CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATION

In the last issue of PHB I gave notice that a number of new people had agreed to serve in some of the executive positions of the Planning History Group. Of these, Dr. Martin Gaskell was due to become Treasurer. Unfortunately a bout of ill-health meant that he could not take over the reins at that time, but I am able to let you know that Dr. David Massey, Department of Civic Design, University of Liverpool, has been able to accept our invitation to assume the duties. The transfer from Philip Booth (to whom many thanks for an extended term of service) has been been effected.

With a new Membership Secretary (Dr. Patricia Garside), Meetings Secretary (Dr. Stephen Ward) and Editor (Dr. Michael Hebbert) we are in many ways changing work-houses, but we are not changing direction. Members will find us as constant as ever, though with a renewed determination to do things well and extend our network. As ever, PHB will remain the key factor in the chain of communications. Editors will have their own ways of doing things, and like John Sheail, Michael Hebbert will push his references: he has an entirely free hand to do this, but I know that he will welcome contributions and feedback from all of us.

One of the new circumstances PHB will have to respond to will be the appearance in 1986 of Planning Perspectives. There will be no question of overlap or duplication. PHB will remain the organ of our informal Group. There will be a relationship, however, and the publishers will be offering to PP subscribers a significantly reduced annual subscription rate for members of PHG. A leaflet announcing PP's arrival next January is enclosed. The Editors will be glad to receive papers which they can consider for publication.

Finally let me touch again on the hoary question of your annual PHG subscriptions. It was with great regret that an increase to £10 had to be made for 1985. We will do our utmost to keep this steady over the next few years. Membership renewals do not seem to have been significantly affected and this gesture of support is appreciated. But one thing remains: do please renew your membership early in the year. If you have not done so already, please complete the renewal form enclosed in this issue; and if you subscribe by Banker's Order, please ensure that it has been updated.

Gordon Cherry
Your new editor is honoured to take over the seat which John Sheail has occupied so capably during the past few years. All thanks to him. No radical shifts of editorial policy are proposed, only that the character of the Bulletin should continue to match that of the Planning History Group itself - a cosmopolitan assortment embracing practical planners and academics, designers and social scientists and historians, postgraduate students and the elder statesmen of the planning movement, whose common ground is their enthusiastic curiosity about the historical development of this movement at home and abroad.

The imminent publication of the new journal Planning Perspectives should make little different to the Bulletin, except that there will be a shift away from full-length book reviews towards shorter informative notes about recent publications. Also, as to emphasize the Bulletin's role as a means of information exchange between members, a new section of RESEARCH REPORTS makes its appearance, in which individuals' current work and preoccupations can be given an airing.

In extending the usual warm invitation for contributions, may I outline some plans for forthcoming issues? Our summer Bulletin will, it is hoped, contain one or two further historiographic reviews on the lines of Professor Tawney's very interesting synopsis of Planning History in the Netherlands below; offers of companion essays will be gratefully received. The autumn Bulletin will bring together some articles on "The New European Urbanism", that fascinating attempt of contemporary architects and town planners to retrieve pre-modernist traditions of urban design. And, looking ahead a full year to spring 1986, we shall review the role of history in the professional education of town planners.

Lastly, a word of thanks to Don Krueckeberg, who, in acting for the last three years as Editor for the Americas, has helped to sustain the international character of the Bulletin. Members will be glad to hear that he has passed on the baton to Daniel Schaffer, the house historian of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Whether you direct your news and contributions to TVA or to LSE, we look forward to receiving them.

Michael Hebbert

PROPOSED MICROFORM EDITIONS OF HISTORIC PLANNING RECORDS

Michael Simpson reports:

"I am discussing with a microform publisher the reproduction of historic British planning materials and, while I have researched in a number of important collections myself, my knowledge of the sources for British planning history is by no means exhaustive. Certain possible sources come readily to mind - for example, the papers of Patrick Geddes and Barry Parker, the records of First Garden City, Limited, planning applications to the Local Government Board, pamphlets on Letchworth and catalogues of Cheap Cottages Exhibitions, and the major periodicals - the Town Planning Review, Garden Cities and Town Planning, and the Journal of the Town Planning Institute. However, I shall be grateful for other suggestions and I would ask readers to send me as full details as they can of other sources which they feel to be of importance in British planning history, their nature and their locations. Naturally, no details of what might be published can be given at present, nor any publication date, but I shall endeavour to keep members informed of our progress".

Michael Simpson, Department of History, University College, Singleton Park, Swansea, SA2 8PP.

NOTICES

FOURTH ANNUAL LUNCHEON OF THE PLANNING HISTORY GROUP (AMERICA)

12.00, Saturday April 20th, 1985, in the Loring Conference Room of the Hyatt Regency Hotel, Minneapolis, in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Organization of American Historians.

Kathleen Nells Conzen, University of Chicago, will present a paper entitled "Urban Pageantry and the Invention of Ethnicity". Jon C. Teaford, Purdue University, will chair the session.

Tickets will be available as part of the pre-registration package for the OAH meeting or at the OAH registration. As the number of tickets is limited, purchase through pre-registration is encouraged.

For additional information, please contact Blaine Brownell (205/934-5643) or Mark H. Rose, The Program in Science, Technology and Society, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan 49931 (906-487-2115).

********

PUBLIC LECTURES ON BELGIAN TOWN PLANNING HISTORY (Summer 1985)

Aachen School of Architecture, Schinkelstr. 1, D 5100 Aachen.

This programme of lectures has been worked out by Marcel Smets of Leuven; the series is sponsored by the Belgian Embassy in Bonn and the Architects Association of Northrhine-Westfalia in Dusseldorf. Most lectures will be presented in English, and the general subject is: "Belgium, the almost forgotten pioneer of European Town Planning and Urban Design".

May 7th Axel Pöhl, Bonn
Industrial Development in the early 19th century in Wallonia as predisposition of factory bound working class housing.

May 14th Marcel Smets, Leuven
Utopian Urban Projects in Belgium in the 19th and 20th century and their influence on the practice of Urban Planning.

May 21st Bruno de Meulder, Leuven
The "Modern Working Class-Tenement" in Belgium around the turn of the century.

June 4th Pieter Vytenhove, Brussels
Urban Planning at the Belgium Seaside: Models for a new kind of Living and Recreation before the First World War.

June 11th Jo Celis, Leuven
Belgian Reconstruction after World War I: Between Urban Design and Planning.

June 18th Herman Stynen, Louis van der Swaelmen and his
The fifteen component exhibitions and other events open on Friday, August 8 and continue through the Edinburgh International Festival till Saturday, August 11.

Details may be obtained from the exhibition director:

Dr. Michael Cuthbert
Edinburgh College of Art
Lauriston Place,
Edinburgh.
Tel: 031-229 9311, Extension 273.

THE CANADIAN URBAN EXPERIENCE - PAST AND PRESENT
August 14-17th, 1985, University of Winnipeg

The conference has two major objectives. First, it will be an opportunity for Canadian Urban Studies specialists to communicate their research results and to receive critical analysis of their work. Second, the conference is intended to promote interdisciplinary and comparative perspectives on Canadian urban topics. Conference themes include Housing and the Built Environment, Social Structure and Action, Government and Politics, Economic Growth and Development, and Urban Education and Research. The conference organizers are planning for several tours of both Winnipeg and other Manitoba communities. In addition, arrangements have been made with the historic Hotel Fort Garry for accommodation and a number of sessions will be held at this hotel. For more information regarding the program and registration, please contact:

Alan F.A. Artibise,
Director,
Institute of Urban Studies
University of Winnipeg,
515 Portage Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3B 2E9
TEL: (204) 786-9211

ON THE MARGINS
One-day Planning History Group Conference, Saturday, 19th October, at the London School of Economics.

The theme of the conference is Marginal Space and Marginal Economies. Papers will focus on both historical evidence of marginal developments and on current trends and issues. In their very nature, on the margins of conventional planning history, these largely unplanned developments and the lifestyles they represent can throw an interesting light on common assumptions about planning and society.

The day's discussions will be based on four presentations, based in turn on recent research publications. Ray Pahl (Divisions of Labour) will develop themes from his book using research findings from the Isle of Sheppey. So too (on the basis of their own findings) will Tony King (The Bungalow) and Colin Ward (Arcadia for All), with a fourth speaker on self-build housing in the Third World.
A full programme and booking form will appear in the summer edition of this bulletin.

Dennis Hardy
Middlesex Polytechnic, Middlesex EN3 4SF

THIRD INTERNATIONAL PLANNING HISTORY CONFERENCE
Autumn 1986

Provisional Arrangements: not a call for papers.

"Industry and the City" will be the theme of the third International Planning History Conference to be held in Chicago, Autumn 1986. The two and a half day conference will have five paper sessions as well as several related events including tours, lunch time talks, etc. All activities will be consistent with the general theme. The theme is intended to include discussions of the way industry has shaped and changed the fabric of the city. Specifically, we hope to explore the way in which urban planning has related to this process. Discussion will not be limited only to the period of rapid industrialization experienced by many cities in the nineteenth century, although this period is obviously seminal in our undertaking. The pre-industrial city as well as the "de-industrializing" city are legitimate areas of study.

Changing residential life, housing, neighborhood structure, urban infrastructure, and commercial development associated with industrial development will be discussed as well as industry itself. Conference papers will be solicited in four thematic categories. Between 15 and 25 papers will be selected for presentation at the Fall 1986 conference.

Theme A "Workplace and Residence"
This session will focus on the relationship of the working and domestic environments. Both acts of conscious planning activity and unplanned development patterns are acceptable topics. What is essential is insight into the way industrial processes or structure affected the forms or patterns of housing, neighborhood and residential life.

Theme B "Industry and Urban Services"
Papers dealing with the relationship of the development of industry in cities to urban services (e.g., utilities, transportation) are requested. Of particular interest are investigations into periods of change in the provision of these services due to technological innovation or political and economic changes (e.g., "electrification", development of the highway system, etc.).

Theme C "Conditions and Structure of Work in the City"
Changing conditions of work in cities have brought about changes in the social order and planning efforts to ameliorate emergent problems. Both social unrest and deteriorating public health stimulated planners interest in these issues. For example, issues of the structure of work and urban life were confronted by both utopian and scientific socialists. On the other hand, pragmatic social reformers sought means of improving public health through improvements in the physical

environment. Papers which bring further insights into these relationships are sought.

Theme D "Industry and the Origins of Self-Conscious Planning"
Urban industrial development proceeded parallel to the rise of self-conscious public planning in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The relationship of industrial development to the emergence of either the planning profession or planning theory is of significance. Papers in this category are being sought.

Further developments will be reported as information becomes available. Any queries at this stage should be addressed to Professor G.C. Hemmens, School of Urban Planning and Policy, College of Architecture, Art and Urban Planning, The University of Illinois at Chicago, Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680, U.S.A.

1988 IN JAPAN

Shunichi Watanabe draws our attention to the multiple significance of this anniversary: the 100th year of urban planning in Japan, the 40th of the City Planning Act and the 20th of the Ministry of Construction. Further news of international conferences around these events will be given in due course.
The theme of 'urban space and building form', explained Martin DAWTON (UCL), was an attempt to unify urban historical scholarship in the face of specialist splinter groups. That the distance (space?) between components of urban historical scholarship might produce a sterile academic climate was quickly and programmatically countered by Mark Swantson (Bartlett School of Architecture) in his resume of the architectural lineage of the concept of space. While Rappoport, Daunton and others employed 'urban space' in an interesting manner, it was an over-used, mis-used, twentieth century construct, claimed Swantson, and departed significantly from its Neogelasian origins.

Space was a primary and positive element of architecture and like art in general was an expression of the 'spirit of the age'. Moreover, urban space was an ideal, and for historians it was fraught with an impressionistic and intuitive approach to the interpretation of earlier societies which presupposed links with historical reality and reduct, or at least downgraded empirical observation and data as the basis for social analysis. A chorus of opposition emerged in discussion. Pene CORFIELD (Bedford College), Gordon CHERRY (CURS, University of Birmingham), and Geoff CROSSICK (University of Essex) in various ways were concerned about Swantson's historiography and suggested amendments to the chronological development of the conceptualization of space. Colin POOLEY (University of Lancaster) provided a geographer's perspective when he noted that 'spatial' and 'space' could have very different meanings, but before the meeting proceeded to a more manageable concept of space it was clear that Daunton's objectives had been reached; urban historians' interest in space, if not against purely architectural formulations of the meaning of space.

'Space and form in the pre-industrial town' was the theme for the next two papers. Derek KEENES (Institute of Historical Research) in his paper 'Spatial order and discrimination in medieval towns c.900-1000' stressed the appearance of densely settled communities. The formal use of space in a specialized way was also evident at an early stage with trading and residential areas well defined and walls adding to the configuration. The early establishment and formalization of 11th century street layouts and awareness of amenity provided indications of a medieval understanding of the use of space. Spatial differentiation in the form of social, occupational and kinship and neighbourhood was particularly difficult. The discussion centred on elites and the role of urban elites in the determination of space for particular purposes. Peter CLARK (University of Liverpool) turned the discussion in another direction when he pointed to the role of the Reformation as a force for the reorientation of the use of urban space due to the decline of religious houses, the ownership of land by private individuals, and the decline of walled towns. Tourism, he also suggested, might be a more powerful force than the unity of the elite in redefining the use of space, if only because the elite were increasingly drawn to the countryside.

Rural aspirations were a theme in Peter BORSAY's (Lampeter) paper, 'the rise of the promenade: the social and cultural use of space in the English town, 1660-1800'. Two formative influences were identified: interest in gardening in Restoration England, influenced by French taste, and the example of London in the provision of urban walks and gardens. In other words, ascommentators had suggested, the 1690s appeared to have seen the establishment of provincial promenades, and in attempting to explain the phenomenon Borsay drew on three illustrations - York, Bath and Preston.

Borsay argued that space such as public gardens formed part of a broader cultural renaissance of which assembly rooms, theatres, and coffee houses were also elements. Walks were also part of a 'rat-race for status' and the purpose of the walk, according to Borsay, was to differentiate the owners from the expanding ranks of the middle class. Promenades also reflected the social and political aspirations of the elite. The location of the walks attracted some comment from the floor. Was the urban walk an echo of the design of gardens in country houses? (Swantson). How much access to promenades controlled? (John WALTON, University of Lancaster). Was not the landowner's interest in land availability more important than rustic aspirations? (Chris ARNSTON, Birmingham Polytechnic). Could women walk without escorts? (Ed COONEY, University of York).

Victorian attempts to control the use of space came under the microscope in three papers on the 'Politics and economics of urban building regulation' by Roger HARPER (University of Lancaster), Roger HARPER (University of Lancaster), and Rebecca JOHNSTON (University of Sheffield) and Martin GASKELL (City of Liverpool College). In their paper 'Building control, building activity and residential location: relations of the achievement of building regulations after 1800 and stressed the importance of local variations in the regulations which were the outcome of a strong desire to avoid building regulations. Johnston and Gaskell investigated in detail how building regulations came to be adopted in five provincial centres in the 1860s - Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, and Sheffield. While the Local Government Act 1858 was significant, they demonstrated the essentially local level of the debate over building regulation and the interplay between local opinion and authority and central government. Each authority could unquestionably be accused of negligence and failure to enforce regulations and in allowing the evils of defective construction in old areas of the city to be perpetuated in the new. Public opinion and taxpayers' reactions to building regulations meant a gradual process of improvement rather than sweeping environmental change, and only by the 1880s, when executive control and administrative will were more effective did urban death rates begin to decline. Decisions taken at some additional influences of the adoption of building controls. The nature of building firms, structural developments in building methods, the professionalisation of architecture, surveying, engineering, urban planning, and scientific understanding of stress, load bearing and fire hazards, brought wider influences to bear on the introduction of building regulations. Just why the provincial towns avoided a national act was evident when Michael PORT (ONC) commented: "It is quite remarkable that the Act 1844", The corruption and inefficiency of the District Surveyors in London charged with the implementation of the 1774 Building Act was an acknowledged cause for reform, and to a reasonable degree the
legislation of 1844 standardised procedures, scrutinised the activities of the district surveyors, and codified many of the previous procedures. Not without substantial opposition, the 1844 act did redraw the boundaries of public and private interests, and acknowledged the wider concerns of public welfare. It was, however, an unpopular measure and offended many local interests, though it did extend building control to the spreading urban area. Discussion focused on the issue of the timing of municipal reform initiatives in general, and building regulations particularly. The "intolerability" of a phenomenon was an unacceptable explanation of social policy changes, argued Crossick, though Walton and Richard Rodger (University of Leicester) retorted that local council politics, emergence of pressure groups and newspaper comment were tangible expressions of an unacceptable social phenomenon which eventually might generate policy change.

Policy was at the centre of the final session on 'The social use of space in the modern city'. Colin Wooley (University of Lancaster) concluded that in Liverpool different phases of slum clearance had varied impacts on the lives of the tenants involved. In the 1980s, rehousing was not very disruptive because rebuilding occurred on slum-clearance sites and blocks were small scale. However, the selective nature of rehousing and the strict discipline enforced by the local authority as landlord, meant that many families were adversely affected by slum clearance, and housing problems were often compounded elsewhere in the city. By the 1930s, the local authority was attempting to move slum-dwellers to the outskirts - providing an improved environment but creating maximum disruption - but these moves were often resisted by families who preferred the urban environment as reasons to remain in the city centre. Even rehousing in the inner city caused considerable disruption for families who had to get used to living in large-scale, high-density blocks, and problems of supervision and control of public open space and access ways around flats became rapidly apparent. Wooley thus concluded that the long term rehousing on-site may have proved as disruptive to local communities as slum clearance and removal to the suburbs.

Robert Thorne (GLC Survey of London) in 'Office buildings in the City of London, 1830-80', showed how domestic space had been displaced by speculative and bequeathed office buildings, often with impressive facades which belied the uniformity and cramped office space behind. Thorne drew attention to the historical adaptation of architectural form and to the relations between builder, client, and architect.

Judged by the quality of contributions, vigour of discussion, cross-fertilisation of interdisciplinary exchanges, the Urban and History Group might usefully establish annual thematic conferences of this type in an effort to reestablish the identity, direction and agenda for urban historians.

(An extended version of this report will appear in the Urban History Yearbook 1985)

Richard Rodger, Dent, of Economic and Social History, University of Leicester.
Finally, John Herson (Liverpool Polytechnic) provided an alternative account of the same corporate process in his paper "Community responses to the Coventry Structure Plan 1970-74". He showed how the 1973 Structure Plan was produced at great speed to beat reorganisation, and the antagonism this created with all-too-briefly consulted groups. The Coventry Community Workshop, a pressure group with community workers predominant, was quickly set up to object to the Plan, but some of its conclusions (e.g. that growth would come to an end) were too conventional for much dialogue to take place. Once again, discussion brought out the depth of commitment of planners to the corporate planning process. It functioned as a very important legitimising device for their presence in government, and generated an audience for planning ideas well beyond their professional frontiers.

The workshop raised many more questions than could be answered in the time available, or, for that matter, with the information to hand. To the organizer, Coventry's planning record seemed to lend itself to a historical interpretation within a problematic of leadership. An alliance of political, professional and industrial groupings was forged in the late 1930s around a distinct model of representation of interests and management of public affairs. In the 1940s and again in the 1960s, town planning was a key method for articulating these conflicting interests and for engineering a technically distinct compromise between them. Of course, any leadership also contains conflicts that may eventually disrupt it, and the reformulation - really, a "modernisation" - of the leadership coalition in the 1960s is of interest precisely from this point of view. Changes in the planning process and in planning strategy made possible new forms of compromise - between Labour, the administration and employers, for example - the novel technical studies that promoted the urban highway concept and thus validated the car lobby as well as provoking the City Council into a dramatic rethink of its public transport provision.

For those interested in following up our discussions, the papers given at the seminar will be made available as a working paper in Spring 1985. I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Ken Carter in mounting this event, and the British Section of the Regional Science Association for funding it. The History of Planning Methodology Group can be contacted via Mike Breheny, Department of Geography, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading RG6 2AS.

Mark Long.

---

The Future of Post Graduate Education in Planning, Department of Civic Design, University of Liverpool 27th to 29th September 1984.

This gathering was organized in celebration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Department of Civic Design, and despite its title concerned itself with the history and the present predicaments of planning education as well as with its future. Two of the most enjoyable aspects of the seminar were retrospective, namely the opening address of Professor Don Krueckeburg, and the Anniversary Dinner. Krueckeburg took as his theme "The Growth and Structure of American Planning Schools" and provided a fully-documented synopsis of the historical trend of courses and enrolments, and the disciplinary affiliation of planning departments, including a fascinating analysis of course quality and its correlates. Interestingly, the top U.S. planning schools tend to be large in size and located not within social science faculties but within the traditional schools of architecture and design. Though the predominately British audience was not so indiscreet as to attempt to apply a similar reputational ranking to the domestic system, there was a confident sense of the excellence of the Liverpool tradition, epitomized the following night in the witty reminiscing speeches with which Professor Gerald Dix and Professor Paul Brenkoy answered the toast of Viscount Leverhulme, Chancellor of the University and grandson of William Lord Lever, whose generosity in endowing the Department of Civic Design and the Town Planning Review we celebrated.

Michael Hobbert

CORRIGENDA

We apologise for two errors in PHB vol 6 no. 3:

p.12 The book title two paragraphs from bottom was -

p.31 Last two paragraphs should read as follows:

During the time when Nineteen Eighty-Four was reaching its initial audience, a planning debate was in progress which paralleled the Cold War confrontation. On the one side was Friedrich Hayek and other conservatives warning free citizens of the totalitarian tendencies of communists and pointing out rather explicitly that a first step along the 'road to serfdom' was the imposition of planning in any guise (8). Planning once undertaken, they opined, would expand exponentially until it encompassed the whole of society. On the other side were the defenders of planning like Barbara Wooten, proponents of the Welfare State such as Richard Titmus, and advocates of democratic socialism such as C.A.R. Crosland and Norman Thomas (9). For the latter it was the anarchy of capitalism which cried out for treatment. Planning was one remedy to regulate the capitalist economy and harness the postwar affluence to a more egalitarian society.
In biography as well as architecture, less is more. Throughout this extravagantly worshipful book, Stephen Grabow is so concerned to establish Christopher Alexander's genius that he obscures Alexander's real—but limited—talents.

Born in Vienna in 1916, trained in mathematics and architecture at Cambridge and Harvard, Alexander is best known for his brilliant Harvard doctoral dissertation which he published in 1964 as Notes on the Synthesis of Form. Here he first addressed the basic problem which continues to preoccupy him: to formulate a set of complex but precise rules which could substitute for the "intuitive" creative process of architects and planners. These rules could then generate buildings and plans which could equal and perhaps surpass the great achievements of the past.

Since coming to the University of California at Berkeley as Professor or Architecture in 1963, Alexander has essentially abandoned the mathematical/funnelist emphasis he finds in Notes for a more flexible set of rules whose structure derives from Noam Chomsky's generative grammars. This "pattern language", as Alexander calls it, was formulated to be more responsive to Alexander's sharpened aesthetic, moral and political concerns, especially his impassioned rejection of modernism. "I am trying to make a building which is like a smile on a person's face", he told Grabow, and his pattern language is now aimed at capturing a mystical "Quality With a Name" which Alexander has found in all the great architecture of the past.

Grabow asserts that Alexander's recent work constitutes a new paradigm, a total re-thinking and renovation of the field. Oddly, his evaluation of Grabow's book is that the two systems are essentially equal (but opposed) to the modern movement of the 1920s. Grabow, who has read Thomas Kuhn on scientific paradigms, routinely compares Alexander to Copernicus or Galileo. But Alexander himself remarks, "Indeed, it turns out, in the end, that what this method does is simply to free us from all method."

One might be tempted to dismiss Alexander as a cult figure, a would-be guru whose influence could never extend much beyond the Berkeley hills. But Alexander's recent work does have real value, I believe, especially when one dismisses the cosmic claims that surround it. For in researching the pattern language, Alexander came to the Center for Environmental Structure in Berkeley undertook a wide-ranging search for what they called the "deep and inescapable properties of a well-formed environment". With great discernment and attention to detail, they brought together examples of houses, neighborhoods, and cities that worked well. Modestly, undogmatically, they formulated precise observations on gardens, dining rooms, walking streets, and literally hundreds of solutions to specific problems. These observations are contained in the collaborative work, A Pattern Language (1977), a remarkable compendium of useful learning and, yes, genuine wisdom.

Grabow, however, is too concerned with establishing Alexander's credentials as the guru/Galileo of our time to bother with such small-scale achievements. In particular, he completely evades the biographer's duty to provide careful summaries of his subject's major works. Perhaps he assumes we've already read them all—although many are difficult to find—or perhaps the mundane requirements of summary interfere with his constant urge to genuflect.

The most valuable parts of the biography are the long monologues which Alexander printed and which Grabow prints verbatim. One would have to turn to the best contemporary fiction to find so fascinating a portrait of a most unconventional hexagonal, high-minded modeste or by anything else. There is a distressing amount of megalomania, paranoia, and sheer foolishness, e.g., his comment on an early photograph of his house at Berkeley that "it really looked like a Judo-stone. There is that insane look in their eyes!" But there is also such love and understanding of beauty, such faith in people's capacity to create a beautiful environment, that one winds up wishing Alexander well.

ROBERT FISHMAN
Rutgers University


Three hundred families were brought from the fertile wheat-growing district of Pfalz in Germany to settle on the Jutland Heath in the 1760s. The people whom the 1800 residents of such densely-populated, intensively-cultivated region were brought in, they would reproduce the same environmental conditions on the heath. The settlers occupied the first of a projected 10,000 colonists, occupying large, geometrically planned villages. The scheme of a prominent German economist, it proved a disaster. Most settlers left within a decade. Instead a more pragmatic policy evolved, based on the intensification of native agriculture through economic incentives and the introduction of new crops and techniques into traditional husbandry.

Two hundred years later, a small group of articulate enthusiasts formed the Jutland Heath Society as a means of promoting the large-scale agricultural and forestry development of the Heath. Through a myriad of private and local works, the reclamation of the heath became a national...
that such a goal was most likely to succeed if the husbandry practices of the past were maintained, revived or simulated.

Dr. Olwig has written a concise book, which is both lucid and stimulating. It demonstrates a greater awareness of trends in ecological thinking, and the considerable expertise gained in conservation management, many of his arguments might have carried greater conviction.

JOHN SNEAL
Institute of Terrestrial Ecology


Harold Lawrence Platt's new book, City Building in the New South, carried a more descriptively accurate title in its earlier incarnation, a 1974 Rice University dissertation, "Urban public services and private enterprises: aspects of the economic and legal history of Houston, Texas, 1865-1905." The book offers an account of a single, rapidly developing enterprise during the postbellum Golden Age and Progressive periods; an account that emphasizes public finance, legal, and institutional problems along with some of the political struggles around providing urban infrastructure and public services for a new city. Rather than giving a general account of city building in the New South, Platt's book deals only with Houston and focuses sharply on the political and legal economy of what Manhattan considered to be the South-west.

After a short opening chapter giving highlights from the city's pre-Civil War history, Platt breaks the rest of his study into two parts. The first part details the growth of the Civil War to 1888 or thereabouts. During these years, the merchants who first clustered at the head of navigation on Buffalo Bayou struggled to create Houston's first primitive infrastructure, initially just a wharf and a few streets. This opening section provides a prelude and analytical foil for the second and larger part of the book, "City planning by experts," which treats the increasingly rationalized and professionalized infrastructure provision characteristic of Progressive Era urbanism to its waning in 1910. The subtitle may pose problems for planning historians who tend to think of planning as the self-defined activities of the public sector. Platt argues that the catching-up process the author could easily have avoided had he made his private meaning explicit early in the book. But enough semantic caping. The book is a good one and it holds much to interest city planning historians.

When the three chapters that cover the years immediately after the Civil War illuminate a critical cycle in American city building. First came a free-wheeling, booster-led, development campaign, followed by an unsecured housing crisis, then a rash of cases in which private management was called in to promote the concept of nature conservation, whereby wildlife communities were managed positively so as to sustain and enhance their variety and richness. Experience on many reserves indicated...
tracks--a deep recession in city building that lasted through the rest of the decade. Houston along with many other cities weiched on their bond payments. This stimulated a debt crisis which in turn triggered aggressive national public policy making, mostly by the US Supreme Court, to control, rationalize, and substantially remove the risk in this area. This produced a debt crisis which in turn triggered aggressive economy.

rationalize, and substantially remove the risk in "most local government became the vehicle for risk management and the low, often negative rates of return and long payback periods from urban investments. This produced a debt crisis which in turn triggered aggressive court system and the law, not the executive or legislative branches and the purse, played the federal role in the interaction.

Part Two covers the Progressive Years. Here Platt emphasizes the struggles over alternative institutional patterns for public services provision primarily with respect to the division of responsibility, costs, benefits, and control between local government and private business. During the early 1890s Houston experimented with public regulation of competing private service providers, initially for transit, then for electrical service. Later in the decade mergers forced the city to try regulating the resulting monopolies. This proved problematical and led citizens to question the very possibility of controlling such services from the vantage point of transit. "The (city) council's" repeated inability to force the transit monopoly to obey ordinances governing its activities in the streets exposed the pitfalls of regulation. After 1900, the basic problem was designing tools of administration to guarantee the efficient enforcement of public policy. But driven and then hampered by his dreams for the suburban development of Houston Heights, Carter (the transit monopolist) bluntly disregarded the municipal charter. His consistent failure to deal with local government leaders led Houston's leaders to again attempt to encourage and regulate competing providers. As another response, some leaders advocated municipal ownership and rates, with an electric utility monopoly kicked off a long lasting political struggle over the idea of public power provision, though its advocates were actually defeated each time. The city council's failure to secure competition or public enterprise got far, in large part thanks to the policy making of the Texas and U.S. courts.

As this quick synopsis indicates, Platt's work embodies a fresh, effective combination of analytical muckraking, pluralist political history. Platt shows that political economic interest not microeconomic efficiently played the central role as monopolies supplanted competition in public services. Repeatedly he shows how local systems of rate bills and the legal environment and the courts determined the course of local history. Yet Platt does not fall into the trap of ascribing his history to the inexorable structural determinism that has clouded some recent historical writing on such relations. Instead, Platt emphasizes the role of public transit and urban redevelopment. Human agency and the culture of liberal Progressivism appear alongside capital and the law as causal factors in this work. Another of Platt's strengths derives from his integration in his work of Southern history literature, the strongest tradition in American regional history. A case in point, he convincingly employs Blaine Brownell's notion of a dominant commercial-elite as the principal local political economic force in Houston. The new account of local government behavior and political interest over the decades, and especially in the period Platt covers, reveals the local history of cities to be at least as complex as the national story.


This book is a major case study of twentieth-century city planning in the United States, comparable in coverage and analytical depth, if not in consistently sound judgement, to Roy Lubove's Twentieth-Century Pittsburgh. Platt shows the complete sweep of urban development in Richmond, Virginia, during this century. What makes this study especially noteworthy is Silver's attempt to grasp, typically, the puzzle of American planning history. What role, if any, has city planning played in the urban development of a nation whose leaders have been deeply committed to private property, to weak, fragmented forms of local government, and to minimally regulated physical growth? American planning, Silver argues, should not be understood simply in terms of formal institutions. The history of Richmond, if written from that vantage, would reward the reading of a planning commission in 1946, the establishment of a city planning department in 1968, and the New South analysis of the creation of a city planning department. Richmond would appear laggard and typically American, caring as little for planning as is commonly, and mistakenly, supposed. Silver rejects this institutional emphasis for a radically different approach, which, for all its merits, yield untenable conclusions about the role of planning in Richmond and, by extension, in American cities generally. He interprets planning as a "manifestation of the dominant political interests" within a city and the history of planning as the expression of a city's changing "political culture". Politics thus becomes the matrix in which planning is generated, and planning history records the motives and actions of the controlling elite. Insofar as it sought to shape urban development.
Applying this viewpoint, Silver argues that a growth-minded business and civic elite emerged in Richmond prior to World War I. Exemplifying the city-booster progressivism then widespread in the urban South, its spokesmen emphasized Richmond's metropole, or "greater Richmond". Annexation, governmental reform, and planning ideas, meaning especially the orderly layout of suburbs - became the means. This agenda lasted through 1920s and 1930s when reentrainment-minded conservatives dominated city government and indeed to resist the progressives regained power. This turn-about made possible Richmond's first and only master plan, an comprehensive program submitted in 1945 by Harland Bartholomew, then the nation's most prolific city planning consultant.

During the 1950s, the dominant elite ignored Bartholomew's plea to halt urban decentralization and revitalize the city's neighborhoods. Instead, Richmond's leaders pushed through a neighborhood building and civic center development, both of which exacerbated white flight to the suburbs and inner-city blight. A major attempt to recapture fleeing white hands, a city-county consolidation scheme that would have made Richmond the fifth largest city in the nation failed to win public support in 1961, causing the long-standing "greater Richmond" ideal to fade and enabling new political forces and planning values to emerge.

In the mid- to late-1960s increasingly powerful black leaders began to resist the bulldozer-style urban renewal then under way, forcing partial recognition of slum-dwellers' demands. More costly federal relocation requirements mandated in 1970, coupled with reduced federal funding, fostered neighborhood conservation and preservation in place of renewal. Nonetheless, black political dominance, achieved in 1977, did not dispel the urban renewal experience of the 1950s and 1960s.

Silver's approach to planning history has the great virtue of exposing the motives behind much of the public developmental activity that did occur. Zoning, subdivision regulation, public housing, urban renewal, and the like are not mere coincidental events. Legislation, code enforcement and many other elements fall into an historical context that demonstrates that planning has indeed played a significant, but not all-important, role in shaping twentieth-century urbanism in the United States - even in a city as institutionally lagged as Richmond.

Nonetheless, Silver's approach to planning history has the great virtue of exposing the motives behind much of the public developmental activity that did occur. Zoning, subdivision regulation, public housing, urban renewal, and the like are not mere coincidental events. Legislation, code enforcement and many other elements fall into an historical context that demonstrates that planning has indeed played a significant, but not all-important, role in shaping twentieth-century urbanism in the United States - even in a city as institutionally lagged as Richmond.

PROF. JON A. PETERSON
Queens College of the City University of New York

********


This is another welcome volume in the series 'Studies in History Planning and the Environment' commissioned by the Alexandria Press. The new book deals with the history of urban planning and city growth in five countries of Southern Europe over the last two centuries, a period which has seen the full impact of industrialization.

Modern, urban development in Italy began with a network of established centers, reflecting the historical importance of the region-state system whereas no similar base existed in the other four countries: Greece, Portugal, Spain and Turkey. In no instance was there any attempt to plan and order the growth that followed the early nineteenth century, but the planning projects being geared to major events like the Lisbon earthquake of 1755. In the late nineteenth century there was a greater need for orderly development as industrialization gained momentum. The response was by no means uniform. Plans for the areas of ensanche (expansion) in the Spanish cities were far superior, conceptually and technically, to those produced in other countries. It was only in Spain that there was any sign of legislation setting out the ground rules for planning and growth on a city-wide basis, though even here the acts passed between 1864 and 1895 failed to control speculative development.

Turkey, in particular, international experience from abroad in the early years of the present century. It helped to generate a new set of plans for the major Spanish cities in which various notable architects, including Le Corbusier, participated. The Garden City concept flourished, especially in the most southern of the Regions, where a number of schemes in the Fascist era and in Turkey where N. Jansen's plan for Ankara is remembered. Architects and planners from Northern Europe produced plans for Lisbon but Greece remained relatively untouched from international planning until the 1920s and the French influence then brought to bear (notably through E. Hebrard) exerted few checks on speculative development. Legislation certainly provided for a hierarchy of plans (Spain 1923, Spain 1924, Turkey 1933 and Portugal 1934) but the authorities lacked adequate financial and technical resources and those plans which did appear were not effective. Even the relatively sophisticated approach taken in Italy in 1942, providing for a hierarchy of plans, failed in practice because it could not come to terms with the economic and political forces of an emerging growth. Further legislation since the war (Spain 1956, Turkey 1957) has still left the planners in a weak position to guide the rapid urbanization process: large public housing estates, as well as speculative private developments, have often contravened local plans. Neither have post-war plans been successful in
relieving congestion in city centres through transfer of industries and services to the periphery.

This book therefore presents a rather disappointing picture of good ideas frustrated by inadequate resources and lack of political will. There is, however, some basis for optimism through the moves towards greater democracy evident in the 1970s and a greater willingness to devote substantial resources to cope with the mounting problems of housing and infrastructure. As a publication the book is also rather disappointing. It is well produced but stands essentially as a set of five essays, backed up by no more than a few introductory and concluding remarks by the editor. The essays are easy to read, well illustrated and thoroughly referenced.


The fifth volume in the series Stadt-Planung-Geschichte (Town Planning History) contains papers of the 2nd Werner-Reimers-Foundation Symposium on Planning History which was held in June 1983. Gerhard Fehl advises colleagues that copies can be obtained at a reduced rate from himself.


Here we have the first report of the joint project between the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia and the Polytechnic of Aachen on the development and construction of European towns. The work is directed by Giorgio Piccinato, for the Italian group, and Juan Rodrigues-Lores, for the West German. The research, based largely on local government archive material, analyzes the interplay of culture and custom, public and private interests, market income and land rent, urbanisation and industrialisation, and local and central government, in the urban development of Frankfurt, Mannheim and München between 1850 and 1914 and Rome between 1865 and 1914.

Members will be interested to note that the Spring 1985 issue of the Journal of the American Planning Association (vol 51, No 2) is a symposium on the theme "Learning from the Past: The History of Planning". The Guest Editors are Dr. David A. Johnson, Professor of Planning at The University of Tennessee and Dr. Daniel Schaffer, Historian of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Norris, Tennessee, and the table of contents reads as follows:

**David A. Johnson, AICP**
Daniel Schaffer
Jon. A. Peterson

**Mark I. Gelfand**
Christopher Silver AICP
Carl Feins, FAIA, AICP
Seymour J. Mandelbaum

---

**WORK IN PROGRESS**

**Supplement 6**

In this sixth supplement to "Work in Progress" a distinction is again down between recent publications and activities (I) and work in progress (II).

Professor Gerhard Fehl, Lehrstuhl for Planungstheorie, Architekturgebaude, Shinkelsstrasse 1, 5100 Aachen, West Germany

---

A1 Gerhard Fehl, Tilman Harlander: Hitlers Sozialer Wohnungsbau 1940 - 1944 (Hitlers Public Housing 1940 - 1944; connecting link in housing politics and design between the Twentieth and Postwar period); in: Stadtbauswelt 84, Dec. 1984, p.391-398

A2 Gerhard Fehl: The Niddatal Project: The Unfinished Satellite Town on the Outskirts of Frankfurt; in: Built Environment vol 9, No. 3, p.185-197


B1 The research project on "Planning and Construction of the Modern German City in the Nineteenth Century" (announced in PHB vol 5, no. 2 1983) is getting on well and intermediate results on Munich, Frankfurt/M and Mannheim are available. The project is conducted by Dr. Juan Rodriguez-Lores.

B2 A new research project, sponsored by Volkswagen-Foundation has...
been taken up in autumn 84, conducted by Dr. Tillman Harland: "Unemployment and Housing in the City: Emergency settlements in the Great Depression of the early thirties in Germany" (1st phase)

B3 The project "Factory-Tied Housing Estates (Werkssiedlungen) in the Aachen Mining Area", conducted by Sabine Kraft, a documentation of housing estates 1860 to 1933 and of possibilities to preserve them.

B4 The project "Public Housing Programs during the war (1940 - 1945) in Germany", conducted by Dr. Tillman Harland and Prof. Gerhard Pehl. A final publication will be published in 1986 in the book-series "Mining-Housing-Politics," as volume 7 and will comprise a collection of original contributions taken from the journal "Der Soziale Wohnungsbau in Deutschland 1940-1944".

RESEARCH REPORTS

Political Economy and Planning in the Nineteenth Century: Looking for a Framework

Adrian Winnett
University of Bath

Political economy was the best organized and most influential discourse about society from the late eighteenth century onwards. Conventional histories of town planning take two broad directions, either tracing the emergence of planning from a confluence of specific policy interventions or from the transition into practice of related socio-spatial models. In both cases, it is quite straightforward to trace the influence of political economy. In the first instance, political economists were important publicists and influential committee members. Specific examples include: Nassau Senior's role in Poor Law reform, deriving from his reappraisal of Malthusianism to take account of the alleged disjunction between work and its rewards under the Old Poor Law in the south of England, weakening prudential checks to family formation; John Stuart Mill's support for municipal control of water supplies, on grounds of natural monopoly; and Alfred Marshall's discussion of rating reform, including imposition of a 'fresh air rate' to prevent overcrowding and encourage the provision of urban open space. In the second instance, the perspectives are broader. On the one hand, historians trace presuppositions which were reflected in contemporary views on urban design. For example, it has recently been emphasized that the emergence of Scottish political economy in the late eighteenth century was closely connected with themes of civic humanist virtue that have their counterpart in neoclassical town planning schemes. Later Benthamite utilitarianism provided compatible links, and towards the end of the nineteenth century notions of biological differentiation and evolution became significant in both economics and planning. On the other hand, orthodox economists were widely taken as the leading exponents of egoistic individualism, private property and the importance of the collective environment. In the course of promoting their schemes the latter felt called upon to refute the former. The outstanding case is Robert Owen, but the same is true of Russian-influenced reformers ranging from Lethaby to Geddes, and there are many other examples.

However, in both economics and planning these types of history have come under increasing criticism, for viewing the past in the image of the present. Such critical movements suggest the need for a different way of viewing the issues. What was the conceptual structure of political economy during different periods of the nineteenth century, and how was this related to perceptions of problems in the socio-spatial environment? Very simplistically, it is possible that the political economy was or was not there could be a rational understanding of the need to labour. This understanding was organized along two axes: along one was arrayed the 'natural' constraint of the relationship between population and land; along the other, the subjective understanding of the utilitarian application of effort to achieve satisfactions. These intersected in explanations of the course of income distribution and capital accumulation.

This structure of concepts was more or less drastically reinterpreted from time to time. Though the periodization of nineteenth century economics is contentious, it is clear that there was a shift around 1840 in the central themes of the functioning of the labour market. From this perspective, two central themes can be identified of relevance to 'planning history'. One is the way in which economists viewed landed property; was this conducive to the best distribution of labour in productive activities? The other is the issue of pauperism/poverty: was this simply a natural outcome of population pressure, or was it a response to the circumstances of the labourer? These questions are linked, in that the labourer's circumstances included conditions of access to immovable property.

There has long been a general view that classical political economy showed an 'urban bias' and a preference for large scale agriculture, as in the arguments for the advantages of the extended division of labour possible in factory production and the need for continuous activity in agriculture for the diminishing returns. But there were considerations running against these arguments. At a fundamental level, political economy inherited Locke' notions of access to land as underpinning the equalities on which the right to freedom was grounded. Freedom was, however, generated tensions which land reformers were never slow to exploit with schemes ranging from allotment cultivation to land nationalization. In other cases, the most important was, of course, George's 'single tax' proposal. Economists themselves were divided on the issue of large scale agriculture, the central argument concerning the tangible and intangible benefits which might flow from 'peasant proprietorship. This has sometimes been interpreted as an attempt to close off an area of society as beyond the rational discourse of utilitarian prompting; but the prevalent view was rather that indiscernible charity, private or public, generated pauperism. The moral problem was as much the giver's as the recipient's. From the late 1870s there was a shift towards emphasizing the evolution of a class, the 'residual', reproducing the conditions of poverty in a quasi-biological fashion. Whereas at the earlier stage, the metaphors of transparency and surveillance in the labourer's environment at home and work, the latter led to images of diseased areas to be excised and healthy, balanced growth stimulated elsewhere. Because of
its acknowledgement by Ebenezer Howard, the best known example is
Marshall's 'Home at the Bottom of the London Poor'. But this needs to be
taken in the context of the related arguments of Marshall and others that
cities to the healthful influences of light and air, of similar
proposals by Booth and others for 'labour colonies', and of the wide
diffusion of views on healthy and diseased social environments, those
otherwise at variance with Marshall, notably the group of Oxford
influenced by Toynbee.

The relationship between political economy and urban issues is
often visualized in terms of the 'Manchester' philosophy of Dickens's
stress on the connection of problem and solution. For although the
subsequent rapidity of their break
the complex matrix of arguments. The
more subtle and sophisticated ideas, often consistent with quite radical change and
intervention, these ideas must be understood as products of that
same matrix, not as isolated precursors of later developments.

Slums and Slum Clearance in London

Dr. Jim Yelling,
Dept. of Geography,
Loughborough College,
London N1P 1PA

I began work on this topic in 1978 and the first part of my
results dealing with the Victorian period will shortly appear in a
book to be published by Allen and Unwin. Initially, my focus was to
be on relationships between political policies, which were necessarily
related and not oversimplified, and the conditions which they encountered on application. It was particularly
evident in the field of property, for example, that there was much to
calculate of compensation payments in relation to different land
uses and forms of land and property ownership. Similarly, although
much more was known about the London poor through the work of
Stedman-Jones, Moli and others, most of this had not been precisely
related to slum clearance schemes. Nor had the mechanics of
programmes been established from designation through clearance to new
building. I therefore undertook the detailed examination of the
records of the Metropolitan Board of Works and London County Council
which was necessary for such a project.

Later, without abandoning this objective, I developed other
interests. These centred particularly on political strategies in
relation to the slum, and especially on those turning points
represented by the adoption of official slum clearance in the mid
1890's and early 30's. Strategies had to be seen as alternatives and as
related to each other not just to some more concrete reality.

Although the inevitable (but variable) non-correspondence between the
slum as conceived in a political strategy and the slum as encountered
on the ground was an important element in the breakdown of strategies,
this required also the construction of alternatives. It is through this
construction of alternatives that we can see the nature of the slum effects the remedies developed in response to it,
it is equally true that the nature of the remedies effects the view of
the nature of the slum. This is so not just at the level of general
political ideology, but also at the more concrete level of the
strategies. Thus the part III strategy required the building of a
different view of the problem of 'slum' from that previously held.
I think it is important also to see these relatively concrete
strategies as complexes made up of various policy strands welded into
rough coherence. Whilst they can be analysed to some extent in terms of
motives and interests, they derive their strength, in my view, from the
manner in which they draw different interests into partial alliances.
They were accepted as packages better than existing
alternatives including doing nothing. Equally, because of their
complex nature, these strategies offered possibilities of development
in different political directions. They were not frozen entities
occupying definite chunks of time of definite political space, but
were open to a certain degree of modification.

I view Cross's Act as embodying a paradigm strategy for the
slum in the late Victorian period. I have therefore been concerned with
the logic of the Act, with the manner in which it drew together
various powerful strands of thought and action, and with the framework
which it imposed on the perception of slum. The early work of the LCC
has been of particular interest in showing how a strategy could persist in modified form despite an apparent earlier breakdown.

I have similarly sought to interpret the development of the Part III
strategy and the changing political alliances and view of the slum
which this involved.

My main interest is now shifting to slums and slum clearance in
London during the period c.1907-1955. This work retains the focus on
political strategies and detailed relations with the world of property
and its compensation, tenants and rehousing. It is obviously centred on
the clearance drive of the 30's, but also includes an interest in the
effects of suburban expansion on the slum. Of the three campaigns in
which public policy has been directed mainly to clearance, that of the
thirties was the only one not to break down in the face of a
counter-movement. There is therefore much interest in examining
how, given the interruption of the War, the 30's experience was interpreted
in planning the post-war clearance drive.
Housing, Community and the Poor: Cincinnati's Low Income Housing Reform Experience, 1920-1950
Robert Fairbanks
University of Texas at Arlington

"Housing, Community and the Poor", came about from my fascination with the history of American public housing. I particularly wanted to identify more clearly the underlying assumptions behind the large scale, self-contained public housing projects constructed in Cincinnati and elsewhere at this time. Having grown up in an era which gave little credit to the impact of place on individual behavior, and stressed individual rights rather than community responsibility, I found it hard to understand how the era's housing leaders perceived such projects as an appropriate reform. Yet the more I read the so-called houses of the 1930s, the more I became convinced that these early proponents of large scale, self-contained public housing projects saw their efforts as critical contributions to the betterment of their cities.

Indeed, public housing offered a whole new way of life, rather than merely shelter. Housing reformers saw themselves as social engineers, reshaping alienated and anomalous slum dwellers into involved and committed citizens. In order to understand better this development and place it in some broader perspective, I decided to examine how reformers responded to the low-cost housing problem from 1890 to 1950. My decision to limit the study to Cincinnati, one of the nation's most poorly housed cities, and the home of prominent housing and planning figures such as Bleeker Marquette, Alfred Bettman, and Latisha Seque, permitted me to examine the rhetoric and actions of reformers participating in the national dialogue over low-cost housing problems in a local setting.

I explored Cincinnati housing reform during the turn-of-the-century, it became clear to me that tenement reform of that period - emphasizing safe, sanitary and healthy living space, along with family privacy - differed so greatly from the housing problem of the thirties - emphasizing homogeneous community within the larger metropolitan community - that it constituted a distinct problem.

This is a key influence on the structure and emphasis of my work. I soon identified Cincinnati housing reform between 1920 and 1950 as a discrete period which defined and responded to the city's low-cost housing problem very different than its predecessor. Though the manuscript examines the turn-of-the-century better housing movement in some detail, this is done not to trace the roots of modern public housing movement in Cincinnati, but to clarify the dichotomy within which the homogeneous neighborhood idea was conceived.

Cincinnati tenement reform at the turn-of-the-century appeared as one of many movements concerned with improving the environs of the poor. Cincinnati housing tenement reform focused almost exclusively on the dwellings of the poor, located in the city's tenement districts. Although tenement reformers readily acknowledged that inadequate playspace, a heterogeneous population and the indiscriminate mixing of residence and business provided an improper setting for community consciousness, they pushed solutions which concentrated exclusively on the dwelling-tenement regulation and model tenement building.

The decision to pursue the large scale community approach to public housing was a reaction that the Public Works Administration and the United States Housing Authority, had several consequences. As early public housing in Cincinnati took the shape of self-contained neighborhoods, a community which had seemed less than tenable earlier, proponents of the new program, attempting to define the spatial and social environment, certain controversies emerged which threatened public housing. High costs and the demanding cooperative effort between city, state, and federal governments created tensions and helped shape the final program. In addition, controversy surrounding the very nature of slums and the tenancy requirements in the new projects further helped make public housing highly controversial.

Despite the full adoption of the homogeneous neighborhood approach to housing developed in the Cincinnati Master Plan of 1945, which called for the redevelopment of slum areas into vital neighborhoods, it faltered. Housing reformers faced local controversy, limited federal funds, and a state judicial decision halted Cincinnati public housing in 1942. By the time it started up for group interaction and a sense of community.

Actions by the Cincinnati Better Housing League, formed in 1916, brought a redefinition of the housing problem. Although its formation had stemmed from the movement to improve the tenements located in the city's basin area, the League not only embraced the broader definition of housing, but also supported the wider improvements of the city's planning movement, supposing that comprehensive planning and zoning would create the proper types of well-housed neighborhoods throughout the city. Having become housing reformers, housing reformers built the new town of Mariemont, built on the outskirts of Cincinnati by philanthropist Mary Emery for the same reason. It would encourage the creation of working class families from the slum filled basin into neighborhood settings which fostered citizen building.

Mariemont, comprehensive planning, zoning, and citywide housing codes, then, suggest a new definition of the housing problem through a comprehensive approach rather than trying to improve isolated elements of the housing problem. Similarly, reformers no longer dealt with the city and suburb as discrete units, but an closely related, inter-dependent parts which could best be improved by treating the larger setting - the metropolis.

Under the new definition of housing, the basin tenement district seemed hopeless. Not only did filth, dilapidation, and disease present a pathological setting, but the heterogeneous population inhibited any efforts to build a sense of community. Cincinnati looked forward to the eventual destruction of this housing area, through the expansion of the city's business and commercial districts. Rapidly growing chief housing which was the future lived up to the new standards of good housing.

In many ways, reformers had shifted the focus of their attention from the poor to the process of good housing.

Under the early twenties gave way to despair by the end of the decade when privately financed community building efforts and publicly enacted regulatory legislation appeared important in dealing with the new standards of good housing. In the future lived up to the new standards of good housing. In the future, development hoped that urban expansion would not eradicating inner city clumps, and that private industry simply could not build affordable housing for the poor. As a result, many local housing reformers turned to the federal government for help in defining the problem that helped shape the nature of early public housing.

The decision to pursue the large scale community approach to public housing that the Public Works Administration and the United States Housing Authority, had several consequences. As early public housing in Cincinnati took the shape of self-contained neighborhoods, a community which had seemed less than tenable earlier, proponents of the new program, attempting to define the spatial and social environment, certain controversies emerged which threatened public housing. High costs and the demanding cooperative effort between city, state, and federal governments created tensions and helped shape the final program. In addition, controversy surrounding the very nature of slums and the tenancy requirements in the new projects further helped make public housing highly controversial.

Despite the full adoption of the homogeneous neighborhood approach to housing developed in the Cincinnati Master Plan of 1945, which called for the redevelopment of slum areas into vital neighborhoods, it faltered. Housing reformers faced local controversy, limited federal funds, and a state judicial decision halted Cincinnati public housing in 1942. By the time it started up
The Rebuilding of Germany’s Cities after 1945

Jeffrey M. Diefendorf
Dept. of History
University of New Hampshire, Durham
New Hampshire, USA

All accounts of post-war Germany begin with the magnitude of destruction and the struggle, in a politically and economically unsure situation, to reconstruct and start over. Most of Germany’s urban centres were severely damaged; in some cases over 90% of the city centre was destroyed. Today, however, even the casual tourist is struck by the fact that only forty years ago were rubble. Surprisingly, the process of physical reconstruction has received relatively little attention from historians, especially compared with the studies of Germany’s political and economic reconstruction. The existing studies of urban reconstruction are primarily brief examinations of specific problems (such as site-seeing housing construction, or rubble removal) in individual cities. Interest in German reconstruction is growing rapidly, however, and there is a sore need for a synthesis of the work done in diverse fields and in different cities.

The lack of attention up to now is all the more surprising in that there are a number of extremely interesting questions to be answered about urban reconstruction. The industrial revolution brought with it a great many urban problems: overcrowding, poor housing, inadequate transportation, and the like. Conceivably Germany had the opportunity to correct or ameliorate these problems during post-war reconstruction and build functional, livable industrial urban centers. But was this actually attempted? Reconstruction took place at a time when many Germans wanted to forget the recent past, while the more remote past was a potential source of cultural values upon which to base a new revival of public life. How was a desire to reconstruct the past balanced against a desire to build truly modern cities? Who made such decisions, and how? What role did the occupation play in the earlier years? Did the occupation plans and reconstruction take place without planning? Where did financing come from, and who gained from the process? What accounts for regional variations? These and other questions were not answered in the existing literature.

For some four years now I have been working on a book on the rebuilding of Germany’s bombed cities. What started out as a study of three or four cities has turned into a much broader work on reconstruction in all of West Germany. I have made three research trips to Germany and have worked in city and state archives in Aachen, Cologne, Dusseldorf, Hamburg, Lubeck, Munchen, Nurnberg, and Stuttgart. The interviews and the study of the records of retired city planners were conducted in Nurnberg, Berlin, and Munchen. I have also worked on the U.S. government records in the National Archives in Washington. Research in secondary materials - my work is close to being a book - includes close study of a variety of published work and gathering illustrative material in the form of photographs, maps and plans.

I have now completed chapters on rubble removal and reprocessing, planning and building law, historic preservation, administrative and technical organization, production and allocation of building materials, allocation of labour, and financing. Currently I am writing about city planners and planning concepts. Since one of my interests is continuities with the period before 1945 - that is, was 1945 really a zero-hour, a new beginning - I have also done some work on the Nazis’ rebuilding planning during the war, which, it turns out, continued right through 1944. Considerably more thought was being given to reconstruction of the bombed cities than is usually believed.

Though I have not yet formulated my final conclusions, I certainly will be stressing the importance of continuities in planning ideas and personnel, a dialectical conflict between pragmatists and utopian urban reformers, disputes between modernizers and preservationists, and the rise of the large southern and northern German cities. In many ways urban reconstruction was a coordination by a group of planners who knew each other and followed each other’s work, but the political divisions in Germany also guaranteed the primacy of local decision making.

The most successful cases of reconstruction in post-war Germany were cities like Nuremberg and Munich, where a careful blending of tradition and modernism resulted from the interaction between strong local municipal governments, who generally favored urban modernization, and strong citizen groups who lobbied for recreation of their old cities. The ideas and personalities of the chief city planner were of primary importance, since these men had to persuade the public to accept their ideas. Some, notably Hilbrecht in Munchen, were able to do this; others, notably Hilbrecht in Munchen, were not. In cities like Nuremberg, planners sought to lower population density, separate urban functions, introduce greenery and sunlight to crowded areas, and facilitate the flow of auto traffic. They organized rubble removal and salvaging of building material, prepared new city plans, initiated the redrawing of old property lines to get larger land parcels for modern houses, and obtained land for wider streets, and supervised construction. Obstacles were many. Laws regulating planning and defining property rights varied, with coercive powers greatest in the British occupation zone and weakest in the American zone. Returning populations and a flood of refugees required rapid repair of all repairable housing, including that which contradicted the planner’s goals, and also the diversion of resources into housing in new suburbs. Until the currency reform in mid-1948, material and labor was scarce and a black market flourished, with public financing that was scarce. The greatest accomplishment was the rapid construction of large amounts of housing, mostly of it publically.
subsidized. Marshall aid helped here, but most financing was German. Inner city traffic planning was generally a failure. The new streets, for which many historic buildings were sacrificed, quickly proved inadequate. Germany's ubiquitous pedestrian zones are the resultant attempt to compensate for this failure. Planners and builders did indeed modernize the old cities, and reconstruction was remarkable rapid, but the loss of historic substance has been irreversible.
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SLUM CLEARANCE, REHOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL SPACE
1980-1940

Colin G. Pooley
Dept of Geography, University of Lancaster

1. Introduction

Literature on post-1945 slum clearance has frequently concentrated on the disruptive effect of slum-clearance schemes, the break-up of communities and kinship networks, and the difficulty of adjusting to new environments. Other work on urban form and rehousing has highlighted the effects of layout and design on human perceptions and behaviour. Together, this literature suggests that slum clearance and rehousing is invariably linked with changes in behaviour and social life, that the design of new units affects the ease with which people adapt to a new house, the way in which they live in it and use the surrounding space, and that slum clearance has been a major force influencing social and behavioural change in communities and cities.

However, slum clearance and rehousing is not just a phenomenon of the post-1945 era. Victorian Medical Officers of Health and City Councils had a considerable impact on slum property in the nineteenth century, whilst demolition and rebuilding by local authorities was established in some towns by the 1880s and expanded rapidly during the inter-war period.

The majority of literature on this topic focusses on the politics of corporation involvement, on house construction and management, and the broad social characteristics of tenants on difference estates. Only rarely is consideration given to the way people lived in residential space and the impact and meaning of slum clearance and rehousing for the everyday lives of council tenants.

A series of six questions which require further investigation arise from consideration of relevant contemporary literature. First, to what extent did slum clearance and rehousing change the spatial form of the city by relocating families in the suburbs? From the perspective of
individual tenants, the extent to which rebuilding occurred in the same locality as slum clearance affected the viability and perpetuation of locality-based communities. Relocation could be the first step towards disorientation and social problems. Second, what were the effects of slum clearance and rehousing on the use made of residential space? With even a low level of spatial relocation, rehousing could affect everyday patterns of interaction and contact and thus have a disruptive effect upon individuals involved. Third, what were the effects of rehousing on class-based segregation? To what extent did rehousing schemes replicate the class structure of clearance areas, or did the allocation policies used in rehousing lead to a greater social mix or to one-class estates? Fourth, what were the effects of slum clearance and rehousing on housing quality? Did all dispossessed tenants gain equal access to new housing schemes and did these provide a real improvement in housing space and amenity for the families concerned? Fifth, what were the implications for tenants of having the Local Authority as a landlord? Management policy adopted by landlords, including policy on arrears and attempts to maintain social control, affected many aspects of privacy, family life, and the freedom of individuals to arrange their own affairs. Lastly, what effects did the design of new housing schemes have on the use made of housing space? For instance, to what extent did tenement design and communal responsibility for adjacent public space affect everyday lives, behaviour and use of residential space?

These six themes, although not an exhaustive list of questions for investigation, provide a possible framework for research. Although interpretation is often speculative, the remainder of this paper will selectively illustrate these points using examples drawn from slum clearance and rehousing schemes carried out in Liverpool before 1945.6

2. Slum clearance and rehousing in Liverpool 1895-1918

There were four principal strands to the housing policy which developed in Liverpool.7 First, from 1901, all sites cleared in schemes using loans sanctioned by the Local Government Board would be used to build corporation houses for the working classes.8 Second, it was agreed that if the corporation were to rehouse those dispossessed from the worst insanitary courts, then units must be let at rents almost equivalent to those normally paid in the slums. Third, it was decided that tenement dwellings should be built to a minimum specification. Many early dwellings were small in size, with shared facilities, and in some cases without hot water systems.10 Fourth, there was a commitment to reserve new tenement dwellings for those dispossessed through slum-clearance schemes.

Given these policies, to what extent did slum clearance and rehousing by Liverpool Corporation in the period before 1918 have a significant effect upon the everyday lives of slum dwellers? The overall spatial form of the city was not changed by these housing operations as new dwellings were built directly on cleared sites. Locality-based communities could, in theory, be preserved and the social and spatial form of the city remained largely unaltered. However, at the individual level slum clearance and rehousing could be very disruptive. Many tenants had lived 1 km or more from the new blocks and by no means all those dispossessed by slum clearance schemes were accommodated in new dwellings. Overall well under 50% of families dispossessed were housed in corporation dwellings and those families who were barred from corporation dwellings on financial or social grounds, or who chose not to apply to the corporation, crowded into substandard housing elsewhere in the locality.11 Movement of only 1 km could necessitate a change in activity patterns for shopping, entertainment and contact with friends, and could thus cause significant short-term adjustments in everyday behaviour.12

The corporation carefully vetted all applications for corporation housing to ensure that tenants had been dispossessed or were from insanitary housing. The occupations of corporation tenants suggest that the new dwellings contained the same working-class social mix that had previously existed in cleared areas, but many of the poorest and most casual workers were excluded. The extent to which corporation policy improved housing conditions for individual households depended on whether families were able to gain access to and stay in corporation dwellings. For those excluded from corporation housing, slum-clearance operations did not improve conditions, but forced them to crowd into multi-occupied, insanitary property elsewhere in the city. Even for families that were accommodated, the improvement in space and facilities may not have been great and a considerable number of cases of overcrowding in corporation dwellings were reported each year.14 Both the relatively high cost of corporation rents, and the rigid policies of
the local authority as a landlord, must also be set against any improvement in physical amenities that corporation tenants enjoyed. Not only were tenants carefully selected, but their behaviour and housekeeping was carefully monitored by the manager of dwellings. The corporation also required prompt payment of rent, and any families who failed to conform were promptly evicted into the private sector.\(^{15}\)

Apart from their small size and rudimentary amenities, there is little evidence that the design of early corporation dwellings failed to conform. Tenement blocks with some shared facilities, most were no more than 3 storeys high, and there would be little difference between living in a typical corporation block and a multi-occupied front or court house. However, it was only after several years, when the council had successfully sorted and selected its tenants and those disillusioned with corporation housing had left, that the tenement blocks acquired a degree of stability that was to make them desirable units within the local authority sector in the interwar years.

3. Slum clearance and rehousing in Liverpool, 1930-1945

The Housing Act of 1930 obliged local authorities to survey housing need and embark on a programme of slum clearance and rehousing, with the possibility of either building high density units on cleared sites in the city centre or of decanting slum dwellers to cottage estates in the suburbs. Liverpool’s Director of Housing, Lancelot Keay, initially preferred the wholesale decanting of slum dwellers to the suburbs, thus lowering central densities and providing an improved environment for family life, but he was eventually convinced that economic and social factors would make this impossible. The Medical Officer undertook a new survey of unhealthy areas and earmarked 13,069 properties for clearance, whilst Keay proposed a 10-year rebuilding scheme that would accommodate 10,692 dispossessed families in inner-city tenements with a further 5,000 suburban cottages for those who could be persuaded to move to the suburbs.\(^{16}\)

The effects that slum clearance and rehousing operations had on individual families in the 1930s depended principally on whether rehousing was in the central area or on a distant suburban estate. For the relatively small number of slum-clearance families who did move to the suburbs, this step must have proved a major upheaval to every aspect of their lives. Such families were removed from locality-based communities in the inner-city, and settled in bleak and expensive suburban estates. For those in employment travel-to-work could necessitate at least a 5 mile journey through unfamiliar territory to the north or south docks, whilst familiar shops, pubs and other everyday contacts were a costly bus or tram ride away.

Although slum clearance and rehousing in the suburbs began to change the spatial structure of the city, it did not necessarily mean that classes became more integrated. The streets constructed under slum-clearance schemes in the 1930s were kept quite distinct from the more selective suburban estates of the 1920s and although locations were changed, social classes remained almost as segregated as they had been before slum clearance took place.

One significant change between the 1890s and the 1930s which affected the way in which tenants lived in and used their residential space, was a relaxation in the attitude of the corporation as landlord. Although the corporation still kept close control over its tenants it was much less ready to evict tenants who failed to conform. Subletting to increase tenants’ incomes was also tolerated if it did not lead to overcrowding, whilst the corporation adopted a much more relaxed attitude towards arrears.\(^{17}\) The corporation may have been a more understanding landlord than most private houseowners during the depression.

The design and layout of suburban cottages could also cause minor problems for families moving from the slums. Although cottages built in the 1930s were mostly small they did contain 4 rooms whereas most slum-clearance tenants came from 1 and 2 room dwellings. Families had to adjust to the increased space, which was often underused at first both due to the habit of living in a confined space and lack of furniture. Facilities such as a bath, gas, electricity, and a garden were also often novel, and the corporation provided copious instructions on all aspects of housekeeping. The new estates themselves were also criticised for being monotonous and disorientating, whilst lack of recreational facilities often led to boredom especially amongst the youth.\(^{18}\) Although fairly trivial, these were all factors which made individual adjustment to rehousing difficult, and which together with
economic factors created problems for those slum-dwellers who chose to move to the suburbs.

In contrast, the majority of tenants dispossessed by slum clearance who chose to be accommodated in central-area tenements faced much less disruption. Most tenants moved from immediately adjacent areas as a process of gradual decanting into new blocks was undertaken and the basic spatial form of the city was retained. At the most detailed level interaction patterns did change, as old shops were swept away in slum-clearance schemes and immediate neighbours altered as the result of rehousing, but long-term disruptive effects would have been small.

Because inner-city communities were moved en masse into new blocks the one-class characteristics of these areas were preserved. Unlike rehousing schemes of the 1940s, allocation of tenancies in the new blocks was not highly selective and most families dispossessed by slum clearance eventually had the choice of accommodation, in a 2, 3 or 4-room flat with full modern amenities. As with suburban cottages, the corporation was concerned to maintain a high standard of housekeeping amongst its tenants - but the level of supervision and interference in the everyday affairs of tenants was much less than it had been in the 1860s. However there remained significant complaints about the lack of privacy in corporation tenements, and about noise, vandalism, poor maintenance, lack of facilities and the fact that 'decent' families had to live with 'undesirable' tenants from the slums.\(^{19}\) The problems of mixing tenants of even slightly different backgrounds at high densities in large-scale high-rise developments, of supervising communal open space, and of providing sufficient amenities to prevent vandalism which have been apparent in post-war high-rise developments, were already beginning to appear in Liverpool's 5-storey blocks in the late 1930s and early 1940s. Many families were finding the flats difficult to adjust to and hard to live in.

4. Conclusions

Although the analysis presented here necessarily leaves many questions only partially answered it can be seen that different phases of slum clearance had quite varied impacts on the everyday lives of tenants involved. In the 1890s rehousing was not in itself disruptive because rebuilding occurred on slum-clearance sites and blocks were relatively small scale. However, the selective nature of rehousing and the strict discipline enforced by the local authority meant that many families were adversely affected by slum clearance, and housing problems were often compounded elsewhere in the city. By the 1930s, the local authority was attempting to move slum-dwellers to the outskirts - providing an improved environment but creating maximum disruption - but these moves were resisted by most families who preferred for social and economic reasons to remain in the city centre. However, even rehousing in the inner city could cause disruption as families had to get used to living in large-scale, high-density blocks, and problems of supervision and control of public open space and access ways around flats became rapidly apparent. Because many families rapidly became dissatisfied with the new blocks - choosing to move out to the suburbs as quickly as possible - rebuilding on-site may eventually have proved as disruptive to local communities as slum clearance and removal to the suburbs.
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In the first two decades of the twentieth century Sheffield City Council developed an active and innovative role in two linked areas of embryonic local public policy. Firstly, it became a protagonist for a policy of suburban dispersal as a means of solving some of the problems of its overcrowded unhealthy central city neighbourhoods; between 1909 and 1914 it struggled to establish a municipal housebuilding role in its efforts to use the Part III powers of the 1890 Housing of the Working Classes Act to provide working class cottage estates in suburban locations. Secondly, it became an advocate for town planning and, when powers became available under the 1909 Act it grappled energetically over several years to put them into effect. The part played by the City Council in developing a municipal housing role during these years has been fully documented elsewhere. The purpose of these notes, therefore, is to examine the City's distinctive role in promoting the idea of town planning during its formative years as a statutory activity. The initiatives which Sheffield took during this period are interesting for two reasons. Firstly, because of the breadth of the Corporation's concept of what needed to be done to effectively implement the planning powers made available through the 1909 Act and, secondly, because of the steps subsequently taken to prepare a comprehensive plan for the whole city. Throughout the years between 1909 and 1919 Sheffield was pushing towards a concept of town planning which went far beyond the possibilities effectively provided by the legislation.

Scheme Preparation under the 1909 Act

Not only was Sheffield in the vanguard of the authorities which tried to implement the planning provisions of the 1909 Housing and Town Planning Act, but it entertained hopes of bringing all potential development land on its urban fringe within an approved planning scheme. The idea of a town planning scheme which took as its starting point the whole exurban ring around the city and not separate suburban areas derived in part from an administrative distinctiveness insofar as Sheffield had boundaries which included an area of underdeveloped land which was twice that of the built-up area. It was Edward Gibbs, a distinguished local architect, who imaginatively saw within the particular circumstances of Sheffield the possibility of preparing a comprehensive town extension plan for the whole city. Gibbs set out his proposals in a lecture given to the Sheffield Society of Architects and Surveyors on 9th March 1911.


A full summary of empirical evidence is contained in Pooley, C.G. and Irish, S. The Development of Corporation Housing in Liverpool 1800-1945, (University of Lancaster, Centre for M.W. Research Paper, 1984). Research for this project was carried out with the aid of a grant from the E.S.R.C.


When Gibbs delivered his paper the Improvement Committee of the City Council had already embarked upon preliminary work in respect of two areas for which it hoped to secure approval from the local Government Board for the preparation of planning schemes. This, Gibbs argued, would not secure just and good town planning. If planning restrictions were applied only to these two areas the result in all probability would be that development would take place in areas free from restriction. Town planning efforts would consequently be nullified. He reasoned:

'...it will be unjust to the owners of land in the two suburbs, as it will put upon them restrictions from which their competitors in other suburbs are free, and yet as ratepayers they will have to pay their share of the cost of the preparation and approval of the Scheme which makes these restrictions ... and therefore appears that if for the public good undesirable building is to be stopped, and if justice is to be done to all owners of land, that the scheme should be applied to all the suburbs and the full area of each, so that there would be no intervening spaces in which advantage might be taken of the absence of restrictions.'

Gibbs applied his case, therefore, on grounds of fairness and effective planning. He also supported his argument with two other reasons. Firstly, he contended that city growth would continue into the foreseeable future and that it would be as well to prepare a long term plan to guide the future development of suburban areas. Secondly, he argued that only a comprehensive scheme would ensure an effective road network for the city. Gibbs offered, in fact, a model traffic network for an ideal city, 'a city on a plain', which he acknowledged would need to be modified in its application to the particular circumstances of Sheffield. His system of radial/concentric principal roads was simple in its conception but it represented a significant appreciation of the need to place town planning within a wider framework than could be accommodated within the piecemeal and site planning context of particular suburban areas.

Gibbs applied these principles in his outline plan for the city. This incorporated lines for new roads including part of an outer ring. He also indicated sites for new park areas and land for 'new works' although he admitted that it was difficult to find sufficient land for new industrial development.

The plan included recommendations as to road widths and density. In relation to the latter he proposed a net density of 24 houses to the acre in working class areas falling to 12 in others. On the administrative implications of his proposals Gibbs noted that the preparation of a town planning scheme required the local authority to notify land owners on six separate occasions. Given the scale of what he was proposing he acknowledged that this was an impossible requirement to meet. He suggested that application should be made to the Local Government Board to proceed by advertisement only.

Gibb's ideas did influence the work of the Improvement Committee which accepted the wisdom of preparing schemes for the whole area of undeveloped land within the city boundaries regarded as suitable for building purposes - an area of 6000 acres as calculated by the City Engineer and Surveyor. The suggestion made by Gibbs that application should be made to the Local Government Board to waive the individual notification of owners in favour of advertisement was not proceeded with. At a meeting of the Improvement Committee shortly after Gibbs had delivered his paper the Town Planning Sub-Committee reported that it

'...had careful considered the desirability or otherwise of immediately applying the Town Planning powers to and preparing a comprehensive scheme for the unbuilt-upon area of the City. Apart from the question as to whether the powers of the Act are sufficiently extensive to enable the preparation of such a Scheme, there are many and serious difficulties in the way, and your Sub-Committee are unanimous in their expression of opinion that at the present time, it would be unwise to undertake this work."

Instead, the Committee decided to proceed area by area but with the intention of preparing schemes for the 6000 acres of potentially developable land. Initially work concentrated on three areas of the city 'where building was already taking place or where it was likely to do so in the near future.' The decision to proceed simultaneously with these three areas was itself an ambitious undertaking. The total area was 2110 acres. The largest (625 acres) was in the north east of the city and adjoined the industrial area of Brightside. The others were on the west and south west boundaries of the built-up area.

Work soon commenced on other areas of undeveloped land and, in 1912, the distinctiveness of Sheffield's approach secured the approval of Abercrombie. By the end of that year approval had been obtained from the Local Government Board to proceed with the preparation of schemes for the
three original areas while work was in hand on an additional four areas covering some 4570 acres. In total, therefore, the Corporation was working on schemes covering some 6780 acres. This represented good progress. Nationally, at this time, only two schemes has secured final approval from the Local Government Board (both in Birmingham) and approval to proceed had been given only to 17 others.6 Nevertheless, some dissatisfaction with the delays imposed by the procedural requirements was being expressed by the City Engineer and Surveyor in 1913.7

However, enthusiasm for the time being did not falter although, with hindsight, it would be easy to forgive local councils for wavering in the face of the obstacles placed in the way of securing an operational scheme especially since the benefits to be derived now appear so insubstantial as to be hardly worth the time and energy required to secure them. In Sheffield, for example, the only principal matters to be determined by the schemes in preparation were: 1) the establishment of lines for new roads and their widths and proposals for widening of existing streets, 2) reservation of land for open spaces, 3) the setting of maximum densities which varied between 24 houses to the acre in areas adjoining working class housing and falling to 12 in others.

The Improvement Committee continued to actively engage in its statutory planning role until 1916. By the end of that year, the Council had sanction from the Local Government Board to proceed with the preparation of schemes for seven areas and preliminary work was still in hand in respect of four other areas. In total some 9157 acres were involved.8 However, it had still not managed to secure the final adoption of a scheme even for those for which approval to proceed had been granted by the Local Government Board as early as March 1912. The minutes of the Improvement Committee throughout the years between 1912 and 1916 demonstrate the reasons why. Negotiations with landowners were protracted and often inconclusive and in circumstances where the agreement of several landowners was necessary progress could not be made. By 1916, moreover, the effects of the war on the pace of new development had made the control of suburban expansion a less pressing need and attention shifted away from the urban fringe to the well-being of the city and its industrial base. For a period of five years, between 1917 and 1922, the initiative tended to move from the Improvement Committee (which, however, continued to exercise responsibility for statutory planning functions) to a new committee of the council, the Development Committee.

The Civic Survey and Plan

The Development Committee was established on 14th March 1917 and it ushered in another innovative period in Sheffield’s planning history. Its appointment arose out of a growing concern about the narrowness of Sheffield’s industrial base and the City’s inability, given its poor image environmentally, to attract new enterprises. Its main task was ‘to watch over and promote the trade, industry, development, and general prosperity of the City of Sheffield, and of the Manufacturers, Traders and Inhabitants thereof’.9 Its terms of reference, as set out by a Special Committee of the Council appointed in December 1916, were wide but broadly encompassed two major tasks. The first was that of providing, in effect, an industrial land availability service. Here it was envisaged that it would carry out investigations of the land available for development whether in public or private ownership and give assistance to those seeking to purchase land or premises. Its second role was that of publicity - to promote Sheffield and its advantages as widely as possible. This was a novel role for a municipal authority and, as the Special Committee advised, there were no powers available to the Council ‘to carry on a Development Department at the expense of the rates’.10 This was overcome by the Council agreeing to defray the costs from the profits of the Tramways Undertaking. Originally it had been intended to establish a separate department but failure to appoint an executive officer to head it led in November 1917 to the decision to postpone the establishment of the department until after the war and to meanwhile place the new responsibilities within the Town Clerk’s Department.11 An Advisory Committee was also established with representatives from local business and trades organisations. It is then interesting to note that E.M. Gibbs, now in his seventieth year, was the representative of the Sheffield Society of Architects and Surveyors. He was to play a crucial role in subsequent developments.

Throughout its first year the Committee was busy particularly in advertising Sheffield both in Britain and abroad and it embarked upon the publication of a series of information brochures on Sheffield and its industries. It became concerned about the need to secure improvements to the centre of the city and decided in August 1918 to begin discussions with the Improvement Committee as to how these might be achieved.12 This was a matter which was referred to the Development Committee which reported back that its members were

‘... pleased to note that the Development Committee have arranged to
The influence of Gibbs was undoubtedly instrumental in giving shape to this widened concept of what was needed and, indeed, it was Gibbs who attended the meeting of the Development Committee in August 1918 as the spokesman for the Advisory Committee. The consequence was that it was decided that a deputation of members, but including Gibbs, should visit Manchester and Liverpool to establish what these cities were doing 'on the subject of a city survey.' A visit was made to Manchester following which it was decided that Abercrombie should be invited to Sheffield to meet members of the Development and Improvement Committees. Events thereafter moved quickly. A report of a Joint Sub-Committee was received by the Development Committee in January 1919. This was unequivocal in its support for the carrying out a Civic Survey on the lines recommended by the Development Committee's Advisory committee five months previously. 'Our view is', the Report stated...

...that the future development of Sheffield for the next 50 years should be studied now, and that a plan should be prepared now laying down the lines of such development as far as they can be foreseen and that all additional powers which are required to secure that such a plan, when prepared, shall be followed, shall be obtained by the Corporation as soon as possible.

The Sub-Committee was firm too in its view that the plan should not be limited to Sheffield's existing boundaries. A wider canvas was required both to make a realistic assessment of transport requirements and to coordinate future housing developments. The Sub-Committee further recommended that the most appropriate means of carrying out the survey and making the plan were through the employment of an expert to direct a special staff employed by the Corporation. These recommendations were approved and in May 1919 it was resolved to engage Abercrombie to direct the work. Abercrombie began his commission on 18th August 1919.

Conclusions

By the time Abercrombie started work legislation had recently been enacted which was to reform the statutory basis for Town Planning schemes. A new phase in the development of Britain's planning system was about to begin. In retrospect we can see only too clearly the shortcomings of the early town planning legislation. Not only was the concept of the task which town planning needed to accomplish a narrow one but the process of securing operational schemes, even within this circumscribed view of town planning, was made virtually impossible by the procedural requirements of scheme preparation and approval. This, however, makes Sheffield's achievements during these early years of the town planning movement all the more remarkable. Here was an authority grappling with a concept of what town planning might achieve which went far beyond the possibilities provided by the legislation. What was true of Sheffield's role in the statutory planning field between 1910 and 1919 had also distinguished the Corporation's efforts in the preceding years under the housing legislation to establish a positive role for municipal housing provision. Even more remarkable in many respects, however, was the decision to undertake a Civic Survey and Plan in 1919. To appoint Abercrombie at this point in time was a bold and imaginative step. The commitment to embark upon the plan was made before the 1919 Act with its enabling powers for joint planning schemes and it predated Abercrombie's commission to prepare the Doncaster Regional Planning Scheme. Of course in one sense all these early initiatives on the part of Sheffield City Council were to end in failure, at least when measured against their real impact in shaping development and affecting positive change. But this would be to seriously misjudge their significance. They and the efforts of other progressive local authorities were part of the slow but necessary process of moving toward a clearer concept of the practice of town planning as well as an appropriate statutory framework within which it could be effective pursued.
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Recent developments in planning

At the beginning of the 1960s, integrated spatial planning gained a place in the Netherlands among the other forms of planning, such as road planning, water engineering, traffic and transport and other variants of economic planning (Den Hoed, 1983). In response to the rapid population growth and the unbalanced distribution of activity over the country (the "full" Randstad versus the "remainder" of the Netherlands), the goal of overall planning for Dutch society through a National Physical Plan, which had been the aim of planners since the 1930s, again became topical. In 1960 the Ministry of Housing and the Building Industry published the Report on Physical Planning, compiled by the National Planning Service, now the National Physical Planning Agency.

During the 1970s, the predominantly economic definition of physical planning was broadened to include environmental matters. Physical planning also took on some of the characteristics of a political programme, partly as a result of the discussions on major infrastructure projects such as the closing of the Eastern Schelde, the Markerwaard and the second national airport, the city of Rotterdam's Plan 2000 for port extension in the Delta region and the planning of large-scale urban extensions such as the Bijlmermeer in Amsterdam. In plan preparation increasing use was being made of social scientific research of the type which had been developed before the Second World War, notably in the Amsterdam General Extension Plan of 1934. In addition, there was increasing public participation, so that here, too, the physical plan could serve as a didactic, decision-making model.

In the 1980s, physical planning seems to have lost some of its position as a vanguard. Like many other forms of official planning, physical planning is much concerned with internal co-ordination of the administrative decision-making process, with a great deal of attention having to be devoted to legal and administrative procedures. Physical planning is stagnating and threatening to become bogged down in purely procedural and instrumental manoeuvres. The role of the urban planner has also changed, because, according to Wigmans, the rise of technocratic urban managers, has resulted in financial and economic considerations and arguments coming to
dominate the urban planning process (Wigmans, 1984). Everywhere, whether it is realistic or not, the call is heard for the objective again to be taken as the starting point for determining the content and style of planning (Kreukels, 1983). It seems as though the present situation in planning, with greater attention being paid to the plan, the concept and the vision and, particularly, the current doubts about a form of image planning inspired by an optimistic belief in progress, have created a favourable climate for a renewed interest in history.

Urban History trends since the 'Fin de Siecle'

Various traditions exist in the Dutch historiography of physical planning. The majority of them have developed within the narrow context of Urban History, in which the city is investigated from a range of disciplines, including that of planning history. If we limit the broad field of physical planning to that of the city, it is striking that, in contrast with France, for example, the tradition of urban geography in the Netherlands has never had strong links with history (Stave, 1984; Heinemeyer, 1977). There have been few geographical studies which have combined research into urban morphology with study of the social and economic components, or with the political and institutional organisation of the latter. A rare exception from the methodological standpoint is Visser's study of Schoonhoven (Visser, 1964). Although the revival of economic history in the 1960s and of social and cultural history since 1968 has stimulated the interest of historians in the physical planning element of urban planning, it has not had the same effect as in sociology, for example, where urban sociology was able to develop into an independent discipline (Nelissen, 1984). Nevertheless, the historical studies of the Wageningen School, with their marked demographic bias and their attention to such questions as urbanisation and industrialisation, form an excellent point of departure for a socio-economic historiography, written from a spatial standpoint (Van der Woude, 1965; Faber et al., 1965). Van Tijn's study of 19th century Amsterdam, however, which integrates with a quantitatively oriented, historical demographic approach, a spatial and socio-cultural one, has so far found few followers (Van Tijn, 1965; Messing 1972).

The architectural history tradition is a stronger one in planning history. Dauntum's remark that historians have concerned themselves too much in the past with politics, economics and society, to the neglect of the physical environment, while architectural historians have ignored almost everything except form, also applies very much to the Netherlands (Daunton, 1983). The latter circumstance can be partly explained by the origins of architectural historical research in pure design theory, i.e., the linking of such research with design education as part of the corpus of an architect's knowledge, while the historians' neglect of the physical environment may be related to the fact that the idea of integrated physical planning did not become generally current until around 1960. The first steps towards a history of Dutch town planning came from the circle of Berlage, who was intensively engaged between 1905 and 1917 with the practice of town planning. A close relationship existed in this period between the efforts to emancipate the young science of town planning and the interest in history. Characteristic of this orientation is the aesthetic and historicising interpretation of Dutch town layouts of the past, such as the idealisation of the famous Amsterdam canal girdle plan of 1611, which has remained the textbook example of perfect town planning for architects and town planners up to the present day (Taverne, 1978).

From the moment in the 19th century that there was again talk of a town extension for the first time in 150 years (Utrecht, c. 1825), the great examples of the 17th century were eagerly examined in the perspective of contemporary town planning ideas (Van Asche van Wyck, 1943; Taverne, 1978). The same happened during the period around the coming into operation of the Housing Act of 1901 (Fockema Andreae, 1912) and during the inter-war period, in connection with the International Town Planning Conference (1924) and the fame surrounding the Amsterdam General Extension Plan (1934). At that time, a number of important urban monographs were published in the form of studies of cities in their regional context (Van Ravesteyn, 1924; 1933; Roegholt, 1925).

The more recent architectural historical studies have shown an unmistakable shift away from attention to the encyclopedic and the development of form towards the relationship between the social environment, urban politics and cultural and social values and ideas. In this respect, Bock's recent studies of town planning and housing in South Amsterdam (Berlage), as well as the majority of the approaches in the recent, co-operative research into the Dutch contribution to the international "New Building", may be regarded as breaking new ground (Bock, 1975; 1983; Dettingmeyer, 1982; Andela, Bosma, 1982).

Recent research into physical planning is obviously closely related to
specific developments in physical planning itself. There is firstly the research into the rise of planning science during the period 1920-1945 - against the background of the broadening role of the town plan and the town extension plan, through the regional plan to the National Plan - and into the emergence of planning science as an independent discipline after 1945 (De Ruyter, 1979; 1983; De Ruyter, Roopmans, 1979). New orientations in social-scientific research carried out for planning purposes play an important part here. Secondly, there are the attempts arising from the current interest in planning procedures, in the decision-making and evaluation processes, and in planning techniques, to re-examine the history of physical planning in the light of these aspects (Van der Valk, 1984). This approach obviously brings with it a risk of historicisation.

What the approaches to planning history which we have described have in common is that they are too self-contained, are too much confined to the current discussion of the discipline and have insufficient awareness of how their own subject matter is historically determined and of the issues and terminology of the argument. What threatens planning history, in the Netherlands as elsewhere, is therefore not so much its fragmentation - its lack of scientific identity - as its isolation from recent developments in historical theory. If planning history is regarded as a certain way of looking at the past, i.e. from the standpoint of the development, management and use of the environment, its scientific standing at this moment would benefit from a thorough enrichment of its constituent elements, namely, planning and history.

It is striking that, both in recent developments in planning theory and in the historical sciences, there is a growing interest in the interaction between social behaviour and the geographical environment (Le Goff, 1978). Both historians and many researchers in the planning field are coming increasingly to realise that the ideas about the design, management and use of the built environment form part of a wider field of social policy. Planning history, defined as a social history of the environment, can make an important scientific contribution in this respect (Daunton, 1983). This requires first, however, a widening of the concept of 'physical planning'. We can concur here with what Constandse has said about the spatial policy of the government in the 19th century: "Although the authorities and, particularly, the central government, abstained as far as possible from intervention in social developments, they nevertheless had a great influence on the changes in the spatial structure through the granting or withholding or concessions and the government's occasional operations as a property developer (Public Works). During the course of half a century the existing railway network was constructed, canals were dug, Amsterdam and Rotterdam were made accessible to large seagoing ships, the Haarlemmermeer, where the national airport is sited, was reclaimed, as well as a number of smaller lakes (...). We are often so taken up with the phenomenon of town extension and the layout of residential areas that the great infrastructural works, industrialisation, the modern organisation of agriculture, the management of the woodlands, sometimes receive insufficient attention as elements of spatial policy" (Constandse, 1980). By getting away from the early 20th century architectural and civic design concept of physical planning, not only will a neglected period, the 19th century, be placed at the centre of interest, but also fresh fields of research (military and public works planning, infrastructure, agriculture, forestry and mining) will be seen in relation to each other.

In order to be able to study all these forms of planning more or less in their true dimensions, there is need for a theoretical framework, which should derive less from planning itself than from the historical sciences. As a result of the interest which has arisen there in ideas and attitudes and, particularly, in all aspects of material culture, the building, the city and the environment have also been recognised as 'documents'. It is also possible to analyse all these forms of planning in the context of the dominant thought patterns of specific social groups (Le Goff, 1978; De Boer, 1983). Still more obvious is the link with the rich tradition of American and British urban history, which considers themes like the collective role of government in such sectors as health care, education, industry and public works (sewerage, water supply, public baths, schools, libraries, roads, railways, harbours, docks and factories), the rise of statistics as part of urban survey, the role of philanthropy in housing and town planning, speculation, land policy, building economics, etc. (Mohl, 1983; Fraser, Sutcliffe, 1983). Nor is the planning historian a "collector of antiquities or recorder of morals and customs". He is interested in asking questions about the expectations and issues of planning, in reconstructing the social and cultural conditions underlying a particular form of planning. This is why Van Gunsteren has proposed as a programme for research into 20th century planning could also be applied to the 19th century: "What is missing in the planning literature is a political history of the phenomenon of planning in the 20th century, in which development planning, the French indicative planning, planning in the
Soviet Union, Dutch physical planning etc. are studied as points of intersection in historical and political fields of force. A study of this kind could make visible the way in which these forces interact and the concepts and assumptions underlying these planning styles and techniques (Van Gunsteren, 1984). In brief, this is a plea for integrating the concept of physical planning into a broader social, political and economic context.

Current research in Groningen

Widening the concept of physical planning and broadening the historical context from which it is to be studied are the main theoretical presuppositions underlying our recently started research programme. This programme has as its general framework a number of thematic and theoretical orientations, emphasising the history of ideas and attitudes, on the one hand, and questions relating to the history of science and historical theory, on the other (Kuhn, Popper, Foucault, Tafuri). Three periods are central in this research: (1) spatial developments in the 19th century (and ideas about them); (2) the emergence of physical planning as an ingredient of social planning in the 1920s and (3) the reconstruction of the Netherlands after 1940. So far a number of explorations have been carried out into method and theory, seeking to link up with the French traditions in recent town and country planning history. A not insignificant part of this has been research by architects, who have given a considerable stimulus to fresh historical research into the creation of a substructure for their criticism of contemporary architectural practice (Van Dansik, De Graaf, Taverne, 1984). In addition, programmes have recently been started under each of the three headings referred to above.

The study of 19th century developments in Rotterdam, published in 1982, is being expanded into a much more comprehensive analysis of thought about physical planning in the Netherlands since about 1780. In this it is not so much morphological research or planning methods themselves, as the specific historical and intellectual context of planning in the 19th century, which is under review (De Graaf, Nijenhuis, 1993). At the same time, a second piece of research has been started into "Public Works, 1800-1900: Architecture, Physical Planning and Government in the Netherlands". This study is concerned with the various contexts within which 19th century architecture and town planning - in their function as vehicle for divergent social and cultural goals - were operative (Van der Woud, 1984).

In association with the research into the work of J.M. de Casseres, the 'inventor' of the science of 'planologie' (planning science), an initial exploration has been made into the emergence of spatial policy as an independent entity during the inter-war period (Bosma, 1982; 1984). On the basis of the assumption that modern town and country planning has developed into an influential synthetic (shaping) science, a study has been started into "Reduction of Scale: Regional Planning in the Netherlands, 1920-1950", which is wholly concerned with the development of regional planning to become an instrument for a social planning of the modernisation of the town and countryside (Bosma, 1984).

Lastly, an extensive project has been in progress since 1982 on the reconstruction since 1940, the first results of which have now been published. These are studies of Middelburg, Rhenen and Nijmegen (Taverne, Colenbrander, Bosma, 1984). This programme is attempting, along the same lines as the international research in the field (Smets on Louvain, Vayssiere on Paris and Nerdinger on Munich), to define the economic and social and cultural context within which reconstruction took place during and immediately after the war. Stemming from this, subsidiary studies have been set up into the organisation of the building industry, the industrialisation of building and the relationship with public housing policy and contemporary ideas about how people lived. Work is being done at the same time on a theoretical historical model linking the views, concepts and techniques of urban studies (Fainstein, 1984) and urban history with those of the cultural sciences, insofar as the latter are concerned with the analysis of the city (Van Dansik, Kreukels, Taverne, 1984).

The rise of planning history is regretted by many as only the latest example of fragmentation within the historical discipline. It is also experienced as a further narrowing of our view of history. Both through the choice of themes and of theoretical assumptions, the aim of the research programme outlined above is to give this subdiscipline a firm anchorage both in history and in planning itself.
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