectural development, and spatial and functional changes in the urban centre. Dr Colin Treen (Leeds Polytechnic) produced a profusely illustrated account of his research into the development of North Leeds, recently published in F. M. L. Thomson, (ed) ‘The Rise of Suburbs’ (Leicester, 1982). The discussion brought to mind the Daunton/Whitehead/Cannadine debate on the urban fringe. We were again in the world of landownership and suburban development: how far did landowners control and initiate development? Was there residential differentiation or segregation? Unlike the Castor’s consolidated estate in Edgbaston, North Leeds was an area of distributed landownership. In a closely argued account, Dr Treen analysed the development of the villages into suburbs, and constantly referred to the fine series of estate plans as well as O.S. maps. There survived an excellent archive of Thomson’s papers, revealing motives and objectives in sum, the suburbs happened.

Promoted by a group of concerned archivists, a Study Group was formed to assess: the current state of archival attention to urban records; the possibility of a classification scheme for urban records; and to promote and publicise the task in hand. Anyone interested in the progress of the Study Group may contact G.A. Chinnery, Richard Childs or Elizabeth Stazlicker. Thanks are due to Allen Chinnery, for help and encouragement in arranging the meeting. Richard Childs for his exhibition on ‘Municipalising the Monopolies’, and to the BBA and staff at Stephenson Hall.

DAVID POSTLES
Sheffield City Archives

Urban Growth and Agriculture

In a lecture to Section M1 of the conference of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in August 1983, Professor Robin H. Best of Wye College, University of London, drew attention to the marked decline in the annual loss of farmland due to urban growth in England and Wales - a trend which was in complete contradiction to conventionally-held views.

The fastest rate of farmland loss to urban extension was fifty years ago in the 1930s. At that time, and especially in the more prosperous Home Counties, there was a house-building boom. This was the decade when detached or semi-detached suburban villas came into their own, stimulated by cheap supplies of land, labour and capital. Equally important was the desire of an increasing number of people who could afford it to escape from the old, cramped and dreary towns to more open semi-rural surroundings. In the new suburbs, dwellings and gardens were built at a density of no more than 30 to the hectare.

Assisting this trend was the fact that farming was at a very low ebb, so that building land was readily and inexpensively available. It was said that the farmer’s best crop was houses. Even more to the point was that planning controls were virtually non-existent. In consequence, many parts of the country saw an amorphous, unregulated sprawl of development take place which was often enormously wasteful of agricultural land. Under these conditions, it is not surprising to find that, at this period, the loss of farmland to urban use in England and Wales rose to its all-time peak with a transfer of over 25,000 ha per year between 1931 and 1939.

The wartime period brought an abrupt end to the suburban boom. Conversely, as might be expected, the early post-war years saw an immediate and marked rise in urban demands on land. But these began to be restricted in a number of ways. First, the
gathering economic crisis applied a brake. Arguably most important of all in the long-term, however, was the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 (and subsequent legislation) which laid the foundations for effective land planning by development control and the long-continued policies of urban containment and the safeguarding of agricultural land. The result was impressive; the scale of farmland conversion in the 1930s was reduced by a much smaller average of about 16,000 ha per year. With fairly limited fluctuations, this lower rate of transfer persisted for the best part of three decades from 1945 to 1975—perhaps one of the greatest contributions made by planning towards the conservation of our rural land resources.

After the mid-1970s the situation again changed. The deepening recession reduced urban pressures on rural land, and by the 1980s, some of the lowest losses of farmland since records were first kept began to be registered. The annual average rate in the five years to 1980 was about 9,000 ha. By the early 1980s, it was under 8,000 ha, or half the rate of the three previous decades.

Professor Best went on to describe how urban encroachment is largely confined within a broad corridor stretching from Marseyside in the north-west, down through the Midlands, to London and the south-east coast. Within this ‘axial belt’, however, there has been a great deal of variation locally as well as temporally. These variations indicate that urban growth often runs contrary to population change because of the overriding effect of alterations in urban space standards (higher or lower densities) used in new development. Throughout the period since the war, the most highly productive agricultural areas of the country, like East Anglia, have been relatively untouched by urban encroachment.

This largely satisfactory state of affairs at both national and regional levels could well persist, as long as the planning system in this country is not weakened. Unfortunately, the last few years do not give cause for confidence in this respect. Should the erosion of planning be allowed to continue, a serious upturn in land losses could result if and when the economy improves.

REVIEWS


This book is a sumptuous object. Its profuse illustrations seem more real than life, celebrating this often and most overlooked of buildings, the terraced house. One could stare for hours at the magnificent full-plate dust cover, almost the apotheosis of the ordinary house in its road, down to the very waste paper in the gutter.

We have here a fascinating compendium of historical terraced houses of all degrees, from single-storey miners’ houses to the ‘tightly packed palaces’ of the aristocracy. It reflects the author’s love and curiosity for the subject. In its concern for such details as deeds, covenants, bricks, stairs, window technology and many other matters that are seldom considered, it is reminiscent of the painstaking but ever fresh detail of the first Muthesius, or of Thomas Webster’s Domestic Encyclopedia of the 1840s.

Since today terraced housing still makes up nearly a third of the total English housing-stock, and since it is the normal backdrop of most urban scenes from London to Bristol, Cambridge to York (not to mention villages and towns), a book that is wholly devoted to the terraced house should be an important contribution to housing literature. Is this book, in fact, as important as, from its presentation, we should expect it to be?

The answer is a qualified ‘no’. The author’s particular expertise in architecture and art history gives it many unique and valuable slants that others have overlooked: for instance, that eighteenth-century grand terraces were built where space and residents’ wealth would have permitted villas; insights into the use or more often non-use of back yards and gardens in this period: the minute detail of façades and their symbolism. Some of the themes touched upon only what the appetite for more—changes in usage of streets, for instance. Even in a book of seventeen chapters that packs in so much detail, it is perhaps unreasonable to expect more in the way of in-depth treatment. There remain, however, many subjects such as domestic technology and domestic service that receive only a cursory review.

The book can be criticised more justifiably for the way it lacks either a unity of style or that of what is significant within the framework of priorities. This is, perhaps, surprising in a book with the title The English Terraced House. 1980 was almost the first Munthe’s and Webster’s, and I doubt that it could hardly be more precise in saying what the book should contain. Perhaps it is an example of what one is often telling students? A subject area is not the same as a theme, and not at all the same as a problem.

Here we find a randomness in arrangement, where ponderous social and economic aspects are left to the last chapter, and where the order of earlier chapters takes little account of whether laws, technology or building should be given priority. The book is not nearly so successful in this respect, as John Burnett’s vastly ambitious Social History of Housing, which considers many major themes in relation to one another, getting them into the right balance. Indeed, one wonders if the terraced house is really a very helpful category round which to frame a book. Many of the constraints, whether of technology, services, social assumptions, and legal considerations, if not architectural and site planning, would apply to any sort of housing—detached or semi-detached, as well as terraced.

It may be this lack of perspective that accounts for the fuzzy and edginess of the book. Muthesius sees the Domestic Revival as formally marking the end of the terraced house, although ‘as early as 1840 the terrace had ceased to be fashionable’. He relates this to a new, but not clearly expounded, practice and ideology in family and domestic life. Rather surprisingly, he does not mention Port Sunlight, which seemed to be an obvious link between the terrace (rather than the row of houses) and the domestic, or at any rate, the medieval, revival. Regrettably, he does not continue the story into the twentieth century, and include the early L.C.C. cottage estates, the classic World War estates like Wall Hall, and the contemporary ‘town houses’. Another serious omission is the absence of discussion on the practical significance for users of living in houses that have no sides, and are therefore prone to the problems of party-wall noise, limitation of access, and orientation. In other words, what are the implications of living in an ‘end of terrace’?

Because of the lack of a dominating theme or framework of argument, this book, like all catalogues, is open to the criticism of why these and other aspects were left out. In view of the wealth of knowledge and interest that it otherwise displays, this is a pity. It is a history of the physical shell, which does not expose to view the key social, economic or personal variables. It lacks the verve of polemic that so brilliantly carries off Dunroamin: The suburban semi and its enemies, by Oliver, Davis and Bentley. This beautiful volume will sit on the shelf as a source book rather than a text book which is daily thumbed over and quarried for ideas.

ALISON RAVEZ
School of Hospitality Management and Home Economics
Leeds Polytechnic

If we follow the history of containment back to its source, we retrace the history of town planning itself. The creation of green belts as instruments of planning policy has in itself been part of the wider story of development plans. Going back beyond the last forty years, the great variety of proposals for green belts was very much part of the campaigning stage of planning history. Lord Meath's plan in 1901, envisaging a protective girdle of open spaces around London, proved to be the first of several in a similar vein. In the nineteenth century, and well before the possibilities of statutory control over urban growth, all utopian schemes idealised the small settlement and sought the restoration of the natural balance between town and country.

Richard Munton indicates something of this rich and varied history, but his prime concern is with contemporary green belt policy, particularly for London. The main purpose of the book is to address those issues that relate to the implementation of green belt policy, which has been part of the planning powers in London for over a century. The second relates to the changing nature of the green belt, which has evolved from its original purpose of controlling growth to a more multifaceted role in contemporary planning. The book covers the ground well, and represents a helpful contribution to our understanding of this well-known and enduring instrument of planning. Although the focus is on current problems and policies, there is plenty of interest for the planning historian. Indeed, the most intriguing question of today may be essentially historical: How is it that green belt policy, which won central government support as long ago as 1955, has apparently enjoyed more or less unwavering support ever since? For all the political, economic and social changes since 1955, green belts have proved to be remarkably resilient. Policies have changed little over time.

The answer to this intriguing question seems to be twofold. On one hand (as Munton demonstrates well), the implementation of green belt policy can embrace a variety of permissible options. In spite of appearing to be very static, it is, in fact, a very adaptable instrument of policy. A second and related explanation may be that the green belt can appeal to a plurality of interests. People at opposite ends of the political spectrum can find something to love about a green belt. To illustrate this latter point, it is worth recalling that a Labour-controlled London County Council in the 1930s initiated the far-sighted scheme to preserve countryside permanently by acquisition for the recreational enjoyment of Londoners. As any planner knows, the fiercest defenders of this land are now the inhabitants of Conservative-controlled towns and villages in and around the green belt itself. No doubt there is a moral in this somewhere.

DENNIS HARDY
Middlesex Polytechnic


A good up-to-date history of city planning in the United States is badly needed. Mel Scott's American City Planning since 1890 focusses narrowly (and often selectively) on the history of the formal profession. Further, it begins with 1890, and was published in 1971. John Rep's The Making of Urban America, the classic in the field, does not cover recent developments, and focuses primarily on plans for the physical layout of cities. The book by Mumford, Tunnard, Creese, Galland and Warner make no pretence at comprehensiveness of coverage. A number of recent articles (many in the Journal of the American Planning Association) illuminate particular aspects of planning history, but they do not provide a picture of the evolution of the whole.

Donald Krueckeborg's new collection, Introduction to Planning History in the United States, does not come together as a whole either - nor, to be fair, does it try to do so. It collects and makes accessible in one place a number of the better known, and some not as well known, articles on planning history that have appeared in the United States in the last twenty years (the oldest actually appeared in 1960). It also includes two excerpts from books, one by Allan Jacobs, from Making City Planning Work, about San Francisco, the other from Alan Altshuler's The City Planning Process. The case study of freeway planning in and around St. Paul. These are generally available, and their inclusion here is somewhat redundant.

One primarily gets case studies, rather than a broad historical account of planning history. The answer to this intriguing question seems to be twofold. On one hand (as Munton demonstrates well), the implementation of green belt policy can embrace a variety of permissible options. In spite of appearing to be very static, it is, in fact, a very adaptable instrument of policy. A second and related explanation may be that the green belt can appeal to a plurality of interests. People at opposite ends of the political spectrum can find something to love about a green belt. To illustrate this latter point, it is worth recalling that a Labour-controlled London County Council in the 1930s initiated the far-sighted scheme to preserve countryside permanently by acquisition for the recreational enjoyment of Londoners. As any planner knows, the fiercest defenders of this land are now the inhabitants of Conservative-controlled towns and villages in and around the green belt itself. No doubt there is a moral in this somewhere.

DENNIS HARDY
Middlesex Polytechnic

John Bauman's account of planning during and immediately following World War II, with Philadelphia used as a case study, is a useful but incomplete survey, focusing on New York, and making an interesting, if unbalanced, comparison between the approaches of a Lewis Mumford and those of a Robert Moses. Petersen recounts an important part of the earlier history of planning: the laying out of sanitary infrastructure by many working under quite erroneous theories of the origins of disease, but nonetheless contributing significantly to the shaping of American cities. But no general conclusions about the relationship between infrastructure planning and urban planning are drawn. In the second of his articles included in the book, Petersen argues that the municipal arts, civic improvement, and outdoor art 'movements' contributed significantly to the broader City Beautiful movement just after the turn of the century. Just what difference that made, why it was important, or how it changed the course of planning in the US is not made clear. And the differentiation between Petersen and Allen Davies' subsequent account of the early playgrounds and housing reform movement are left unresolved.

The case studies of events in the inter-war period are likewise interesting, but again give a very episodic picture of what was happening. Eugenie Birch's account of Radburn is informative and well written, not only in respect of the development of Radburn itself in the late 1920s, but also in terms of the intellectual history of the ideas it represented. It is a telling if unintentional irony that Krueckeborg, in his Introduction, should label this 'new town' planned for 30,000 people as one of the great symbols of the American planning movement. 'The town never accommodated more than 3,000 people.'
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in point, examining the one theoretical difficulty that comes closest to providing the book as a whole with a unifying theme. He argues that the critical shortcomings of America's post-war housing and redevelopment can be traced to “conflicting visions.” These visions were, on the one side, those of the "regionalists", interested in the "deconcentration of the older industrial cities", and the "house-redevelopers", interested in "restoring life to the empty central city." A "separate school of urban redevelopment (also) emerged... possessing a unique vision of the post-war city." This school was more concerned about commercial redevelopment of the downtown core than with providing housing for low income families. That conflicts of economic and social interests were involved here, conflicts which produced (not were produced by) "alternative visions", may be dimly perceived through the account. According to Marcuse, however, it is ideas, and particularly the ideas of planners, that are decisive.

This also seems to be the interpretation of the editor in his Introduction. He traces "three independent ideas" which arose and "gradually began to converge toward the concept of city planning. These were "scientific efficiency", "civic beauty", and "social equity". True enough, the intellectual history of city planning may include these and other ideas. The real roots of planning, however, can also be traced to the changing demands of very specific groups and interests. While Krueckberg and most of his contributors occasionally recognise this underlying set of causative factors, it is hardly touched upon in most of the articles.

The three case studies selected to represent planning since World War II all illustrate the point. Altschuler writes about St. Paul, Jacobs San Francisco, and Krumholz about New York. John K. Walton's focus of the activities of one of the most progressive ventures in local planning for the 10 years of its existence (1969-1979). Each is a study of political and economic conflict, how it shaped plans and how planners responded to them and occasionally tried to shape them. Ideology may motivate some individuals, but the forces that will ultimately decide what can be achieved are not individual ideas but the compromises made between groups with power. That dimension of planning history is unfortunately largely missing from the accounts of earlier developments.

A good current history of planning in the United States is still needed. Until it is produced, the reader has made available some solid accounts of a few pieces of that history.

PETER MARCUSE
Graduate School of Architecture and Planning
Columbia University


Geographical pedants and readers of a nationalistic bent will wish to know that, despite its title, this fascinating book by John Walton deals with Welsh seaside resorts as fully as the English resorts, but not with those of Scotland or Ireland.

The author began by undertaking a study of Blackpool alone. He was happily persuaded by Professor Dyos to expand his horizons and to survey the whole range of very varied seaside towns in a single volume. The advice was good, and the result is an illuminating insight into an important element of our social and urban fabric. The book is not without its weaknesses. The author frankly and modestly admits (he should not have done; confessions are the first things that reviewers spot) that the book is certainly not the last word on the seaside and that it may raise at least as many questions as it resolves. He has made a fair judgement. He does not explain sufficiently fully why seaside recreation was for so long a characteristically British phenomenon. He is rather light on the influence of railways on urban form, and, sadly for this History Group, his chapter on the planning and building of seaside resorts is rather too sketchy. But to have expected much more on such an intricate subject in 25 pages is perhaps to demand too much.

On the positive side is the detail and interest of the changing social history of seaside towns, lightly and refreshingly presented. The book proper begins with an exploration of the rapid growth of demand for seaside holidays, particularly in the Victorian and Edwardian periods. This leads to a study of the population, local and visiting, of the resorts and to an examination of their economies and social composition. As one might imagine, both was mixed and generated a predictable set of problems which, by sensible compromise and local government intervention, one way or another were accommodated. But conflict there was - of economic activity, of land usage and of social class. The chapter with planning and building focuses mainly on the influences of land ownership upon development. It is followed by a sharp change of direction in a section which covers seaside entertainment and styles of holiday-making. It is in this section that the true flavour of the social diversity of seaside towns emerges, in which the conflicts are most clearly revealed. We see the nature of present-day resorts beginning to emerge. Economy and society within each resort were presented with a choice - to adhere to the respectability, selectiveness and perhaps diminished economic returns of the upper end of the market, or to encourage a mass market mix of frivolous amusements and modest accommodation in the hope of maximising profits. In the context of the remaining parts of the book, this final section helps to explain why Brighton differs from Howe, or Why from Llandudno, in their "social tone".

Though not perfect, the book is interesting, readily scholarly, and makes a contribution in a generally neglected area of study. It is a helpful essay in social history that throws considerable light upon an important and rapidly changing type of urban centre - one which has changed recently as a result of competition from abroad and changing recreation patterns, and ever since therapeutic society. Though perhaps modest level of popularity in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

DAVID THOMAS
Department of Geography
University of Birmingham


In 1966 the late H. J. Dyos organised a symposium on urban history. The proceedings were eventually published as *The City and Urban History* (1968). The symposium and the book marked the emergence of urban history in Britain. Jim Dyos proposed to hold a further conference to take stock of development, but his untimely death intervened. The project, however, was carried forward and the papers presented at a meeting in 1980 form the basis of *The Pursuit of Urban History*. Although the editors indicate that considerable modifications have been made. Not all the conference papers appear, whilst others have been added. The volume is organised into three 'books': Book One is called 'Defining the Urban' and itself made up of three parts entitled respectively 'A Town is a Town Wherever it Is', 'The Early Modern Town', and 'Perceiving the Urban'. Book Two is called 'The City as an Economic and Social Entity' and its three constituent parts are 'The Creation of the Urban Environment', 'The Visible City' and 'Urban Society'. Book Three, 'In Pursuit of Urban History', has only two parts, 'The Effort to Understand' and 'The Practice of Urban History'. The whole volume, divided into these books and parts, contains 23 chapters plus an introduction by the editors.
Considered in toto, here is certainly no symmetrical and classic building founded on the rock of an accepted urban theory. Rather, it is a ramshackle structure resting on the quicksands (one author uses the analogy) of urbanism as more than a dependent variable. In addition, it is never clear whether the structure was devised first and each author given a brief or whether the contributions were assembled and then classified into the component parts by the editors in order to give some coherence. There is certainly a beginning - The Nature of Urbanization - and an end - The Nature of Urban History - but generally the structuring is arbitrary and many chapters could equally as well appear in other parts. Perhaps this does no more than reflect the incoherence of the subject, a point which will be taken up later.

It is impossible to discuss each chapter in a short review so that the most appropriate approach is to consider some issues raised by the book. Three suggest themselves. The first is the interdisciplinary character of urban history which was so characteristic of the first conference, the second is the general scope of this volume and the third, and the most significant, is whether urban history in the last decade has achieved a formal identity and can now be considered as a discrete discipline.

An immediate reaction to a comparison with the 1988 publication is to record a certain circumscription. In the present edition, as reordered and rethought, the absence of a consideration of urban history as a discipline is disconcerting and defensible. It is symptomatic that all the contributors appear in their brief biographies as historians of one sort or another. The exceptions are one co-author and Professor Pahl, both in Departments of Sociology. Professor Pahl, in his introductory piece, in the guise of the Clown or Fool at a medieval court. Under the cloak of an amusing diversion he gives tongue to those penetrating and critical comments which the courtiers are afraid to utter.

If the disciplinary breadth of the book is disappointing, so too is the historical reach. Apart from three papers devoted to the early modern town, and they are among the more interesting and readable, the book is concerned mainly with the period after 1800. In some cases down to the present. There is nothing on medieval towns, Barley's edited volume, European Towns: Their Archaeology and Early History (1971) merits a desultory but his edited C.B.A. Research Report The Plans and Topography of Medieval Towns in England and Wales (1976) does not even get a mention. Lobel's atlas volumes on Historic Towns (1969, 1972) have no place, although surely a major component of urban history - neither does Barlow and Bidwell's extensive and important work on Winchester. It is strange that urban history, which has been so occupied with the early borough, should now be pursued so exclusively in relation to the nineteenth century. Perhaps the reason is the accessibility of data, but one has the suspicion it is an inheritance from those other disciplines in the social sciences from which urban history at least in part derived its stimulus and which it now appears to drown.

Finally there is the major and central issue, which is taken up by several of the authors, as to whether urban history can be considered an independent, systematic and discrete part of the broader subject of which it is an offshoot. This revolves about the problem as to whether the city can be considered as an independent variable creating social and economic consequences peculiarly its own, or whether it is a dependent variable reflecting, in its own way it is true, political, economic and social processes which are universal: at least within cultural realms. There are some brave attempts to defend the first position, but they remain unconvincing. By the time he was involved in the preliminary work on this symposium, Dyos had abandoned the position that a coherent systematic subject could be developed. 'Urban history', he said, 'is no discipline. It is not even a clear-cut field. It has to be regarded as a kind of strategy, an operational strategy' (p. 421). Ultimately, Pahl's critique is irrefutable, and of course it applies with equal validity to any study prefixed with the adjective urban, whether it be archaeology, econometrics, geography, sociology or literature. But this in no way undermines the pursuit of urban history, it simply places it in proper perspective and unveils the mixed approaches are adopted. Critical insights into historical processes can be derived from the urban situation. Ultimately, theory cannot be developed in a vacuum, it is derived from the consideration of empirical study.

The tone of this review has been properly critical in an attempt to assess the difficulties which the burgeoning field of urban history faces. But it is also imperative to record that, without exception, the chapters are highly professional and valuable. They present new ideas and always stimulate interest. The book will certainly achieve what it set out to accomplish, it will become a landmark on the progressing path of urban history. It is a fit and proper memorial to Jim Dyos and that, perhaps, is the best summary and an appropriate evaluation of its worth. It is a great pity that at its present price it will be beyond the reach not only of students but of most academic urban historians as well. Perhaps a paperback version might be possible, even if it means some chapters are omitted; it would be very welcome.
The positive achievements are exemplified for Esher in Newcastle, with its metro and Byker, and in Sheffield where, outside the city, a planning scheme ‘began urban transformation’ has been achieved in Gleadless, ‘one of the prettiest suburbs in England’, and in the ‘great faceted cliffs’ of Park Hill where increasing ‘crowning edifices’ of Hyde Park. He does, however, acknowledge the social failure of at least the last of these.

By the early 1960s the consensus has attained its climax. He claims that ‘History will probably record the Beatles Age as a genuinely creative movement, and British planning and architecture the most soundly conceived and the most healthily various in the world’. But the doubt implied by that word, probably is reinforced when in the same paragraph he goes on to say that ‘History will also recognise that the cells of Liverpool (the very birthplace of the Beatles Age) had to be destroyed’ in the name of proper and economical planning. In the end, a consensus based on comprehensive redevelopment had within itself the seeds of its collapse.

Esher advances three reasons for the collapse of the consensus: the slow and late growth of the resistance to change, materialising in the rejection of the professional authority claimed by the planner in his ability to interpret the public interest; and, within planning itself, the challenge to the hierarchical concept of the city, the segmented city in Alison Ravetz phrase. The three reasons are put forward but not really analysed in any rigorous sense. Nowhere is it suggested that one of the fallings might be in his underlying assumption about that consensus. He himself seems to write large, and that planning the city is synonymous with its design and construction.

Thus he is unable to account, in other than anecdotal terms, for the later experience of Covent Garden where, averting the eye from the intractable urban conflicts that had been the stuff of planning, he quotes for instance motor cars versus pedestrians, new structures versus old environments, planning has become estate management.

The consensus did have its positive, practical achievements. Esher identifies the disappearance of the slums, the great clean up towards the past, and the new sensibility. In more specific terms, he instances pedestrianisation as the best contribution of twentieth century planning to the minor pleasures of life. One in which, ironically, the lead given by British planning has been overtaken by planners in many German and American cities.
adopted at American academic conferences and now being introduced into Britain at the meetings of the Urban History Group and the Planning History Group. Some volumes were already at the planning stage but it is thanks to the vigour of the series editor, Derek Francis, that publication has proceeded at such a spanking pace. Cannadine's being the fifth to appear since the series was launched in 1981.

The year, 1981, also saw the publication of a spate of favourable reviews of David Cannadine's great monograph, based on his Ph. D. thesis, Lords and Landlords: the Aristocracy and the Towns, 1774-1967 (Leicester University Press, 1980). It is no surprise, therefore, that the volume under review should echo many of the concerns which imbued Cannadine's own work. After a review of the question by the editor, we encounter four local case studies of the urban activities of great landowners: Cardiff and the Butes, 1776 to 1947, by John David; Dudlee and the Dukes of Devonshire and of Dudley in the Black Country, c. 1810 to 1914, by Richard Trainor; the Health and the Streets in Scunthorpe, 1842 to 1931, by John Liddle; and a number of smaller landowners in Bournemouth, c. 1850 to 1914, by Richard Roberts. All are original and enlightening treatments, with even John Davies overcoming the alarming disadvantage of publishing in the wake of Martin Daunton's massive study of late nineteenth-century Cardiff, Coal Metropolis (Leicester University Press, 1977), by emulating the broad chronological sweep adopted by Cannadine before him.

Lawrence Stone, so we are told, is about to publish a book with an even broader sweep which will expose as a single phenomenon the creation of an English landed class on the basis of sixteenth-century pillaging of the Church and its virtually unchallenged survival into the later nineteenth century, when cheap American grain and tax reforms at last began to undermine it. Indeed, this review, Stone's book, and Cannadine's inevitable discussion of it in

The London Review of Books may well appear within weeks of one another. This flurry of activity will sharpen the contrast between the current low status of land as a political issue and its centrality - in association with other forms of wealth - in recent historiographical graphs. As such, it is interests most historians is not so much the land itself but the status and power into which it is so readily converted. The day's not long gone when we believed that the Industrial Revolution threw up a new class of self-made entrepreneur who displaced the unproductive landowner and ruled the roost in a new, forward-looking Britain, the Workshop of the World. Instead, we stress the participation of the landowners in industrialisation, the survival of the essence of their power long after 1832, and their undying cultural influence which may well have prevented Britain from becoming a fully growth-oriented society on the lines of later industrialisers such as Germany and Japan, to whose case only reference was made to the country's present malaise.

David Cannadine's evolving interests have closely reflected these changing emphases. It would be rash to predict that he will never again tussle with David Ward over the physical and economic structure of the Victorian city, but he has now made a clear progression since the early 1970s from Edgbaston and its once-obscure gentry owners, the Gough-Calthorpes, to the dukes of Devonshire, on to the English aristocracy as a whole, and ultimately to the Royal Family. In doing so, he has shifted his attention from the economics of land development and its physical results, to the political power wielded by the urban landowners, to the representational role of the aristocracy as a legitimating force within industrial society, and ultimately to aristocratic fashions and the norms of behaviour as I understand it, in an almost anthropological perspective. His choice of contributors for Patricians, power and politics in England and Wales, 1719-1939, is a moderate one which more remains to be written: David Cannadine and his associates deserve our congratulations for showing how well it can be done.

ANTHONY SUTCLIFFE
Department of Economic and Social History
University of Sheffield

THESIS


Describes and explains local variations in patterns of municipal expenditure and policies adopted for housing, highways, parks, town planning and industrial promotion by urban authorities and special boards. The early 1920s brought a resurgence of municipal activity, with the creation of the Housing Association as a regional housing authority, and the Team Valley Trading Estate. BURNLEY, though de-
pressed and declining like Gateshead, did not experience the high poor relief costs as in the north east, and was able to pursue a moderate spending regime, and particularly to embark on a local industrial promotion policy, unlike Gateshead. Finally WAKEFIELD experienced moderate growth, but was clearly much more dependent on municipal spending, particularly a massive council housing programme, and large scale infrastructure and planning expenditures.

The study emphasises the close inter-relationship of economic experience and municipal actions, usually expressed operationally as demand pressures but in a substantial minority of towns, through fiscal difficulties. Generally interwar municipal intervention reinforced the differences between the growing and declining areas, though reducing the disparities between the slowly and rapidly growing areas.

PUBLICATIONS:


Municipalities made only a modest contribution to the massive amounts of capital needed to finance the expansion of Western cities during this period. The capital came instead from private charities, individual entrepreneurs, contractors and joint stock companies, and from individual citizens in the form of property taxes. In return these private interests realised an increment in urban land values.


Considers four Victorians of differing backgrounds and temperaments, who endeavoured to solve disturbing social problems through the medium of an urban utopia, namely James Silk Buckingham, Robert Pemberton, Benjamin Ward Richardson and Ebenezer Howard. A prudent and humble man not readily dismissed as a crank or mystic, Howard's success was attributable in large measure to his personality - that happy combination of dreamer and man of action.


The garden city tradition has been a profound influence on the history of Australian planning during the 20th century. Particularly between 1910 and the mid '20s, an eclectic, liberal and environmentalist garden-city movement paralleled the British prototype, and found expression in the adoption of 'garden city principles' in the layout and style of housing.


The turn of the century marks the transition from a pedestrian society to one which was to have much greater mobility. In London, the distance between working-class homes and work entailed a rail journey. Access to distant stations was solved by the humble bicycle. A case study is made of the role of the Great Eastern Railway in the development of suburban life between London and Southend.


The neighbourhoods of Chamartín de la Rosa and Pueblo Nuevo in north-east Madrid are testimonials to an experiment conducted by Arturo Soria y Mata at the turn of the century. As an innovative concept in urban development, the 'linear city' provided a physical environment capable of promoting and sustaining modernisation while lessening, if not eliminating, the potential for social upheaval.


Small and unstructured before 1800, Welsh towns underwent rapid and significant growth. Land uses became segregated according to socio-economic status. The major lineaments of present towns were created.


The discovery that the marble monuments of Rome were disintegrating as a result of the effects of pollution and neglect has caused a bold reassessment of the future of the city's classical patrimony. Conservation involves not only the national archaeological service but the planning departments of the local authority. A plan has been revived to create a vast archaeological park.


While Port Sunlight represents the acme of the contribution to town planning made by William Hesketh Lever (1851–1925), he was also involved in a series of other projects. The bibliography provides sources on the full span of his activities and on the ideas and philosophy that lay behind those activities. It cites a selection of Lever's own writings, and commentaries on his work.


The discussion paper introduced a seminar organised by ORSTOM to discuss the relationship between history and planning and, in particular, to examine the extent to which a sound historical background not only strengthens but is an essential prerequisite for sound development planning.


The discussion document is intended as an opening salvo in a growing debate, turning the current climate of concern into a phase of positive and constructive thinking, which will lead eventually to a concerted attempt to secure adequate legislation for the protection of British archives. The booklet sets out the need for a national archives policy, and an outline programme for a coordinated public system, the semi-public, publicly funded organisations, and the private sector.

Assesses the implications and consequences for specifically sociological research of the considerable volume of writing by both sociologists and non-sociologists in the broad field of urban studies over the past decade. The seven contributions include 'On the role of the state in urban policy-making: the case of inner-city and dispersal policies in Britain' by A. Cox which includes critiques of the explanation given by Manuel Castells for the gestation of the New Towns policy in Britain in 1946, and of the recent instrumentalist Marxist explanations of British inner-city policy-reappraisal in the 1970s. Another paper, 'Town planning and sociology', by E.J. Reade, outlines the origins, nature and extent of the gulf which has developed between urban sociology and town planning in Britain.


The tripling of the population of Bucharest increased the need to relieve congestion in the centre and repair neglect on the periphery. The article examines the ideas of the city's best trained planner and most skillful politician, and describes the obstacles before them. They had to contend with conflict between central and municipal government, and the inhibiting role played by private construction.

Gordon E. Cherry (1983) Thomas Sharp: the man who dared to be different. Dept. of Urban & Regional Planning, Northern Branch, Merz Court, University of Newcastle Upon Tyne. NE1 7RU. 19 pp.

In the second Sharp Memorial Lecture, given in March 1983, Professor Cherry focusses on three particular features of Sharp's professional life, namely his views on the despoliation of the countryside and the threat of suburbia, his contributions to town and village design, and his philosophy of planning, as reflected in his dealings with the Town Planning Institute and his reaction to the Planning Advisory Group in the changing scene of the later 1960s. The lecture concludes with an assessment of the man and his work, both in the context of his contemporaries and town planning today.

NOTES AND NEWS
Planning Education

During 1983–84 the Department of Urban and Regional Planning in the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign will observe several milestones in its history: the 70th anniversary of the appointment of the first professor of civic design in the United States, the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Bureau of Community Planning, the 40th anniversary of our first Master of Urban Planning degree, the 30th anniversary of the authorization of our Bachelor of Urban Planning degree. As part of the observance, a history of planning education at Illinois is being prepared by a faculty team composed of Professors Lachlan Blair, Albert Guttenberg, Leonard Heumann, Mary Ravenhill (Librarian) and Louis Wetmore (emeritus).

In addition to a written account focusing on the founding fathers and their accomplishments the department is also developing an exhibit and an audio-visual presentation of highlights in the planning education program since its inception.

ALBERT Z. GUTTENBERG
Dept. of Urban & Regional Planning

An Invitation

Dr Shun-Ichi J. Watanabe, Associate Director, Department of Environment, Design and Fine Building Research Institute, Ministry of Construction, Tokyo, Japan, writes to say that he would be willing to accept a visiting scholar at the Institute, who would share a common academic interest.

Society and Space
Volume 1. Number 1. of Environment and Planning: D: Society and Space. appeared in March 1983, published by Pion Limited, 207 Brondesbury Park, London NW6 5JN. The editor is M.J. Dear of the Department of Geography, McMaster University, 1280 Main Street W., Hamilton. Ontario L8S 4K1, Canada.

Papers are welcomed on aspects of the philosophy and practice of social theory, as well as those emphasizing such substantive topics as theories of the state and of under-development: industrial restructuring and uneven development: multinational corporations, capital movement and the urban hierarchy; language, culture and ideology; and urban social movements.

Disposal of Old Planning Records

Local planning authorities have extensive records relating to their schemes and applications and often possess material relating to other areas (British and foreign), old books and journals on planning, etc. From time to time, they clear out these records. Sometimes the local archives service or public library officials are allowed to sort through the material for disposal and valuable historic material is saved. However, one suspects that this kind of liaison is less than perfect in many areas and much of our primary source material may be lost. Occasionally, eagle-eyed PHG members in planning offices manage to salvage important material.

The Working Party on Historic Planning Records hopes that when planning authorities are about to dispose of old material they will liaise with the archivists and/or librarians. However, where this is not the practice, it will be appreciated if PHG members in planning authorities can establish it as the normal routine. If this is not possible, members should try to salvage anything they feel may be of value to historians of planning and related subjects, present and future, and offer it to the local archives service or local history section of the public library service. There are other archives and libraries willing to take some old planning materials if your local ones are not, and I shall be pleased to try and find a good home for old but good material. Furthermore, anyone wanting advice on what kinds of material should be saved can write or phone me: Michael Simpson, Chairman, Working Party on Historic Planning Records, Department of History, University College of Swansea, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP. Office tel. 0792-205678, ext. 7109; home tel. 0792-404345.

The Filtering Down Theory

I would like to find out more about the origins of this theory in Great Britain. Any information and help with sources would be acknowledged in a forthcoming paper.

In Germany, the theory can be traced back to Julius Faucher's paper on the 'Wohnungsreformbewegung' of 1865, and subsequently to 1866–7. In the paper, he argues that new housing can only be built for the better-off, and that the existing old housing stock is left - filtered down - to the poorer population, mainly the growing working-classes. The cost of new housing was well beyond the means of the working-classes. Faucher applies his concept to the new suburban residential districts of the period, located around railway stations. He describes how the well-to-do moved out of the increasingly cramped urban centres, leaving them to the less well-to-do. In essence, Faucher sets out a structural concept for the construction of the modern city and the marked spatial distribution of classes.

Because Faucher cites the example of London, it may be supposed that he was confronted with the theory during one of
his visits to London. Whom did he meet there? Whose work did he consult? Was the theory commonplace in the London of 1865? If so, where is the original text setting out the concept of 'filtering down'?
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In this third supplement to 'Work in Progress' (PHB 4(3), 1982) a distinction is again drawn between recent publications and activities (A), and work in progress (B).
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B2 Changes in Land Ownership in Palestine at the End of the Ottoman Period (1800-1917) and the Implications for Settlement.
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B1 Preparing a book based on material in Ph.D. thesis

B2 Longer term work on urban development and growth of car industry in Oxford. associated with the Oxford Polytechnic video archive created in the preparation of the Channel 4 'Making Cars' series by the TV History Workshop.


A1 Historical Study of the Pre-war Housing Policy III: Prototypical Analysis of the Urban Structure of Pre-war Tokyo. prepared by the Japanese Planning History Group team led by Watanabe (Housing Research and Advancement Foundation of Japan, 1983). (Japanese)

A2 Study of Capital Reconstruction Program: Charles A. Beard's Visits to Japan 1922-23 And its Meaning to Comparative Urban Planning. Papers of the Annual Conference of the City Planning Institute of Japan, 1983. (Japanese)

B1 Historical Study of the Pre-war Housing Policy IV: Development and Control of the Japanese Suburbia and its Comparison with the West prepared by the above Team (HRAFJ. 1983 as scheduled). (Japanese)
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ARTICLES

The History of Housing Reform and Planning in Belgium, 1830-1930, as seen by Marcel Smets

Marcel Smets' *L'avenement de la cite-jardin en Belgique: histoire de l'habitat social en Belgique de 1830 à 1930* was published in Brussels by Pierre Mardaga in 1977. A word of explanation is required for our failure to note it in PHB until now. Owing to an unfortunate oversight (though it was by no means the only one) it failed to secure a place in *The History of Urban and Regional Planning: An Annotated Bibliography* (Mansell, 1981). Marcel Smets was subsequently kind enough to give me a copy of his book, which clearly merited an extended review in our pages. It also suggested that the housing history of Belgium has been unjustly neglected in Britain, and, a fortiori, outside Europe.

Much the same can be said, of course, of the history of Belgium as a whole. That country's somewhat factitious national status and its turbulent political history, riven by ethno-cultural hostilities, have tended to discourage foreign interest. Belgium was, however, arguably the first part of continental Europe to industrialise, and it did so on the British coal- and textile-based model. Hubert Watelet has recently written, in *Une industrialisation sans development: le bassin de Mons et le charbonnage du Grand-Hornu du milieu du XVIIIe au milieu du XIXe siècle* (Ottawa: Editions de l'Université d'Ottawa, 1980), that Belgium's precocious industrialisation failed to generate long-term development, and Belgium was progressively outshone by industrialising Germany, and even by the mining and weaving regions of northern France, as the nineteenth century progressed. However, Seebohm Rowntree was attracted to Belgium by what he regarded as a happy balance between rural and urban, a standard of workers' housing which surpassed the British (despite lower real wages), and enlightened urban policies notably cheap rail commuting between city and suburb, and even between town and country. Rowntree published his findings in *Land and Labour: Lessons from Belgium* (Macmillan, 1910), a book which influenced the Liberal Party Land Enquiry Committee which reported on the eve of the First World War.
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Meanwhile, the Belgian example had begun to exercise an influence on France, principally in the areas of conservation and urban art from the 1880s, and workers’ allotment gardens in the early 1900s. French reformers were also interested in Belgian housing policy, which had much in common with the German approach of encouraging building by housing cooperatives and public utility companies. Belgium thus partly took over the role of intermediary between Germany and France which had been played by Alsace before the German annexation of 1871. Foreign interest in Belgian urban policies reached its zenith between the international housing congress held at Liège in 1905, and the international congress of cities held in 1913 in connection with Ghent international exhibition, from which sprang the International Union of Local Authorities.

However, the First World War created a new Europe in which Belgium no longer shone. National reconstruction was the priority, but it was difficult to achieve during the economic instability and depression of the inter-war years. Then a new world war subjected Belgium to a renewed occupation, this time total, recovery from which was to occur within a European political structure which partially effaced Belgian distinctiveness. It is, therefore, no surprise that Smets should concentrate on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But he has a fascinating tale to tell.

Marcel Smets is an architect and architectural historian whose approach to housing and planning history is strongly reminiscent of that of J.N. Tarn. However, Smets’ interpretation of the nature and function of workers’ housing has more in common with Enid Gauldie, in that he sees housing as a means of exploiting the masses and imposing social control upon them. Entering, as he does, a largely unploughed field, he is right to adopt a narrative technique and to combine social and design history, with the help of profuse illustrations. His theme is that Belgium gradually adopted the British garden-city approach to mass housing. This was grafted onto an early tradition of model factory-villages which were built, as in Britain, by entrepreneurs eager both to exploit primary resources in remote areas and to socialise their labour force. In this way, Belgian urban policy came full circle. In the mid- and late nineteenth century, the provision of the urban environment had been largely entrusted to small capitalists in the growing towns, with parlous results which royal and imperial planning on Haussmannesque lines in Brussels and other big cities did nothing to cure. Thus summarised, the history of housing reform and planning in Belgium appears to follow the British course, but when looked at more closely the Belgian story is fascinatingly distinctive.

In the towns, early industrial-workers’ housing took the form of crowded tenement blocks or, more frequently, corons – tightly packed rows set at right angles to main thoroughfares, often built back-to-back, and rising to one or two storeys. Like similar ones in the mining and textile areas of northern France, these rows were a product of the deep, narrow sites which were often available in the interior districts of the growing towns at a time when peripheral expansion was discouraged by fragmented landownership and the shortage of capital for extensions of the infrastructure. The Belgian back-to-back solution thus had much in common with the Leeds variety which Maurice Beresford has dissected so convincingly. Building entrepreneurs were particularly attracted to the interiors of sites because, away from the street frontage, they escaped all municipal control. Indeed, until 1844 only the facades of buildings fronting the highway required municipal authorisation – an echo, this, of French building legislation, dating back to the early seventeenth century, the main object of which had been to prevent private buildings encroaching onto the thoroughfare.

In the countryside, the expansion of mining made it necessary for the mine owners to provide large quantities of workers’ housing. Smets, with some support from Watelot, argues that the provision was minimal and was shamelessly used for purposes of social control. However, the factory village of the Grand-Hornu stood out from the rest. It consisted of 400 houses built between 1820 and 1832 by Henri-Joseph de Gorge. Each house, incredible though it may seem, had six rooms, a cellar, a garden, a pump, a privy, an oven, and the possibility of drawing hot water directly from the factory. (Almost forgotten, even in Belgium, until recent years, the Grand-Hornu clearly ranks as the outstanding European model village of its time, and is fully worthy of its new status as a historic monument.) This enlightened example was followed, though more cheaply, in Bois-du-Luc and a handful of other industrial villages down to mid-century. By this time, however, plenty of labour was available in the industrial areas and employers
no longer needed to provide housing to attract it. Only in the most remote rural areas, where new mines were being opened up, did employers continue to provide housing on a significant scale.

Public regulation of poor housing and environmental conditions was prompted largely by middle-class fear of epidemics. The first big impulse was given by Édouard Ducpéiaux's study of mortality in Brussels, published in 1844. Political troubles in 1847-8 also played their part. However, Belgium diverged from the British model in the area of owner-occupation, which was vigorously encouraged by Belgian reformers and to a large extent aspired to by the workers themselves. One wonders whether this emphasis reflects the survival of pre-industrial attitudes or, on the contrary, the influence of Proudhon's version of socialism. Smets is not explicit on this point.

Concern about poor housing had, in fact, preceded the full exposure of the public health issue, with the first official study of the subject being conducted at Brussels in 1838. In the same year, Ducpéiaux put forward the idea of the association, a combination of building society and cooperative community reminiscent of the thinking of Robert Owen and other early British cooperators. In 1844, he published plans for a district of 134 houses to be built in Brussels by such an association. The design was the work of an architect, Cluysenaar. Capital was to be raised by selling shares to middle-class sympathisers, who would then have the right to nominate tenants. This paternalistic enterprise failed to get off the ground, and no real progress towards building was made on these lines until 1861, when an association was founded at Verviers. Even then, it took the cholera epidemic of 1866 to prod the legislature into granting, in 1867, automatic limited liability status to all building associations.

In the following twenty years, eight associations were set up, and they built 1093 dwellings. The four-in-a-block design, pioneered at Mulhouse in the early 1850s, was widely followed, as it was in Germany at this time. However, the idea of a central building with communal facilities, which had been fundamental to Ducpéiaux's plan of 1844, was dropped. This activity was supplemented by a number of local poor-relief administrations, which built houses — usually in terrace form — under a general authorisation issued in 1849. Seven hundred and ninety dwellings were built in this way between 1859 and 1889. However, the greatest extent of physical change was achieved not in housing but in extension planning and central renewal. Municipalities were authorised to draw up general street plans by a law of 1844. These powers contributed to the partially planned extension of Brussels carried out by Victor Besme under the aegis of Leopold II. Central improvements were carried out mainly in the 1860s, under a law of 1858 facilitating the expropriation of insanitary housing, very much on the model of the French urban renewal legislation of 1852.

Smets is very dismissive of all these efforts. He averrs that even as late as the 1880s attitudes towards housing in official and reforming circles had advanced little over the 1840s, with owner-occupation still seen as the natural solution to poor housing and related political contentiousness. However, during the 1880s a new wave of official interest in housing inquiries, paralleling a similar phenomenon in Britain, recreated the policy conjuncture of 1843-6 and led to the passing of a housing law in 1889. The new legislation encouraged the creation of local committees on workers' housing, and made building funds available from the national savings bank and the retirement pension fund. At the same time, tax reductions were offered to encourage both the building of workers' housing for rent by individuals and associations and the spread of owner-occupation among workers. These new facilities had the effect of encouraging skilled workers to borrow money to become owners of their own single-family houses, and this 'petty bourgeois' aspect of housing reform was encouraged by a new statute in 1908. Consequently, most of the housing financed under the 1889 legislation was in single-family form: building associations built little under it and so very few multi-dwelling buildings resulted from it. In the legislative framework, if not in the physical result, Belgium largely followed German Developments, but foreshadowed those in France, during this period.

The 1880s saw more, however, than a new phase of official interest in housing from a conservative standpoint. In the face of enhanced State action, a socialist alternative was elaborated by the Belgian Workers' Party, under the principal inspiration of Hector Denis and Louis Bertrand. It included rent controls, and the building of housing for rent by the municipalities, this latter formula echoing that advocated by socialists in the Paris City Council in the early 1880s. This solution would be resisted nationally until after the First World War, but Bertrand, as a municipal
councillor at Schaerbeek, was able to set up a programme of municipal housebuilding there in 1899, under the 1889 law. The resulting building was all in multi-dwelling form, but Smets points out that the opportunity to incorporate socialist or cooperative models of high-density housing — for instance on the lines pioneered at Guise and much discussed in Belgian socialist circles — was not taken. Instead, conventional barrack blocks were built. Meanwhile, however, the Belgian approach to urban design was being transformed by Charles Buls’ conservationist work in Brussels, which in the 1890s had expanded — partly under the influence of Joseph Stubben — into the ‘public art’ movement. From about 1895, Stubben became personal planning consultant to Leopold II and helped to draw up extension plans for Bruges, Antwerp and Louvain.

Smets detects an underlying current of anti-urban thought which reached its fullest development after 1890 — as part of a European trend — in the work of poets, social philosophers and architects such as Verhaeren, Vandervelde and Van de Velde. In urban planning, the logical conclusion of this sentiment was the garden city concept. However, although Belgium played a leading part in the European planning debate between the turn of the century and 1914, powers to implement the garden city as a social programme as well as a design mode were lacking until after 1918, when the imperatives of reconstruction overcame the Belgian parliament’s objections to mass public housing. Before 1914, the garden city was seen mainly as a district of villa housing incorporating parkland and other open space. This degradation of Howard’s idea was partly the fault of the French garden city advocate, Georges Benoît-Lévy, whose books were widely read in Belgium. However, in a perceptive critique, Smets points out that German zonal planning, for all its social-reform rhetoric, tended to split the city up into single-class districts, so that the degraded garden city idea helped to provide a veneer of respectability for what amounted to residential enclaves for the rich. Alternatively, it was used to disguise the often low standard of new housing provided by industrialists for their workers from the early 1900s.

After the First World War, Smets detects a new climate in which a modified version of the garden city idea, faithful to Howard’s social ideals but less rigidly opposed to the existing city, could make significant headway in Belgium. The main creator of this more realistic planning strategy was Raymond Unwin, who thus acquires in the work of Smets a stature which parallels much recent British analysis. The extent of Unwin’s influence may surprise British observers, but it becomes easy to understand in the context of a Belgian reconstruction strategy which was elaborated on an international plane during the war, beginning with a conference organised in London, in February 1915, by the International Union of Local Authorities and the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association. Dutch planning and architecture also exercised an important influence.

To the ideal of comprehensive urban planning was added the recognition that a more ambitious social housing effort would be necessary in the reconstruction of a devastated Belgium, as reflected in the establishment of the Société Nationale des Habitations à Bon Marché in 1919. Its main function was to allocate low-interest loans to local building associations on the lines foreshadowed before the war. In the absence of effective powers to deal with speculation and high land values in the existing built-up areas, urban reformers increasingly concentrated on the advocacy of planned new settlements on cheap land just outside the towns, to be linked to the centres by new public transport.

Smets attaches great importance to the construction policies of the Société Nationale des Habitations à Bon Marché in the 1920s. It only built flats in the most heavily urbanised districts. Elsewhere it did its best to implement the garden suburb solution which it had formally adopted at its big congress in 1920. These new developments were consciously intended to create a new social order rather than just an improved environment, and in this they reflected the leftward shift of political opinion brought about by the First World War, which extended even into central government circles. They also inherited, as Smets rightly points out, a degree of nineteenth-century utopianism. New developments around Brussels represented a concerted attempt to implement the star-shaped urban form, with green wedges penetrating well into the centre, advocated by R. Verwilghen from 1924. Elsewhere, much of the interest in the new areas lay in the design debate between English, traditional Belgian, and modernistic design modes. Smets devotes considerable attention to the most influential schemes.

In the late 1920s financial difficulties and government economies forced a
In his concluding chapter, Smets attributes the ultimate failure of the garden city solution to its fundamentally bourgeois origins. The garden city of the 1920s, for all its socialist aspirations, turned its back on the central city whose problems it could not solve. It was a fundamentally artificial environment designed by an elite for an abstract community ideal rather than for real people. As such, it formed an essential link between nineteenth-century utopianism and that of the Modern Movement which was to triumph after the Second World War, with such disastrous results. The volume then closes with a selection of documentary abstracts from Belgian writings on housing reform, and an extensive bibliography.

This beautifully illustrated study has certainly put Belgian housing-history on the map. Its concentration on housing developments on the periphery of, or outside, established cities means that it makes a smaller contribution to planning history, but it has laid the foundations, together with a number of articles by the same author, for further progress in this area. Like much work by architectural historians, it appears to this reviewer to attribute too much social and political significance to physical forms, but this is probably mere prejudice. Certainly, Smets’ emphasis on continuity between pre-modern and modern design modes reflects a recent, and convincing, tendency in European design history, as evidenced, for instance, in the work of Donatella Calabi. Most important of all, Smets has placed Belgium, the microcosm par excellence of the international planning debate, in its long-merited historiographical place as the fulcrum of nineteenth-century housing reform and twentieth-century mass architecture and planning. Thanks to Marcel Smets, we can expect to hear much more about Belgium from now on.

ANTHONY SUTCLIFFE
University of Sheffield

Neville Chamberlain and the Local Government Act, 1929

We remember Neville Chamberlain as a Prime Minister, and as a singularly unsuccessful one at that. His apparent naivety made him an easy dupe for dictators. He has been caricatured as having looked at international affairs through a municipal drainpipe. By so remembering him, we recall only the twilight of a political career. It was in the 1920s that he established a position of dominance in his adopted party. His time as Minister of Health between 1924 and 1929 established his claims as a future leader of the party.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REFORM

The historian, A.J.P. Taylor, has claimed that Chamberlain ‘did more to improve [local government] than any other single man in the twentieth century’ [1]. What did he do? For many, his crowning achievement was the Local Government Act of 1929. The complexity of central-local relations, and especially the system of finance on which they are based, makes a study of them only a little more accessible to the layman than nuclear physics.

So as to begin to make sense of the chaos, we need to have some idea of the condition of local government in 1924. Table 1 identifies the main structure. All agreed external forces were bringing about changes in the balance of authorities and in their relations one to another, and with central government. This was most evident at the level of the smallest units, the parishes. Nearly one thousand parish councils and over 5,000 parish
Informal discussions between the representatives of the County Councils Association and the Association of Municipal Corporations began at the department in 1922. They were chaired by the Ministry’s Parliamentary Secretary, the Earl of Onslow, and, as he recorded subsequently, ‘I found it was quite useless, and that [the two bodies] would never be in agreement’ [5]. The Minister toyed with the idea of submitting the dispute to a parliamentary joint committee chaired by a well-tried arbiter but in the end acceded to Onslow’s matter of fact suggestion that a royal commission should be set up. The local authorities’ associations were asked to suggest names for membership of the commission, and the Ministry accepted them without demur. There were four independent commissioners. If ever a commission took minutes and lasted years. It was this one. The commission began work in 1923 and published its first report in 1925, the second in 1928, and the final one, somewhat apologetically, in 1929 (Cmds 2506, 3215, 3436). Taken as a whole, the commission’s recommendations were careful compromises, discreet buttresses of the status quo. This has led to harsh criticism of its deliberations. Keith-Lucas and Richards saw them as a natural consequence of a commission whose expert, not impartial, membership allowed the local authorities’ associations to sit in judgement on themselves [6]. There is something in this comment but it misses the essential point. The significance of the Onslow commission lies not in what it said or in what it left unsaid, but in its existence. Although it was set up as a pragmatic response to a particular issue, it came to be used by Chamberlain and by his officials as an effective way of tying up the representative associations whilst the ministry prepared the proposals that were to be brought together in the 1929 Act. Correspondence between Chamberlain and Onslow, and between the department’s officials, bears this out.

Chamberlain’s reform of local government was epitomised in the 1929 Act. We may summarise its clauses by saying that it had seven proposals. It abolished the boards of guardians and transferred their responsibilities to the counties and the county boroughs. It detached most of what had become specialist poor law services and gave them to the counties’ and county boroughs’ public health committees. It provided for coordination between local authority and voluntary hospitals, partly to give encouragement to the

---

Table 1: Number of local authorities in England and Wales [3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Authority</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County councils</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan borough councils</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County borough councils</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal borough councils</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban district councils</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural district councils</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish councils</td>
<td>7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish meetings</td>
<td>5650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic change was especially important. Between 1888 and 1922, 23 new county boroughs came into being as urban districts grew beyond the 50,000 inhabitants arbitrarily stipulated by the 1888 Act, and appealed successfully to parliament for county borough status. There were 60 extensions to existing county boroughs as adjoining communities were gobbled up. The loss to the counties was considerable: 350,000 acres, 3 million in population, and about £14.5 million in rateable value - in population and in rate yield, about 20% of their totals. Chamberlain summarised the effects of change on the structure of local government in these words.

'It would be a miracle if it were not found that this stereotyping of the old conditions of government had not resulted in a widespread friction, in a widespread loss of efficiency and inability to perform the functions which were given to them in such different circumstances.' [4]
In strongly imply just over £87 services rose from about central control cost that local welfare. The fundamental Chamberlain's departmental consideration? chancellor of the Exchequer and a sudden enthusiast for this 'new idea' of derating and for 'some large new constructive measure'. (7) or was it Chamberlain, seizing his opportunity to promote the products of long

departmental consideration?

The fundamental problem addressed by the 1929 Act was the insufficiency of local authorities' revenues for the increased services they were required to provide. It had long been recognized. Central government had made subventions to local expenditure often by various forms of percentage grant: that is, a grant by which the Exchequer promises to pay a proportion of the cost incurred by the local authority concerned. Percentage grants had the advantage of stimulating expenditure on services provided by local authorities; but carried with them the disadvantage of diminishing though not removing central control over local spending. Total grants-in-aid of local authority services rose from about £6.5 million in 1890 to £48 million in 1920, and just over £67 million in 1930 (8).

In a powerful minority report to the Royal Commission on Local Taxation in 1901, the chairman, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, had recommended a system of block grants which would have the virtue of being defined by the Treasury in advance of local authority expenditure, unlike percentage grants which depended on local spending. For the local authorities, block grants offered a promise of a reduction in central supervision and examination of local expenditures. After 1919, officials in the Ministry of Health took up Balfour's suggestion. These were the proposals that Chamberlain found when he arrived at the Ministry.

It is difficult to assess the value of the 1929 Act's block grants because of the depression. Specific grants remained: for example, for education, for the police, and for housing. As these three services accounted for between 80 and 90% of revenue distributed by the Treasury, the effect of the block grant was not as great as might be imagined from the rhetoric surrounding it. It did, however, satisfy for the moment the Treasury's demands for greater central control, and in this sense brought local spending more completely within the Government's general economic and financial policy than had been the case previously. It appeased local authorities anxious to rid themselves of central supervision of their every expenditure. The 1929 Act is important to the historian because the block grant it introduced was 'the first actual attempt to distribute grant according to a formula incorporating some criteria of needs and resources' (9). The Act strengthened county boroughs within their own areas, for it made them the units of administration. It enhanced county councils' powers of planning and coordination; and it is in this respect that it found its place within the Ministry of Health's officials' thinking between the wars.

NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN

In his methods of work, in his rhetoric, and in his attitudes Chamberlain appears at times curiously apolitical. Here, one might say, is the hard working, detail loving minister, diligently promoting legislation recommended to him first by his officials, and only second by his party. Some of his statements - for example, his consistent portrayal of the need for local government reform as being expressed by its inefficiency and the requirement to eschew it - strongly imply that he saw his own reputation as standing or
falling by the skill with which he oiled the cogs of an already existing machine, and not on the rearrangement of the mechanism itself. Increasingly he seemed inclined to dispense with party politics, less out of the common conviction that in his party all interests might be represented than from a hostility to pluralism. He was reluctant to allow that just as there might be more than one option about political ‘ends’, so might there be a number of views about ‘means’. Partisanship was at best an inconvenience and at worst an irrelevance.

To see Chamberlain as politically colourless would be to misunderstand him. We should not imagine that, by such comments as ‘to my mind local government reform means social reform’, Chamberlain believed that ‘to improve the conditions of life for the poorer people’ all that needed to be done was to rejig a few responsibilities within the structure of local government [10]. He had a strong faith in local communities bound together in a public spirit that threw up and was directed by responsible leaders. But he was also one of the first politicians to see that local authorities could not long remain a haphazard mosaic of fiercely independent units but that together they might make up an inter-related system. It would be a system that would provide for most of the fundamental wants of its citizens: education, public health, and so on. Accordingly it had to be a sound one. During the 1920s Chamberlain attempted to make it so.

STEPHEN STACEY
Wadham College
Oxford
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City Planning, Conservation and Urban Historical Geography in Germany

By the 1860s and the onset of industrialisation the city no longer belonged to the middle ages. Particularly after the Thirty Years War, the numerous capitals and towns of the old German Empire became a model for town planning. Not only their appearance but their whole structure changed. An important stimulus was the secularisation of church properties in the early nineteenth century. Particularly in the French-occupied Rhineland, the old churches and monasteries were destroyed. Even in Catholic states, like Bavaria, many old buildings were lost.

CONSERVATION

When Protestant Prussia took over the Rhineland in 1814/15, the head of the Prussian Building Authority, Friedrich Schinkel, sensed a new danger during a journey through the Rhineland. King Friedrich Wilhelm III of Prussia reacted immediately to his memorandum and, in October 1815, he passed an act which allowed the authorities to intervene where public buildings of historical value were threatened with change or destruction. There was a further pronouncement against the random dismantling of the town walls and gates in 1830. The first head of a Conservation Authority for Prussia, Alexander Ferdinand von Quast, was appointed in 1843. The Provinces were made responsible for the conservation of their monuments and the appointment of conservation officers in 1875. They made an inventory of the monuments identified since 1815. In 1902 and 1907, laws were passed against the disfiguration of settlements and landscapes, making it possible for the first time to protect complete streets, villages and areas of the
landscape, as well as single monuments. In reality, however, it was still left to the individual community to decide whether to adopt any protective measures.

In a sense, Government legislation was a reaction to particular changes in the settlement pattern. By the 1830s, it was possible to open the old town walls. Because it was no longer necessary to collect the excise duty at the entrance of the town, the medieval town gates were no longer needed. They were replaced by modern buildings, which did not interfere with the new traffic flow. Symbols of a former independence and vigilance, they were destroyed wholesale in the first half of the nineteenth century. Cities spread over their old boundaries, either as an urban sprawl or as planned extensions.

From the middle of the century, the increase in urban population, caused by marked internal migration, led not only to new urban centres but to the appearance of new urban features. More than half of the population lived in towns by 1891. Up to the 1860s, population was still concentrated in the old city. In the 1870s, certain sections moved into the new extensions: the tertiary sector of the economy concentrated in the inner town. It was not yet, however, a CBD in the modern sense because the residential population was still growing. This was made possible by the construction of flats above the shops. This precursor to the development of the CBD is a neglected field of research. It led to a considerable change in the building fabric.

For the Federal Republic of Germany, it is estimated that 40% of the 1938 building stock was destroyed in World War II, with above 80% lost in the old cores, causing the proportionate loss of older buildings to be even higher. Post-war traffic-planning and prosperity destroyed a further 45% of the 1938 stock.

The post-war experience of German inner cities demonstrates that land-use plans are not in themselves sufficient to ensure the integration of the architectural and urban heritage into the modern city. The only successful aspect was the introduction of the pedestrian precincts. The Act of urban redevelopment (Städtebauförderungsgesetz) of 1971 covering the whole Federal Republic was no help for old cities. The great resources for redevelopment in these years were not used for urban conservation, but for urban destruction. The attitude of those who have to implement the act is of decisive importance. A positive example was set by Bonn, where public opinion and the Conservation Officer of the local authority caused a large Victorian town extension, the so-called Southern Town (Sudstadt), to be preserved on the basis of the zoning map. The legal basis of it was the Central Building Act (Bundesbaugesetz). Amending legislation of 1976 drew attention to new trends in urban conservation. A community can now protect by regulations (Satzungen) where 'the view, the urban shape or the landscape ... are of historical or artificial importance'. This amendment holds out even the possibility of protecting buildings in order to conserve the existing social structure of the residential population, if it is necessary for urban conservation. It takes a complex view of integrated conservation.

URBAN HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

Town conservation must include more than the physical townscape (Stadt­bild), otherwise it will run into a dead facadism - in the front, timber framing, at the back reinforced concrete. Integrated conservation must take account of both the physical and social pattern. Sometimes new functions destroy, and sometimes they conserve the traditional pattern. Historical change produced individuality and variety of urban morphology. Now, there is a danger that we might lose these qualities. The physical fabric of the town was always determined by the constraints of craftsmanship and the pre-industrial materials, but now the engineer is technically able to construct whatever he wants. Town planning has the task of assigning certain functional and morphological areas within the urban boundaries to achieve a balance between the traditional and generally more static quarters, and the modern dynamic ones.

In the 1977/78 competition "Urban Morphology and Preservation in Town Planning" of the Land North-Rhine-Westphalia, the concept "Stadtgefüge" or urban pattern, was put forward as something to be conserved and maintained as a functioning entity. To achieve this, there had to be: (a) a discussion of the historicity of the town, (b) survey and analysis of the urban pattern, (c) a plan for maintaining the identity of historical structures, and (d) an inventory and documentation.


The Genesis of Post-War Housing in Glasgow

In the 30 years after the Second World War, the City Council of Glasgow pursued an urban renewal programme whose principal component was an ambitious municipal housing plan. By 1961, the proportion of public sector housing had reached 38% and by 1975, it had risen to 61%. disposed mainly in massive peripheral housing schemes and high-rise monoliths. One hundred thousand housing units in the old tenement core were demolished. Designed to solve one of Glasgow’s major problems, dating back to the previous century, the scale of social upheaval, and the single-minded pursuit of living-space, spawned a range of severe and lasting difficulties.

PROBLEM ROOTS AND PARTIAL SOLUTIONS

During the nineteenth century. rapid and large-scale industrialisation brought about a massive concentration of population in Glasgow. From a total of around 84,000 in 1801, the city’s population rose to over 1 million by the outbreak of the Great War, partly on the basis of natural increase, but more significantly swelled by successive waves of migration. By 1914, 85% of the city’s population lived in tenement houses, many of them already of considerable age, and most far below acceptable standards of sanitation and air space. Over 620,000 people lived in one- or two-roomed flats, comprising 67% of the city’s housing stock [11].
The Royal Commission into Industrial Housing in Scotland (1917) agreed that the housing problem was so acute that only the State, acting through local authorities, could and should take responsibility for solving it. The direct result of this pressure was the Addison Act of 1919, which forced Scottish local authorities to submit proposals on working-class housing schemes to the Scottish Board of Health, encouraging quick action by offering generous subsidies (2). This was a watershed in the acceptance by national government and municipal authorities of their responsibility to provide accommodation at decent minimum standards. The subsequent Housing Acts provided substantial subsidies for every housing unit built, and permitted extremely high standards of estate layout, building construction, and internal fitting. Glasgow annexed 10,000 acres of land, and construction of cottage housing schemes began with Mosspark and Riddrie (Figure 1). With the onset of the Depression, and a consequent reduction in government subsidies between 1930 and 1939, cheaper tenement housing was built on peripheral and inner city gap sites. Between 1916 and 1944, almost 55,000 houses were added to the city’s stock, and while these made only a small impression on the housing problem, they represented an important departure. The scale of building activity, the creation of the infrastructure to build, maintain and administer these houses, and the extent of municipal involvement fostered an attitude of mind which was to lead to a virtual monopoly of new house provision by the local authority in the post-war period.

1940s PLANNING AND LEGISLATION

While house construction virtually ceased during the Second World War, advanced planning for post-war needs was necessary. A 1942 survey of housing needs showed a desperate desire among the working population to escape from overcrowded, insanitary tenements after ten or twenty years on the waiting list (3). Two reports by the Scottish Housing Advisory Committee introduced a revised scale of overcrowding which added over 400,000 houses in Scotland to the unfit category, and proposed the evaluation of new house-building needs on a national basis, phasing and locating housing development along with industrial development (4). The 1946 Act widened the responsibility and powers of local authorities. As a final crucial step, the 1949 Act, by deleting all references to ‘working classes’, entrusted local authorities with providing for the housing needs of all members of the community. It elevated the local authority to a position of pre-eminence in the housing field.

On a more localised scale, the Clyde Valley Regional Plan of 1946 embodied the twin aims of breaking up the concentrations of traditional heavy industry and their workforces (5). In the case of Glasgow, there was to be a limit on further peripheral growth of the built-up area, with around 250,000 people to be absorbed between existing city limits and the inner edge of the proposed Green Belt. A further 250/300,000 were to be located away from the existing conurbation in expanded existing towns and in specially created new towns provided for under the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act of 1947. At first, Glasgow Corporation tried to prevent the designation of East Kilbride (6), but, by the 1950s, had accepted its role, and agreed to the designation of Cumbernauld New Town.

HOUSING NEEDS

House-building programmes of the interwar period had done relatively little to diminish the intense concentration of population within the city. Within an overall city density of 163 per acre there were wide variations in housing standards, particularly in levels of overcrowding and numbers of small houses (7). The pre-1914 sandstone tenement was still the dominant housing type (8). In 19 of the 37 wards, over half the houses were of one or two rooms. Almost half the housing stock was judged to be overcrowded, with the worst levels concentrated in the smallest houses of the inner city wards. Over half had no bath, and 37.5% had only shared W/C facilities (9).

The time-lag between recognition of the problem and remedial action caused more houses to enter the overcrowded or unsuitable categories through lack of basic repairs or age deterioration. Demolition of dangerous or sub-standard property removed more houses from the pool. Between 1945 and 1961, the local authority completed over 62,000 new houses, but the housing waiting list which stood at almost 90,000 families in 1949 continued to grow. Despite strenuous effort, Glasgow’s overcrowding level (more than 1.5 persons per room) stood in 1961 at 34.3% of all houses. In comparison with
10.7% in Birmingham and 6.4% in Manchester.

**HOUSING RESPONSE**

The series of housing initiatives undertaken from the 1950s must be viewed in the light of the pressing urgency of the problem. Planning experience is hard-won, and the decisions of the 1950s and 1960s may have laid the foundations of many social problems, but they were conceived of necessity on a scale to meet the challenge. While one strand of post-war planning struggled to combat industrial decline, the city’s bold response to its housing needs dominated its energies [10]. The City of Glasgow Development Plan Approval Order of 1954 listed 23 housing areas, some of them phases of schemes already under way, with the greater part of building to be completed by 1960. Apart from the Milton, Barmulloch, Balornock group, huge housing estates were constructed at the four corners of the city (Figures 1 and 2). The vast majority of these houses were three and four-storey tenements with small groups of pensioners’ houses, and five-apartment terraced houses for large families. Limited numbers of three and four-apartment terraced houses completed the stock [11]. In the desperate race to provide houses, virtually no amenities were provided. Until the late 1960s, shopping facilities were very limited. The low-density building of the peripheral schemes makes location difficult, while high rents for purpose-built shops, uncertain profits, and lack of attachment to the area by shopkeepers, produce a dependence on outside retailers [12].

From the early 1960s, rapid decay in tenement fabric and scarcity of building sites encouraged the adoption of pre-fabrication and rapid assembly of multi-storey structures. High-rise housing soon spread to any available site in the city. By 1968, 120 blocks had been constructed, but the main phase was yet to come. By 1982 the total had reached 321, ranging in height from 8 to 31 storeys. The social costs of multi-storey dwelling are well documented. The incidence of psychoneurotic disorders is twice as high in flats as in houses; the incidence increases as the height of the flat increases. Isolation leads to social withdrawal and confinement, and ultimately ill-health, in young and old.

**COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AND THE HOUSING STOCK**

Once the peripheral housing schemes were well under way, demolition of the slum tenements in the city core could begin. An ambitious programme of comprehensive redevelopment outlined 29 Comprehensive Development Areas (C.D.A.s) covering one-twelfth of the total city, but concentrated strongly in the central zone (figure 1) with a westward elongation into the industrial areas north and south of the River Clyde. Beginning with Hutchesontown-Gorbals in 1957, clearance was to focus on working-class housing areas with their associated industry and services, while middle-class residential zones were to be largely undisturbed. Long delays were incurred, and by 1969 only 9 areas had formal approval. The bulk of the 63,000 demolitions carried out by this time was strongly concentrated in these areas (figures 1 and 2). By 1975, another five C.D.A.s had been approved, and the total number of demolitions had reached over 95,000.

The effects were both physical and social. Destruction of the bulk of the city’s tenement housing virtually destroyed the private rental sector. It removed properties at the cheapest end of the owner-occupied market, and helps to explain how the public sector became overwhelmingly dominant after 1961. Territorially-based communities, with deep historical roots, were destroyed as the massive C.D.A. onslaught tore the heart out of the city, and eventually destroyed vital areas of Govan, Partick and Springburn. The lasting desolation brought the programme to a halt in 1974.

**CONCLUSION**

It was not the purpose of this paper to indulge in a polemic exposing the structural and social evils engendered by Glasgow’s post-war housing programmes. Rather it was an attempt to explain the present housing landscape in terms of a perceived need that was so enormous in its scale that it produced radical, or even desperate, solutions. It may be fashionable to write off the undoubted horrors of peripheral housing schemes and multi-storey flats as the by-products of faceless and thoughtless bureaucracy, but this would be to deny the considerable achievements of three post-war decades of energetic striving on the part of planners and municipal government alike. The face of Glasgow has been changed almost
beyond recognition, but hundreds of thousands of Glaswegians now inhabit dwellings whose space, sanitation, and conveniences would have been unthinkable and unreachable to their grandparents or even their parents. Hard lessons have been learned, and if the post-war housing programmes have done nothing more than provide a breathing-space, then that has been vital. Without that experience, the new, finer threads of social and physical planning might never have evolved, and a more intimate and humane scale of response might never have been engendered.
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In Planning History Bulletin Vol. 5. No. 2, the history of physical planning in the Netherlands was reviewed.

In selecting publications relevant to planning history, the following definition has been adopted: the history of urban planning is the study of well-considered interventions by man in the built and natural environment, including the effects of these interventions as they have taken place in the past. It is a definition that appears to cover all the research activities of the Association for Study of the History of Physical Planning in The Netherlands.
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