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Editorial

As I write this editorial Britain is in the middle of a general election campaign that seems more likely to produce a change of government than any since 1979. Readers have the advantage over me in that the result will be known by the time they read this, so it might be regarded as plain foolishness to address such a topic when I could comment on something much less controversial and uncertain. However I have to admit that the challenge to say something that will appear reasonably sensible even after the election has outweighed natural caution, so I will press on.

Planning, still less planning history, is far from being a major election issue, in which I suppose Britain is no different to most other countries. But elections provide opportunities for reflecting on the recent and likely future directions on many aspects of public policy, and I fancy the main trends in recent British planning history will have immediate echoes in many other countries.

Thus over the last thirteen years Britain has experienced the first serious attempt to dismantle the post-war planning consensus which had emerged in the 1950s and 1960s when the highly statist planning system created by the Labour government in 1947 was moulded into something more appropriate to a mixed economy welfare state. However since 1979, when the Conservatives under Mrs Thatcher first came to power, we have seen a radical change in the pattern and purpose of planning as part of a more general push of "rolling back the frontiers of the state". Much of general character of the resultant changes will, I think, be familiar to most overseas readers. Most countries have experienced at least some of the same medicine, if not always administered with the same highly personal style that Mrs Thatcher gave it in Britain.

There has accordingly been a strong reaction against what used to be called 'positive planning', whereby central or local government agencies directly undertook planned development, prioritising public interest objectives. Traditional instruments of such interventionist planning, such as the comprehensive development area or new towns, have rather gone out of fashion. The Thatcherite equivalent of these instead used state power to give greater encouragement and freedom to private developers. The classic example of this approach has been the Urban Development

Corporations associated with the regeneration of the London Docklands and other inner city areas. Traditional public interest planning has been subordinated to market criteria. This has been underpinned by the assertion that the pursuit of private profits by developers in such areas has actually been synonymous with the 'true' public interest in a dynamic market society, a viewpoint which has not been widely accepted in planning circles.

And there were similar moves to change the impact of the regulatory 'negative' side of planning. In the early 1980s we were told that planners "locked up jobs in their filing cabinets every night when they went home". A great of effort was put into "lifting the burdens" of the allegedly unreasonable demands by planning development control on the legitimate desires of private developers to develop. Again the assumption was that the public interest would best be served by a planning system that aided the private developer. However the reality was that the public interest had to be pursued through the rather unpredictable mechanism of negotiating planning gain.

Not surprisingly these attacks on the two basic modes of public planning activity in Britain were viewed with considerable dismay in planning circles. The planning profession became convinced that planning itself would only survive in a radically slimmed down form. Several planning schools had professional recognition withdrawn on the strength of this assessment, forcing some to close completely. In the event though this judgement was well wide of the mark and planning authorities in the south of England found themselves short of qualified staff during the development boom of the 1980s.

Moreover the belief in a much more strongly market-led approach to planning and development itself soon ran into serious practical problems. It became clear by the late 1980s that many voters who supported the government actually valued a planning system that controlled private developers fairly tightly. The opposition to the proposed private new towns at Tillingham Hall, Foxley Wood and Stone Bassett brought this contradiction between Mrs Thatcher's pushes towards an enterprise culture in the field of planning and more traditional Conservation to a head, with the latter essentially winning the argument. Moreover as the development boom began to fade at the end of the 1980s, it became clear that relatively uncontrolled and uncoordinated private development in areas like the London Docklands was creating quite serious and costly problems. In addition growing
environmentalist pressures both within Britain and from European institutions have encouraged greater caution in relaxations of the planning system.

By the early 1990s therefore the classic arguments for planning are beginning to be relearned along with a few new ones. All of which bodes well for planning after the election. We can, I think, be reasonably confident that, whoever turns out to have won, planning will be a much more significant force over the rest of the 1990s than it was in the 1980s. Perhaps a new planning consensus, transcending party, is in the making, as my immediate predecessor as Planning History editor, Dennis Hardy, has been hinting recently. Or perhaps it is simply that, as his predecessor, Mike Hebbert, once sang in an Oxford Polytechnic planning revue of the 1970s, adapting the lyrics of Ira Gershwin: In time the Rockies may crumble/ Gibraltar may tumble/ they're only made of clay/ but planning is here to stay.

Stephen V. Ward

Notices

Bartlett International Summer School (BISS) 1992

THE PRODUCTION OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT: EUROPE 1992
Brussels, Belgium, 5-10 September 1992

1992 marks a conclusion and starting point in the process of integration under the auspices of the EC. Simultaneously, the disintegration of East European socialist states gives rise to novel relations between eastern and western Europe. What impact will this process of integration and disintegration have on building protection, particularly on the labour process, and on the development of the built environment in Europe and the rest of the world, especially so-called developing countries?

This is the main theme addressed in BISS 1992 to be held in Brussels, a city well reflecting the contradictions inherent in European development, coming under a traditional, provincial government, with scarce local income and unemployment, and confronted by massive destruction through international developers and local capitalists.

BISS is a forum, constituted by agreement between different academic institutions world-wide, for the discussion, research and teaching of problems concerning the development of the built environment on the basis of the production process, seen essentially as a social process. This year’s session will be hosted by La Cambre, Institute supérieur d’architecture de la Communauté Française, and co-sponsored by the European Federation of Building and Woodworkers, with contributions from the Museum of Architecture and Urbanism in Brussels.

As well as plenary sessions relating to the general theme and to Brussels, workshop themes planned include: Production and Built form; Labour in the Construction Industry; Legal, Technical and Financial Constraints; The Privatisation of Public Urban Space; The Role of the Professions; Top Locations as a Development Strategy.

Deadlines for papers are 22nd May 1992. For further information and bookings contact: The BISS Conference Secretariat, La Cambre, Marcel Pésieux, directeur, Place Eugène Flagey, 19, B-1050 Brussels. Tel: 32-2-6403696; Fax: 32-2-6474655.

Articles

American Influence on Stockholm’s Post World War II Suburban Expansion

Kermit C Parsons, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, USA

"Those that know the influence of Radburn outside America are probably best acquainted with the developments in Sweden, particularly Vällinge." The history of Swedish town planning in the last one hundred years is one of thoughtful continuous attention to the social and physical needs of all of its citizens who live in urban environments. The evolution of Swedish housing design including the layouts of residential areas, community facilities and aesthetics has been always responsive to human requirements and to the natural environment. The development of urban plans and their efficient, equitable and high quality implementations are among the most significant achievements of city planning in the world.

American community architect, town planner and urban statesman Clarence Stein was an unabashed admirer of the remarkable mid twentieth century accomplishment of Swedish town planners in the expansion of Stockholm in a structured process of building clustered communities. Stein wrote extensively and enthusiastically about the Stockholm planning and expansion process, about the quality of Swedish housing and community design. He returned frequently to and stayed long in Stockholm to witness its extensive new suburban community development, and to confer with its planners and builders. He also, it will be argued here, had a significant influence on several of the major design elements of these new communities.

Stein’s Third Career

Clarence Stein launched a third career in 1949. He was sixty-seven. His first career had been as an architect with Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue from 1912-1919 and on his own as an independent...
architect in New York City in the early 1920s. His second career as a community architect, planner and regional planning theorist, planner of some of the key projects in American planning from 1922-1948. Stein's career that is so well documented in his own books, Town Planning Review, and in publications by Roy Lubove, Francesco DalCo and Carl Sussman. In 1949 Stein had the most influential phase of his professional life. Now, as a writer and consultant, he worked to extend to others the ideas embodied in his community planning projects of the previous thirty years.

This new phase of his life, his third career, was invited by Stein's good friend Gordon Stephens, Editor of the Town Planning Review and Professor of Civic Design at Liverpol University. He suggested that Stein prepare a series of articles about his town planning and housing projects for the Town Planning Review. These articles were to review in detail Stein's and Henry Wright's revolutionary American housing designs at Sunnyside, Long Island; Radburn, New Jersey; Chatham Village in Pittsburgh; Stein's House I in the Bronx and Stein's consulting architect role in the design of the Greenbelt Towns of Hampstead Garden Suburb, England, and the Hampstead Garden Suburb. At Wyldes Stein began the writing and consultation that was to become his principal means of influencing change in the basic layout of areas and new towns in Great Britain and Sweden, and later in America and many European countries as well as Australia and Japan. His writing about new communities and the Radburn plan, as well as the writing of others about this idea, spread the new concept of residential layout throughout the western world.

How the Radburn Idea was Transferred to Sweden

Several scholars have commented on Clarence Stein's influence on the large post World War II suburban communities in Stockholm. Even a casual inspection of plans of these projects reveals their consistent use of separate pedestrian and automobile circulation systems (see Figure 1). This account of Stein's influence on residential layout in Stockholm focuses on the nature of his influence, the way it occurred, on his appreciation of the qualities he observed in Stockholm's planning and on his respect for Stockholm's processes of planning and city building. Stein's discussions with Swedish town planners and city builders, including Yvonne Larsson, Sven Markelius, Göran Sidenbladh and I H Martin strengthened their initial decision made in the mid 1940s to use of the Radburn concept in the design for Stockholm's new suburban city extensions. Swedish planners may have first read about Radburn in RPAA members' 1930s publications about its plans and may have seen them at their exhibition at the 1931 International Federation of Housing and Town Planning (IFHTP) meetings in Berlin and Stockholm. Stein Eler Rasmussen in Denmark and Tage-William Clausen, town planner for Göteborg, Sweden, used illustrations of Radburn in their design studios in the 1930s. And Mumford's The Culture of Cities reproduced Radburn and Greenbelt plans in its Swedish translation in 1942.

Markelius probably met Stein when he designed the Swedish Pavilion at the 1939 New York World Fair. Stein was a member of the design review board for the fair. Markelius, Larsson's assistant and successor as head of Stockholm City Planning, visited America in the mid 1940s as a member of the international group of planners and architects. They asked about site selection and design for the United Nations permanent headquarters in New York. Stein took them to see Radburn. By the summer of 1947 Larsson and Markelius must have already decided to use the Radburn superblock system with its central green areas, structure of neighbourhoods and large pedestrian oriented shopping and cultural centre for the new Stockholm suburban districts. Markelius's 1948 visit to New York where he met with Stein and may have visited Radburn would have strengthened their conviction to use this concept. Stockholm's expansion was to be laid out around several rail transit nodes of the Tunnelbanen (rail transit) extensions planned west and south of the central city.

Clarence Stein visited Stockholm in the summer of 1949 to see first hand the early stages of building this new suburban community and to study the rational Swedish new concepts for building them. Early in his visit he could see that he had already greatly influenced the design of housing layouts and town centres in Stockholm's new communities. Stein directed his studies to their metropolitan regional government and land use policies and to the detailed design and real estate development processes that Swedish policy makers had established to implement their plans.

When Clarence and Aline Stein left Sweden for England in August 1949 Clarence wrote about his visit to Lewis Mumford: "I am so enthusiastic about the way the Swedes are developing great new communities, not just planning them on paper but actually determining how and where to build them..." Stein later commented on his visit to Stockholm in a letter to Larsson summarizing his admiration for their work: "...I look over streets to me that the strongest impression of progressive movement in planning was that which I got in the short time that I was in Sweden. It may have been that your hospitality and the thoughtful guidance of all others bewitched me, but I think not. I think that a tremendously valuable contribution is being made, not only in the orderly manner in which the remainder of Stockholm is being planned and built as a single process, but also in the design of the neighbourhoods as units related both the requirements of living and the form of the land. My first impression of the unusual approach of the Stockholm planners I received when I arrived by air and saw the new houses, partly hidden among the old trees that were left standing. This relating of every building and every group of buildings to the site..."
Stockholm's Expansion 1946-1976

Stockholm's suburban expansion policies guided a massive effort to meet post World War II housing shortages. They were shaped by public ownership of very large areas of land outside the city, by its evolving plans for rail transit and a realisation that very large areas of land outside the city, by its massive effort to meet post World War II development of acquisition for housing and recreation at the outer edges of the city was long term Swedish policy. As early as 1904 the city of Stockholm had acquired very large areas of forest and farm land west and south of its built-up areas. The municipality, which had been active in housing construction since the early 1930s, took charge of formulating a new suburban expansion plan in 1944. After a relatively short period of internal debate a new set of policies for suburban expansion were adopted, general plans drafted and work started on detailed plans for developing of the first large area of city owned land to the west of the city at Södra Spånga (The Vällingby Development Area) and south of the city at Farsta Forstning (The Farsta Development Area) (Figure 2 and 3). Each of these areas was to include six or seven city districts with populations of 6,000-15,000 each. A parallel decision in the mid 1940s to extend rail transit west and south with new subway access to the city centre and with long (6 car) stations at suburban centres gave regional shape to the suburban plans.

Over the last thirty years of Stockholm's extensive large scale suburban development after 1947 most western city planners have come to identify these policies with the first and most densely populated suburban central districts (Vällingby and Farsta) of larger clusters of suburban neighbourhoods. Actually each of these districts is the main centre of a larger suburban development area and serves as their primary shopping and cultural focus. The primary district of each area cluster is centred on a rail transit station and includes the area's highest density housing, three and four storey 'walk-up' apartment groups and elevator buildings in point blocks and slabs (see Figure 4). The 'area centres' (Vällingby and Farsta) serve five or six city districts located 'like pearls on a string, linked to downtown [Stockholm] by a [rail] rapid transit line'. Each of the areas also includes employment opportunities in the area centres and in industrial districts in Stockholm. Those centred on Skärholmen southeast of the city and Kista at Jarva north of the city were built in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Stockholm's policy for the planning of these suburban expansion areas was first clearly expressed in its 1952 metropolitan regional plan which called for them to be 'small neighbourhood units' around 'common greens'. Each district would include separation of different kinds of traffic so that people could 'walk to the

eighbourhood centre and children to school without crossing roads'. "Neighbourhood shops [were to be located] to make the consumers' walking distance as short as possible: 200 metres or 700 feet to each high density district centre. An area of 44,000 population or more (several districts clustered around the higher density area centre was to be concentrated so that residents [would be]...at a walking distance [to the area centre] of 900 metres at most." The net residential densities of these core districts were quite high.

Diagrams of the 1952 Stockholm Regional Plan show the division of suburban development areas as 'groups' into "city districts" (see Figure 5). They called for grouping these units with shared industrial areas around rail transit stations, spaced at 1800 metre intervals along two new rail transit lines west and south of the city centre. The Vällingby 'Cluster' at Södra Spånga included Blackeberg, Räcksta, Vällingby, Hasselby Gård and Hasselby Strand residential districts and the

Figure 2: Vällingby Development Area including Blackeberg, Räcksta, Vällingby, Hasselby Gård and Hasselby Strand; Johannelund Industrial Area is at Vinsta with a T Station at South Corner.

Figure 3: Farsta Development Area Plan, Industrial Area is along northeast edge of site plan. Farsta Centrum site plan at centre of drawing.
Johanneslund industrial district. Its total population was to be about 44,000.

Sven Markelius's initial detailed site plans for Blackeberg, the district nearest the city centre on the rail transit line, were submitted for review in 1947. They incorporated the Radburn Plan layout type's grade separated pedestrian, pram and cycle paths, and central greens areas in their 'superblocks'. Their designs for pedestrian underpasses and bridges provided generous widths and excellent access to schools and district shopping. These plans faced strong opposition from Alex Dahlberg, then Director of the Municipal Real Estate Department, because of their high densities (the favoured single family garden suburban) and their extensive use of large blocks with connected green centres linked by pedestrian and cycle paths separated from the automobile circulation routes. His principal objection to these plans was that they were 'unnecessarily expensive and dangerous for unescorted women at night'.

Dahlberg's opposition to Markelius's 'Radburnish' layouts within the framework of the new suburban residential districts was neutralised by his transfer to the finance department of Stockholm's city government in 1948. Markelius's subsequent plans for the Råcksta district (Figure 6) and the Vällingby centre (Figure 7) formulated in the late 1940s as the Director of Planning for Stockholm were soon approved. They provided for complete traffic grade separated pedestrian ways and cycle tracks from all residential areas to the shopping centres, schools and transit stations.

Figure 4: Suburban Community Development Diagram from General Plan for Stockholm, 1952.

Figure 5: The Stockholm Region showing stages of suburban growth. Groups of districts of 'Satellite' Suburbs. The Vällingby, Farsta Skarholmen and some others were shown on the 1952 General Plan, all of the satellite groups shown have been developed. 'Older' and 'Garden' Suburbs were built between World Wars I and II.

Figure 6: Site plan for housing at Råcksta, 1949. Complete separation of pedestrian and cycle traffic from road system.

When Stein next visited Stockholm for an extended stay in the spring of 1952, plans for the Vällingby Centre had been approved and the first phases of the community were under construction. He and Aline returned to Stockholm to live in a little house in Mullerberget, Djurgården for two months and to study Swedish town planning. At the American Society of Planning Officials meeting in Boston in October 1952, Stein reported his findings in a glowing account of the livability of the Vällingby cluster, of its rational community layout, and of the urban efficiencies to be achieved by dispersing population along rail transit lines in high density clusters. He also reported admiringly on the clarity and strength of Stockholm's administrative structure for detailed planning and implementation.

Stein's visits to Stockholm in 1949 and 1952 came at a time when the plan for regional expansion was well underway. Stockholm's principal planners, Larsson, Markelius and Sidenbladh, had incorporated many Radburn ideas in it. The work of his colleagues in the RPA who were exploring a score of articles about Radburn in the early 1930s, the IFHTP's 1931 exhibition of the Radburn Town Plan, Mumford's endorsement in 1937 in the Culture of Cities, and Larsson's and Markelius's visits to Radburn itself had convinced all of them of the value of its innovations. They adapted it to Stockholm's special needs for high density suburban districts which were served by rail rapid transit, and they provided community site designs which exhibited high levels of sensitivity to the hilly, rocky landscapes of the western suburbs at Råcksta, Vällingby, and Hasselby Gård. They also developed an approach that made excellent use of the political possibilities of a progressive society which had great respect for the quality of housing and of community services for all family members,

Figure 7: Vällingby Centrum, Cross-shaped buildings (point blocks) are the tallest of the multifamily housing types which surround the shopping core.
young and old, women and men, workers and professionals.

Stein's concepts of the best physical framework for a high quality of community life, which provided safety and quiet from auto traffic and excellent pedestrian and bicycle circulation, were only part of the innovation of these new layouts and the strong regional structure of the plan for Stockholm's growth. These plans were also influenced by the image of Le Corbusier's 'tall buildings in a park' and of course by the Swedish planners' modifications of these concepts and images in the informality of their site planning and in the human scale of their designs for high density residential areas. In only a few areas of the Vällingby clusters of communities (for example, in the northwest section of Hesselby Gård) does the residential site plan form exactly follow the details of the Radburn layout: alternating automobile access and park-finger pedestrian entrances to the houses with the walls leading down to a large park shared by several such sub areas. The details of site plan layout and the range of dwelling types are much more varied in the Stockholm suburban communities than in Radburn. The Stockholm residential densities are, of course, much higher, but the basic 'Radburn idea' of layout is pervasive in these designs for thirty years.

Why in Sweden?

Stein continued to visit Stockholm over the decade from 1952 to 1962 and he maintained a steady correspondence with his Swedish friends. He truly loved Stockholm and admired its historic values as well as its approach to city building. He optimistically hoped for opportunities to ignite similar new community programmes in the United States. But the different and diverse values of the US were not fertile ground for the idea of governments as real estate developers as Stockholm had been. The residential layout innovations of Radburn and its few US descendants did not dominate the patterns of US suburban growth in the 1950s and 1960s as they did in Stockholm.

Use of the Radburn prototype layout is evident in the over twenty-seven Stockholm suburban residential districts built since 1950. Some, such as the Skarholmen group (Bredäng, Satra, Skarholmen, Varberg) built in the mid to late 1960s and the Kista cluster (Kista, Husby and Akala), built in the early 1970s (Figure 8), are similar to the Vällingby and Farsta clusters in their objectives. All place the higher density housing groups near the

Figure 8: Site plans of later suburban districts. Kista represents a return to the right-angled courtyard. Skarpnäck plans show a return to street architecture and the gridiron plan.
Tunnelbanen stations and commercial centre. All locate work places close to houses, preserve quality landscape features, provide separate systems for footpaths, bicycles, and automobile access. The Skarholmen group includes a wide range of landscape features, provide separate systems for footpaths, bicycles, and automobile access. The high density (left of the centre). The lower density districts of Figure 9, built at about the same time as the Skarholmen cluster was formed a consistent set of patterns for the fabric of Stockholm's urban expansion from 1946 to 1976. In this thirty year period the basic pattern formulated by Larsson, Markellus, Sidenbladh and their associates guided almost all development in Stockholm's suburbs so clearly typified by Vällingby (Figure 10).

Stockholm's development policy changed significantly after the mid 1970s period of recession/inflation. After 1975 fewer new dwelling units were built. In 1950 the number of dwelling units built was about 9,000. This rate climbed to over 27,000 per year by the late 1960s. In the early 1970s migration to Stockholm slowed, unemployment increased and interest rates and prices went up rapidly. Between 1973 and 1976 housing production fell from 23,000 units to 7,000 per year in the metropolitan area. Stockholm's era of rapid growth came to an end in 1976. The very consistent development pattern of this era includes as one of its basic ideas the residence layout pattern evolved by Swedish planners and architects from the Radburn concept. This modified pattern of pedestrian favouring layout is as consistently used in Stockholm's suburbs as the curved street/cul de sac/low density/single family/FHA subdivison manual pattern is found everywhere in North American cities' suburbs built in the same era.

The influence of one of Clarence Stein's community design ideas, the Radburn plan, on Swedish planning was considerably greater in Stockholm than in any other western city. Almost half a million Stockholmers live and work in that new part of the city's urban environment shaped by ideas of Stein/Radburn inspired Larsson, Markellus, Sidenbladh planning for Stockholm's thirty year post WWII expansion. Why in Sweden and not in the US? Stockholm's municipal land ownership policies, municipal land development design and construction policies, and the policy of extensive municipal and cooperative housing construction and the policy of raising municipal revenue to support large public infrastructure programmes of rail transit and community services were the necessary conditions for this singular achievement. These policies were sufficiently cohesive and centrally administered to carry out the 'community regarding' ideas inherent in the 'Radburn idea'. None of these policies, let alone their operation in concert over an extended period of time, have existed elsewhere in the Western world with the possible exceptions of the somewhat linear suburban expansion new communities of Copenhagen and Paris.

In Sweden the seeds of Clarence Stein's and the RPA's Ebenezer Howard inspired macro ideas for an urban region planning structure of satellite towns and Stein's micro ideas for urban residential area layout structure fell on fertile ground. They were cultivated by a very astute, talented team of Swedish urban statesmen, politicians, planners, site planners, urban designers, architects and city builders. The Stockholm accomplishment is not universally admired by Western (including Swedish) architects and planners (especially the later generation). But major elements of the City's expansion planning team's work were clearly rooted in the Radburn Idea for community layout and were greatly admired by Clarence Stein, one of its many coaches and perhaps its staunchest early cheerleader in America.

This article was first presented at the Joint Fourth National Conference of Society for American City and Regional Planning History and the Fifth International Conference of the Planning History Group at Richmond, Virginia, USA, November 7-10, 1991.
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Metamorphosis of Corinth: From the Community of the Ottoman Era to the Neohellenic Town

Vithieem Hastaoglou Martinidis
Department of Urban and Regional Planning, School of Architecture, University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

La Grèce est un pays qui a, plus que tout autre, son génie et son caractère propres, ne ressemblant à aucune partie de l'Europe, soit dans ses moeurs, soit dans ses institutions. Ce même peuple a pourtant besoin d'être, pour ainsi dire, refait, puisque tout à peu près y est arrêté, ou dans un état de délabrement; et cette régénération ne parait pouvoir s'opérer qu'en introduisant des lois et des usages qui appartiennent à une civilisation étrangère à son sol.

Quelle sera donc la marche à suivre? Faudra-t-il procéder de manière à ce que les nouvelles institutions effacent ce qu'en introduisant d'original et de caractéristique, afin que La Grèce, valeur en dans le monde européen, en sorte entièrement changée, et façonnée à notre manière de vivre, de penser et d'agir? Rien ne serait plus facile que de commencer une telle métamorphose...

(Frédéric Thiersch, 1833, De l'état actuel de la Grèce et de moyens d'arriver à sa restauration.)

The quotation summarises the main issue the communication will deal with, using as an example the transformations of the city of Corinth during the 19th century. The urban history of this town, which has never in modern times succeeded in regaining its former importance, nonetheless presents a particular interest: in a way the town offered the field for testing the novel planning ideas and techniques introduced at the time by the newly established Greek state, aiming at the 'occidentalisation' of what was perceived as an 'oriental' society and of its spatial assets. The modernisation of Corinth is an account simultaneously of the transition of the traditional community into a modern town and of the formation of town planning, in the context of a profound and all-embracing change from Greek Independence in 1828 onwards.

Corinth is unique in the sense that it was the only town for which three different plans were drawn up within a short period (1829, 1836 and 1858), probably due to its excellent location on the isthmus. Prominent French, German and Austrian engineers successively projected the future face of the town, radically reshaping its traditional image. Their designs, although each one of distinct morphological reference and planning approaches—corresponding to different stages of planning evolution—reveal the predominant concern of State intervention in urban affairs: to move away from the Ottoman past towards a more European direction by consolidating the modernisation and rationalisation of urban structures, and to restore the nation's historical continuity by reconnecting the ancient world to the modern kingdom. To that end, the physical shape of the city, strongly reminiscent of Classical patterns, proved to be an efficient instrument of regulation, as well as a powerful means for ideological signification.

The paper will attempt to explore the four faces assigned to Corinth in the course of 19th century, tracing simultaneously the evolution of Greek town planning.

The structure of the town at the turn of the 19th century: history evolution and Ottoman heritage

In the beginning of the 19th century, Corinth was a provincial market town with typical features shared with other towns of Peloponnesus. With a mixed population of about 4,000 Greeks and Turks, its position commanding the access to the peninsula, it occupied the same site of Classical and Byzantine city, one mile from the coast, at the foot of the old citadel of Acrocorinth. Chief town of the Vilayet of Corinth, extending its jurisdiction over 80 villages and consuming the most fertile plains of Peloponnesus, it was also the head point of the postal service of the peninsula and the seat of the most powerful and wealthy family of Turk Beys of Mores after 1715.

The change of the city from a flourishing commercial and industrial centre of the early medieval era to a provincial town date from 12th century, when the Normans captured and plundered the city in 1147. Historians locate the
decline of its prosperity in the period of Frankish conquest (1210-1458), during which Corinth remained an ecclesiastical as well as a political and military centre. The adventures that followed the Turkish conquest in 1458, have reduced further the importance of the city transforming it into a rural town serving its agricultural hinterland.

The fortunes of Corinth during this long twilight cannot be easily traced. It seems though quite certain that above the fourteenth century settlement a community was established, which remained nearly the same until modern times; the organisation of the former Byzantine urban centre in fortress-bourg-suburbs survived into the late 18th century. By the beginning of the 19th, the larger majority of the inhabitants resided in the lower town (the ex-suburb) and there were fewer in the outer castle, whose citadel was the post of the Turkish garrison. The lower town, modern Corinth, changed only slightly throughout this period, as is well indicated by the descriptions of travellers, who visited the region from the 16th to 19th century (R Lubenau in 1588, G Wheeler and J Spon in 1676, C Thompson in 1730, W M Leake in 1805-6, F C H L Pouqueville in 1815, P E Laurent in 1818), as well as by recent archaeological evidence; the survey plan of 1828 and that of 1835 (see below) confirm this and provide a detailed image of the town as it was in the third decade of 19th century.

The town exhibits the typical layout of settlements at the time of the Ottoman occupation: it consisted of separated neighbourhoods (mahalle), enclosing their religious and social edifices (the church or the mosque), with intervals of vineyards and cornfields. The buildings were not contiguous but surrounded by gardens of fruit trees, mixed with cypresses, and enclosed by walls lining roads; so that the town seemed made up of distinct villages structured around the main road, along which the centre of the town was situated. The streets formed an inextricable network of rugged lanes and impasses giving access to individual properties. The largest neighbourhood (Calamate mahalle) next to the Bazaar, consisted of about 100 houses and contained the small cathedral, the residence of the Archbishop, and the Greek school. The Bazaar occupied the centre of the town at the intersection of the principal roads, a little northern from the site of the Classical 'agora' and the Byzantine market; it was the locus of community life, concentrating the commercial and religious activities, and most of the public buildings (the shops, the coffee-houses, and the great mosque); next to it, the open-air weekly fair was located, and to neighbouring sites, the Menzil-hane (post office) and the Caravanserai (inn) were erected in the course of the 18th century. At the north end of the main road the Palace of Kiamal Bey, political and administrative centre of the town, stood in the middle of the cliff commanding an enchanting prospect. It was erected in the course of 18th century, in a large enclosure with harems, baths, kiosques and gardens, and celebrated as a good example of oriental luxury. Seven columns of a Doric Temple, two or three masses of mason-work, and numerous springs were the only visible remains of its ancient glory.

Yet this apparently confused topography conformed to a fairly regular plan, typical of the Ottoman town: the Great Mosque stood in the centre, with shopping streets (souqs) all around; then in a series of concentric circles the khans or caravanserais the craftsmen and the open-air bazaar were ranged in a traditional order; then the quarters of habitations divided into distinct religious and ethnic neighbourhoods - another regular feature of the Ottoman town. At the outer end of the town, linked to the centre through the market street, the residence of the Turk prince was situated confirming his authority over the town.
Corinth had still its two ancient ports, although in miserable conditions: Lecheum, on the gulf of Lepanto, where the small custom house and the warehouses of the Bey stood, and where some merchant vessels anchored in the year; the other, at Kenchreae, on the gulf of Aegina, where only few fishing boats anchored.

The plan of Peytier, 1829: the years of pragmatism and the prevalence of European rationalism

Corinth emerged from the war of Independence devastated. Only 154 families were left (1830 census), a few spruce houses still standing and a number of dilapidated shacks. Its public buildings were ruined and its market deserted.

As a result of a petition of the inhabitants demanding the reconstruction of their town, President Capodistrias commissioned the French military geographer-engineer Emile Peytier, a member of the French Military Expedition in Morea attached to his service, to draw up the plan for the town. Peytier, accompanied by his assistant, the Italian d’Islay, arrived on site before the end of 1828; after having drafted the survey map of the town, he prepared the new plan which he submitted to the President in February 6, 1829.\(^\text{6}\)

The plan is a characteristic example of the early urban designs made mostly by foreign engineers for important towns of the country, like those of Nauplia (1828) or Tripolis (1829). Its conception and approach are quite representative of the urgent initiatives (1828-1832) taken by the President to ensure the urbanisation of the country and to deal
with the reconstruction of towns devastated during the war of Independence. The plan, with its unaffected layout, reflected the military rationalism of its author, who nevertheless introduced the late 18th century Classical forms, particularly the closed-angled oblong square (reminiscent of Renaissance patterns) a generic element of his composition. Peytier proceeded according to the scientific devices of his time: sanitation, alignment and amenities, to establish regularity and order, to create the public spaces necessary to promote the commercial function of the town, and to provide administrative and cultural facilities. He preserved the existing network of streets, which were widened to 10m (except for the newly-traced main street crossing the town from east to westwards), and opened up eight regular squares on non-built sites, with dimensions and shapes varying according to particular features of each spot. A specific function and the relevant edifices were assigned to each of them as can be seen on Figure 8: 1P, the biggest one where the seven Doric columns stand, was proposed for the administrative and ecclesiastical centre; 2P, for the central market place; 3P, for the quarter of Panagia with the small cathedral of the same name; 4P, for the cattle fair; 5P, on the ruins of Bey's palace, for the hospital, prison, and military academy; 6P, at the intersection of the main streets surrounded with the best-preserved houses; 7P, at the existing crossroads into a courthouse. Two main streets, from north to south and from east to west, linked the squares to an articulated structure framing between them the triangle-shaped building blocks with individual plots. As for the compensation of the properties affected by the new layout (chiefly in the Panagia quarter where street alignments were more rigorously applied), he proposed a sort of property exchange for plots excluded from the surface area of the plan or cut out by alignments.

Peytier was at once both conscious of the moderate character of his intervention, and fully aware of the means required for radical planning. Yet, he was restricted by the topography, the relatively good condition of some houses and the need to optimise the scant stock of edifices (Christian or Ottoman) available to cover the demand for public amenities. Besides, he had to make his design conform to the instructions addressed by Capodistrias to all engineers to operate limited and gradual interventions in order to prevent the opposition of the inhabitants and to avoid high implementation costs.

Although, the plan brought about only limited alterations in the existing fabric, it nevertheless succeeded in reversing the previous multi-nucleated pattern, and to unifying the 'detached villages' into a coherent urban space, regularly laid out and containing places for new political, economic and social activities. The town plan was part of a threefold project aiming at the reactivation of the commercial role of Corinth, and including the reconstruction of the port of Lechenum and the suburb of Examilia, for which Peytier had also started the survey.

The plan was approved in February 12, 1829 by the President, who ordered the commencement of works in order of priority from the cathedral square, the administrative centre, and the site of the central mosque, at the same time making a down payment of a small sum of money. By March 1829, under the supervision of Peytier himself, the demarcation of the lines of streets, building plots and squares began, and in April 1830 the construction of the Government house, the school building, as well as the reparation of the cathedral were under way.

The Plan of Schaubert, 1836: the formative years and the rise of Neoclassical city

In April 1834 the inhabitants addressed a new petition for the rebuilding of the town, this time to King Otto, who had arrived in Greece the previous year. We do not know what caused the petition. Probably the events which followed the assassination of Capodistrias in 1832, the scanty financial means available to the state for building towns, the vagueness as regards the management of national land, among other things, may have hindered the implementation of Peytier's plan. What we know with certainty is that by this time the condition of the town had scarcely improved, and that Corinth had failed the candidate to become the capital of the country, having been rejected in favour of Athens. Anyway, Otto immediately responded to the demand, and commissioned the topographer Abele to complete a new survey map (as well as with the levelling of the surroundings lands to be distributed to the inhabitants for cultivation). This was followed by the new town plan drawn up by the German Eduard Schaubert and submitted for high approval in 1836.

The commissioning of the plan by Schaubert, Chief Architect of the public technical services, indicates the particular importance attached to Corinth and is closely linked with the endeavour of the Ottoman administration to found new towns on the sites of famous cities of antiquity: Sparta, Pireus, Eretria, Thebes, and naturally Athens, were typical examples.

The plan had neither the splendour of that for Athens (1833), nor the geometrical refinement of that for Eretria (1834), which was from the outset traced on virgin ground. Besides, Schaubert himself in his hitherto unknown report specifying the plan, seemed quite reluctant as to the necessity of the work, considering that the town should be rebuilt in a new location near the Isthmus, more adequate for its anticipated...
Planning development. Despite all this, the existence of Schaubert did not take water and the proximity of the port, restricted confined to a surface (not including streets) of 28.4 hectares: an area which was considered adequate so advanced for the local community that it could known the reasons: was it because the project was indeed, within two months, in March 1858, the decision was taken to move the town to the location of Schinias on the shore of Corinthian Bay near the Isthmus, a location which a thorough survey proved to be the most appropriate "for the health and future commercial and industrial progress of the Corinthians." In May, a series of individual laws and decrees were published to deal with issues concerning the allocation of national land for the new town, the compensation mechanism for the private fields affected, the beneficiaries, the size of the plots to be allocated, and way they were to be allocated and shared out. They also provided for the reservation of urban land for public amenities, the way of financing them, and chiefly the financing of construction of the port in order of priority, the enforcement of specially adopted building regulations, the controls applied for the good building of the town (ban on rough lodgings), and short deadlines for reconstruction. A special Commission was set up to deal with issues arising from the evaluation and distribution of properties.

This legislation drew on the former relevant experience, suiting it more to the particular conditions of Corinth. The speed with which the location of Schinias was published and the detail of the important official in the Ministry of the Interior. It was approved in July 26, 1858 and widely published in newspapers, and stuck in public places in Athens, Nauplia and elsewhere. Its form is significant in that it involved the simplification of the previous urban designs; this simplification, attested in a host of plans produced after 1843, constituted a prominent feature of planning.
The plan depicted a medium-size town, functional and rational, without excesses, yet not without care. A promenade created on the Quay, linked it to the triangular-shaped ‘esplanade’ where the church of Saint Nicolas stood, and with the small public gardens westwards. To these two centres - civic and commercial - or urban life, a number of other public places and squares were connected, to the outer ends of the boulevards, as well as a square with the church of Saint Paul and the school buildings laid out to the south. It is worth noticing that in this case the arrangement of public spaces resulted from the subtraction of building blocs, in a completely different fashion from those of the closed-angled square of Peytier or the monumental prospects of Schaubert. The composition was framed by a ring boulevard lined up with trees, and confining a total surface area of circa 130 hectares. The plan of New Corinth constituted the model for coastal settlement planning, like those of Cylini (1864), Calamata (1868), Cythere (1871) etc.

The reconstruction of New Corinth began in very favourable circumstances, related to the development of public works after 1860 (extension of road network, railways, harbour works³⁷ and chiefly to the excavation of the Isthmus canal in 1884³⁸. The forecasts for the range of influence of the canal as a pole for international trade, analogous with that of the recently completed Suez Canal, fed the expectations of the Corinthians for the future of their town. In 1882, Corinth was struggling into a quasi-European aspect: head city of the district, seat of the county council and bishop, it had accumulated 3,000 inhabitants, public services and edifices, had been rebuilt to a large extent, its two central squares were arranged, a mole was built, but the construction of the port was still in prospect³⁹. In 1884 it was connected to Piraeus by rail. However, the expected bright future did not materialize: the proximity of more dynamic urban centres, such as Athens and Piraeus, did not allow New Corinth to overcome the image of a small harbour-side city.

Another natural disaster, the earthquake of 1928, offered the opportunity for a new planning intervention in Corinth, a hundred years after the first. With this operation a century of town planning comes to an end, and a new era commences for the modernisation of the planning and the reconstruction of Greek cities.

**Conclusions**

To sum up, the urban history of Corinth during 19th century permits us to trace the steps taken for the transition from a communal organisation of space to a modern urban environment. The successive plans drawn up for the town, despite their differences as to the morphological patterns and planning ‘tools’ adopted by each one, depict the pursuit of a common purpose: the modernisation of the traditional structures and the creation of the Neohellenic city. From the early efforts of Peytier’s plan to regularise the ‘struggling’ settlement and to unify the separated ‘villages’ into...
Planning arrangements and constitution of modern Greek society to an extent from the Independence onwards, to break with the oriental past and to link the desired values and norms, meet that purpose consisted of: the formation of a special technical service staffed chiefly by foreign engineers; the adoption of obligatory drafting of the town plan and its application by an expert Architect, to control the development of the town; the allocation of national land to establish new settlements; the reservation of urban land for the construction of public buildings; the adoption of regulations for the hygiene, solidity and security of the town; the clear distinction between public and private spaces; and the definition of appropriate size of building plots, including the regulation of the intervention in private ownership; the concern for preservation of architectural and urban elements of historic, aesthetic or local interest (i.e. ancient relics, religious or other buildings), as well as the use of existing buildings to accommodate modern functions.

The measures established by Capodistrias to meet that purpose concerned: the formation of a special technical service staffed chiefly by foreign engineers; the adoption of obligatory drafting of the town plan and its application by an expert Architect, to control the development of the town; the allocation of national land to establish new settlements; the reservation of urban land for the construction of public buildings; the adoption of regulations for the hygiene, solidity and security of the town; the clear distinction between public and private spaces; and the definition of appropriate size of building plots, including the regulation of the intervention in private ownership; the concern for preservation of architectural and urban elements of historic, aesthetic or local interest (i.e. ancient relics, religious or other buildings), as well as the use of existing buildings to accommodate modern functions. Of historic, aesthetic or local interest (i.e. ancient relics, religious or other buildings), as well as the use of existing buildings to accommodate modern functions.

This article is the first publication of an extended research report concerning the urban evolution and the planning history of Corinth, from the late Ottoman era to the early 20th century. The present paper it was first presented at the Richmond Conference 7-10 November 1991.
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Street Widths in Victorian New Zealand
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Tucked away in the South Pacific, as far distant from Britain as it was possible to go, leaders of the early European planned settlements in New Zealand had a vision of an ideal society where the increasing problems of the rapidly growing English urban areas would not be recreated.

I am currently researching the planning and development of 19th century New Zealand towns. During that period ‘planning’ in New Zealand was seen in a very narrow sense. There was limited interest in, or concern about, the functional use of various areas of urban places, and what planning there was dealt primarily but not exclusively with streets. Earlier papers have already discussed the street patterns adopted in New Zealand last century, and the provision of open spaces.

Early Colonial Settlements

New Zealand became a British colony in February 1840, and the country’s early European settlement was different from many other areas of colonial endeavour in that a number of urban centres were established from the beginning. The New Zealand Company, using the ideas propounded by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, was responsible for the foundation of the towns of Wellington (1840), and its offshoot Wanganui (1840), New Plymouth (1841), Nelson (1842), and later in the decade Dunedin (1848) and Christchurch (1850).

Starting with a clean slate, these towns were planned from the beginning. Surveyors employed by the New Zealand Company during the 1840s were given guidelines as to what was to be incorporated into the urban layout. But despite this bold and visionary start the New Zealand Company’s good intention did not come to fruition, for as the 19th century finished it was evident that all was not well. Stares were obvious in the major cities, and this overcrowding was seen partly as a result of narrow street widths and small property sizes.

Although no definite recommendations as to street measurements were made by the New Zealand Company to its surveyors, they did direct F A Carrington, who was responsible for surveying New Plymouth, that all streets were to be of ample width. This was accepted advice for all the Company settlements, and resulted in the first instance in most New Zealand towns having streets wider than those to be found in English towns.

But despite the fact that there was no pressure on the land, bold steps were not always taken to ensure wide streets. Within two years of its foundation in 1840, the streets of Auckland - a government rather than a New Zealand Company town - were being criticised by the local newspaper:

The narrowness of the streets is another crying evil, and the formation of those horrible nuisances - 16 ft lanes, are the means of causing the very evils which it was said to have been intended to avoid...Lower Queen Street appears the only main-street of decent width, and we maintain, that the others are too narrow for the due keeping of the health of the inhabitants of a populous district.

Over the next two or so decades similar criticisms were increasingly being made about newer parts of the original New Zealand Company towns. While the original plans were satisfactory as far as street widths were concerned, narrow streets came with a town’s population growth. It was when subdivisions for residential purposes were made by land owners within or on the margins of established urban areas that the problems began to arise. Even new towns created in rural areas by the cutting-up of privately-owned lands did not escape the burden of narrow streets. The only way the situation could be resolved was by some legal control.

Administrative Response

From 1853 until 1876 New Zealand was split into several provinces which were self-governing in a number of administrative functions, including surveying and municipal affairs. In some provinces, such as Otago, the provincial survey department was far-sighted and saw to it that streets were laid-out in new towns on crown land with an adequate width. In some towns, notably Invercargill, were criticised for having streets of excessive width.

Most provinces made some half-hearted attempts to
set minimum street widths, but often this was by means of ordinances which applied to specific towns already in existence. Auckland Province, however, under an 1862 Act set 40 feet as the minimum width for all streets open to the public, and gave Town Boards within the Province the power to close any street which did not conform. But the law had limitations in that a majority of electors had to apply to the Provincial Superintendent to have the Act brought into force in their town. Even if in force, ways could be found to evade its provisions. Many subdividers simply made narrow lanes or alleys which, being private, could be of any width. This naturally caused problems and the Auckland newspapers frequently brought abuses to light. For example, on 6 April 1864 the New Zealand Herald reported that in a subdivision of 30 cottage allotments off the town’s main thoroughfare, one street was only 10 feet wide.

In 1867 a Municipal Corporations Act was passed by the central government, and this for the first time set a nationwide minimum width for streets of 40 feet. In 1876 this was increased to 66 feet. Two years later an Amendment to the Act prohibited Borough Councils from altering any street so that it fell below the 66 feet minimum. This suggests that streets were being constructed at the legal width and then subsequently narrowed, for much of New Zealand's 19th century legislation was in response to a situation rather than being forward looking. The 66 feet minimum width remained throughout the 19th century and into the 20th, though a backward step was taken in the Municipal Corporations Act, 1900. This allowed, by Order in Council, streets to be constructed less than 66 feet wide as long as the terrain was such that it could not be laid out with two such streets. These were to be at least 99 feet in width, but in 1902 the Towns Main Street Act was passed which allowed the Governor by Order in Council to waive this regulation in specific instances, and for main streets of only 66 feet to be surveyed. This law was made use of in a new town, but the reasons for the concession being granted require further research as no obvious terrain reasons were present which would justify them.

**Private Streets**

The 1867 Municipal Corporations Act set a low minimum of only 20 feet for private alleys and in 1879 to have the Act apply to town subdivisions on private land failed. Thus while the 1875 Act had a lasting benefit on some new small rural towns, the already established and growing urban areas were unaffected.

The 1875 concept of wider main streets was resurrected in the 1885 Land Act, which required all new towns, whether on crown or private land, to be laid out with two such streets. These were to be at least 99 feet in width, but in 1902 the Towns Main Street Act was passed which allowed the Governor by Order in Council to waive this regulation in specific instances, and for main streets of only 66 feet to be surveyed. This law was made use of in a number of new towns, but the reasons for the concession being granted require further research as no obvious terrain reasons were present which would justify them.

courts though even this low figure seems not to have been rigidly adhered to in practice. Private streets, while not specifically mentioned, were apparently included under the general clause which set the minimum width for streets being carried ways at 40 feet. In 1876 private streets were placed on a par with public streets, the minimum width being set at 66 feet, but two years later this was reduced to 40 feet. It remained at this figure for eight years before again being raised to the standard figure of 66 feet. Provision was made in the 1886 Municipal Corporations Act for municipal councils to take private streets over and declare them public even though they were as narrow as 20 feet, so long as they had been constructed before 2 November 1878.

The **Need for Wide Streets**

The reasons suggested for why wide streets were necessary were the same as those constantly propounded throughout the latter half of the 19th century in New Zealand whenever any attempts were made at town planning, namely health and morality. These were eloquently if somewhat emotionally stated by William Swanson during a debate in the New Zealand House of Representatives in 1878. If they looked for crime, vice, destitution, and everything that was bad, they would go to the narrow slums and lanes, where these evils were actually engendered. If they made good wide streets, depend upon it that they would greatly promote the virtue, morality, and health of the people, so that, in the interest of every community, the Government should insist upon the laying out of wide streets. Wide streets were seen as the “great ventilators of the towns” for they allowed the frequent winds (a feature of New Zealand’s climate), to blow away the bad smells and the possibly lethal disease carrying air which resulted from bad urban sanitation and drainage typical of most of the 19th century.

The health argument was generally not as altruistic as it may appear, however, for there was a fear amongst the better-off that narrow streets could be the breeding ground of epidemics which would spread into the more wealthy suburbs. So what support there was for wide streets often served self-interest as well.

By calling it a ‘right of way’ this street in Dunedin serving six houses was able to be made just over 13 feet wide at its entrance, though at the stables it was almost 50 feet wide. This subdivision on private land was made in 1877. Measurements on the map are given in links. (Hocken Library, Dunedin).

On a more mundane level, narrow streets were seen as potentially dangerous areas where so many buildings, even in town centres, were built of wood, so that a fire could easily jump across narrow thoroughfares from one block to the next causing great destruction and monetary loss. Indeed, few New Zealand towns in the 19th century escaped from having at least one, if not more, major confabulations.

Some more far-sighted citizens opposed narrow streets on the grounds of possible future traffic congestion, particularly from the 1870s onwards as tramways began to be built in the towns. Narrow streets also created problems when laying or repairing water and sewage services, as thoroughfares could be completely blocked whilst work was being carried out.

Opposition to streets being constructed to a set minimum width was based on the perception that such thoroughfares would be far too excessive for many of the country’s small towns, where future growth was seen to be limited.

A further powerful argument used, particularly since the overwhelming majority of legislators were landowners, was the fact that when subdividing land into town properties, profits were potentially greater when land devoted to thoroughfares could be kept to a minimum. Not that the profit motive was emphasised. Rather, land subdividers tended to point out that by surveying their land into small property lots and narrow streets, they were creating opportunities for the poorer classes in the community to purchase their own land on which to build their homes.

And of course there was the widely-held Victorian belief that private property was just that - private. Therefore an owner had a right to do what he wished with it, even if his actions did eventually create social problems or environmental degradation.

By the end of the 19th century, despite all the good intentions, New Zealand cities and towns were still faced with having many of their streets too narrow, and these were the ones generally associated with slum housing. The problems were to become exacerbated as the 20th century passed, for the rising standard of living which in time eventually created social problems or environmental degradation.
Transatlantic Exchanges in Planning: the UK-US balance sheet

Gordon E Cherry
University of Birmingham, UK

In selecting a text around which to fashion this article I have turned to Christopher Tunnard who I was delighted to meet for the first time, late in his life, at the First International Conference of the Planning History Group in 1977. In an essay written in 1963 he observed that ‘if we are to ensure that in our generation man’s imprints will change from the careless to the premeditated, then the history of urban design is one of the most important tools at our disposal.’ He was making the point that while the historian of city planning may be concerned with the physical, behind each physical form lies an act of will - of a society, a group, or an individual. Hence it is necessary to be curious as to why certain societies prepare plans in the way they do.

Indeed this curiosity about the reasons for historical change in the morphology, design and appearance of cities, and the form of both townscape and landscape, has sustained planning history throughout its formative years. During this time, our international perspective has encouraged study into the transference of planning ideas and practice into both countries, apart from the dangers and limitations of the new critical gaze upon its urban conditions: the se were widely approved;

The very term was current in the middle of the 19th century, the census of 1851 of the striking developments of the last century. The linked with the Garden City movement (the plan for Letchworth was not commissioned until 1905: there were many literary tours through the extent the countryman. 3

The point about this reminder of urban history is that the thrust for environmental beauty, and the search for housing and social reform, reached their peaks on both sides of the Atlantic at the same time in the years around the turn of the century. In Britain the Garden City held out particular promise, while the benefits of low density suburban living were widely approved; in the US the City Beautiful was seen as the vehicle for improvement. Elsewhere, urbanised Europe as a whole cast a critical gaze upon its urban conditions: these were the years of Camillo Sitte and his call for sensitive design, and the various models for urban form - concentric city, radial city, linear city and satellite city. During this time there was a number of shared British and American experiences. It began with an American attraction to the English landscape style of gardening. Indeed it developed into a commitment during the early childhood of Frederick Law Olmsted, on family trips through New England and Upstate New York. It blossomed during his first visit to England, setting sail for Liverpool in 1850 as a 23 year old. His first visit to Paxton’s new public park in Birkenhead, and his subsequent experiences of the delights of rural England, would ensure that the pastoral visions would be the basic model of his park designs. In due time Olmsted’s suburb of Riverside, west of Chicago (1869-71) anticipated by a full generation the early steps of the Garden City movement (the plan for Letchworth was not commissioned until 1904), though to be sure Bedford Park in west London, and Bournville in Birmingham, provided their mark as low density suburban settlements.

The link with the Garden City is indeed intriguing. The very term was current in the US before Howard finally settled on it, after his earlier flirtations with Unionville and Ruttsville; Howard’s sojourn in Chicago after his failure as a homesteader must have familiarised him with his vocation as a reporter, wrote about slum life in New York; one published in Scribner’s Magazine entitled How the Other Half Lives, was the basis for his first book published in 1890. More substantial perhaps, and certainly more scientific, was Charles Booth’s Life and Labour of the People of London, published in 18 volumes between 1889 and 1905. There were many literary tours through the urban underworlds of the day, and in one case it needed an American to come to London, live in the East End and experience the undercapital of the world in the summer of 1902: Jack London’s book, The People of the Abyss, was a powerful denunciation of the depths to which urban society had sunk.

The point about this reminder of urban history is that the thirst for environmental beauty, and the search for housing and social reform, reached their peaks on both sides of the Atlantic at the same time in the years around the turn of the century. In Britain the Garden City held out particular promise, while the benefits of low density suburban living were widely approved; in the US the City Beautiful was seen as the vehicle for improvement. Elsewhere, urbanised Europe as a whole cast a critical gaze upon its urban conditions: these were the years of Camillo Sitte and his call for sensitive design, and the various models for urban form - concentric city, radial city, linear city and satellite city. During this time there was a number of shared British and American experiences. It began with an American attraction to the English landscape style of gardening. Indeed it developed into a commitment during the early childhood of Frederick Law Olmsted, on family trips through New England and Upstate New York. It blossomed during his first visit to England, setting sail for Liverpool in 1850 as a 23 year old. His first visit to Paxton’s new public park in Birkenhead, and his subsequent experiences of the delights of rural England, would ensure that the pastoral visions would be the basic model of his park designs. In due time Olmsted’s suburb of Riverside, west of Chicago (1869-71) anticipated by a full generation the early steps of the Garden City movement (the plan for Letchworth was not commissioned until 1904), though to be sure Bedford Park in west London, and Bournville in Birmingham, provided their mark as low density suburban settlements.

The link with the Garden City is indeed intriguing. The very term was current in the US before Howard finally settled on it, after his earlier flirtations with Unionville and Ruttsville; Howard’s sojourn in Chicago after his failure as a homesteader must have familiarised him with...
Riverside, on his Garden City diagram in Tomorrow (1898) Fifth Avenue adjoins Central Park (as it does indeed in New York); and he himself acknowledges a debt of inspiration to Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward, a romance set in Boston of the state of US society in the year 2000.

In the meantime, urban speculation and exploitation went hand in hand with concern for housing and social amelioration. Both the US and Britain could share almost equal activity, with a good deal of inspiration from each. Henrietta Barnett, for example, has shown how the British cooperative housekeeping movement was invigorated by the writings of the American Charlotte Perkins Gilman who first visited Britain in 1886.1 Emphasising socialised domestic work, her books Women and Economics (1898) and The Home, its Work and Industry (1902) were very much part of the Letchworth cooperative housing scene. British feminism was a generally more moderate force than its American equivalent. American feminists found support in evangelicism, but British churches did not encourage women's active participation. British women, typified by Octavia Hill, were more likely to be attracted to philanthropic reforming activities which were not a challenge to the prevailing social structures. But perhaps the comparison is perhaps not quite as simple as that. For whilst from Britain we have to recognise the influence of Henrieta Barnett, the driving force behind Hampstead Garden Suburb, a formidable lady of whom it was once said, 'the only person known who could recite the Ten Commandments as if she had just made them up.6

This perhaps takes us to Hull-House, Jane Addams' famed settlement house in Chicago's west side slums. Like so many innovations in social welfare in the UK, the settlement was an English import.2 An Anglican churchman, Henrietta Barnett's husband, Samuel Barnett, established the first settlement house in London's impoverished East End in 1884. Stanton Cott, an American member of the Ethical Culture Society, spent a few months at Toynbee Hall, returning to the US in 1886 to found the first American settlement, Neighbourhood Guild (soon renamed University Settlement), on New York's Lower East Side. Jane Addams visited Toynbee Hall extended tour of Europe, after which she and her college friend Ellen Gates Starr opened Hull-House in 1889.

Planning movements

But to return to the early 20th century planning movement: whereas British innovation came to rest in cottage architecture, informal suburban layouts and the Garden City, American highlights focused on the City Beautiful. Even here however there is a blurred edge: the landscape architecture of Olmsted, which was and was helped along by his British counterpart Calvert Vaux, and at least an echo of US civic boosterism can be seen in Mayor Joseph Chamberlain's civic gesture for Birmingham. This created moved from designing single parts to comprehensive, multi-purpose parkland boulevard systems, progressive public works projects. Such instances of municipal improvement fused into the City Beautiful movement when it incorporated newly developed ideas of civic design. A progressive hope in clean, beautiful, well governed cities inspired middle class and upper middle class people keen to adopt business efficiency both in government and in private philanthropic organisations. The bible was a Charles Mulford Robinson's book The Improvement of Towns and Cities: or the practical basis of civic aesthetics, published in 1901.

Reach ultimately exceeded grasp, but that is not to criticise the ideal. A similar fate awaited Britain's parallel planning contribution. Whereas Paris had been beautified and regularised by Haussmann, London's civic improvements comprised a few street widenings, new thoroughfares and the construction of the Thames Embankment, had been largely underground where the Metropolitan Board of Works had its network of sewers and drains. Instead, the impetus came from 'a dy ing class of bourgeois social reformers conned together with socialists within the British Labour Party' as Sutcliffe1 has described them, enabling a middle class, professional group to push forward with reformist ideas in working class housing. An obsessive, perhaps diffident new urban writer, Ebenezer Howard, tallowed his ideas before various debating and philosophical societies before becoming the grateful recipient of a friend's £50 loan, which made possible the publication of his book which became the manual of the subsequent Garden City Movement. Meanwhile, a socialist engineer, draughtsman and self taught architect, Raymond Unwin, together with his cousin-in-law Barry Parker, led the dramatic shift from the monotonous low law street to the cottage-inspired dwelling, fronting winding, tree-lined streets. Unwin's contribution to planning literature, Town Planning in Practice: an introductory to the art of designing cities and suburbs (1909), confirmed the enduring power of the British design tradition, and Howard's Garden City and Town Planning Association (to give it its new name from 1907) took on an international breadth from 1913.

The two movements were clearly very different, but the turn of the century for both the US and Britain had many similarities. For example, planning in both countries operated in the emergent ground of new planning and new research. In Britain, the rise in the number of professional bodies took place throughout the Victorian years. The Royal Institute of British Architects secured its royal charter in 1837; the Institute of Civil Engineers was founded in 1818 spawned a number of engineering bodies, including one which became known as the Institution of Civil Engineers in 1909. The Surveyors Institution was founded in 1868. All this was matched in the US by the American Institute of Architects (1866) and the engineering professions (1871).

There were other uncanny parallels between the two countries. The US got off to a head start in 1893 with the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago and the model city it presented to the nation. Thereafter, the first decade of the new century saw a number of parallel developments. Britain was ahead with Letchworth and Hampstead Garden Suburbs, but the US responded in 1909 with the publication of Burnham and Bennett's Plan for Chicago and its region. Throughout these years plans for many cities were prepared, beginning with Harry Leland's Robinson, Nolen, Griffin and the younger Olmsted. In 1910 the plan for New Haven by Cass Gilbert and F L Olmsted showed residential areas separated by ring roads, and an inner greenbelt in the form of a continuous recreational area - echoing earlier indicative plans sketched by Lord Meath for Birmingham. The Town Planning Institute was founded in 1909. The first University course in instruction in city planning began at Harvard, the same year in which the Department of Civic Design opened at the University of Liverpool. The US celebrated its first National Conference on City Planning in 1909; 1910 saw Raymond Unwin's international conference for the Royal Institute of British Architects. The Town Planning Institute was founded and so too was the American City Planning Institute; both began publishing their journals.

Housing: common and divergent paths

Close contact did not cease even during World War I. From Walter CREASE3 we learn that Charles Whitaker, editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, and L Ackerman to England in 1917 to investigate the housing of the munitions estates, for which Unwin was in charge. Strong relationships had been forged between the great personalities of the day: Barry Parker for example was friendly with Unwin through whom the Garden City influence was communicated. Nolen's book New Towns for Old began with a map of Letchworth and he looked forward to new towns of the American Garden City tradition which would result from the decentralisation of industry. Clarence Stein and Henry Wright visited Letchworth and Harlow in 1913. They submitted their plans for Radburn, New Jersey, begun in 1928. In return Parker refers to the Radburn Plan in his Report on Wythenshawe Garden Suburb to the Corporation of Manchester in May 1928. Furthermore, the inspiration for the Princess Parkway at Wythenshawe (the first such highway in Britain) came from the parkway system of Chicago and of Westchester County, New York. A dominant common theme was the effort made to create American Garden Cities patterned after Letchworth and Welwyn. The most notable examples were the series of communities designed by Clarence Stein as at Sunnyside Gardens, New York City (1924-8) and Chatham Village, Pittsburgh (1922). As in Britain, truly satellite townsships were stubbornly resistant to take off and Radburn was the only truly independent creation.

Intellectual harmony between the great figures in both countries was maintained through conference participation. Unwin acknowledged his debt to Patrick Geddes in The Culture of Cities (1938) he wrote in the Preface that as far back as 1915, under the stimulus of Geddes, he had come to believe that planning was a science and in particular at home in the US. From 1936 to his death in 1940, he was at Columbia University for four of the nine academic months. As Cowen observes, 'Towards the end, Unwin seemed to be more attracted to and more needed by Americans than his own countrymen'.

But by the 1930s the traditions of the two countries may have been moving apart. Inter-war Britain, after an early flowering of town planning, relapsed into a cautious conformity with planning practice grounded in the statutory work of local authorities. Welwyn (1920) was the second and last of the garden cities. In the US, however, the work of the Regional Planning Association of America and the New York Regional Plan encouraged the close involvement of British planners like Howard in the planning of Thomas Adams, earlier the first secretary of the Garden City Association, but the British counterpart was the modest work of Unwin for the Greater London Planning Committee between 1928 and 1933. Practical steps towards decentralisation were the New Deal proposals for Green belt towns to be created under Federal Government auspices. Rexford Tugwell,
the programme administrator wanted 3000. 25 were selected by the Resettlement Administration; Roosevelt approved eight; Congress reduced it to five and 400 were built. But this record was better than the housing needs of the New York Times Society in Britain, which were totally unfulfilled.

After World War II the divergent trends widened. One of the differences lay in regard to public housing. Britain's record was encouraged by 19th century antecedents when the State slowly but continuously breached the interests of private property, first in enforcing standards and then in establishing a new tenure group, that of the local authority council house. Between the wars, four million dwellings were built in Britain, one quarter being local authority provided; the die was cast from 1939. After World War II an important argument was won, namely that the State would be the principal provider of post-war housing. It did not turn out that way, the private sector recovering its buoyancy, but nonetheless Britain's State housing sector, until the reversal of the 1980s, was internationally impressive in extent. Housing and planning in Britain were always inextricably linked, and planning in Britain was always inextricably linked, and planning and housing entered into party relationships. A British profession, steeped in the local authority house building and a vigorous slum clearance programme between the mid-1950s and mid-1970s when nearly 1.5 million dwellings were cleared, and their occupants rehoused.

Post-war developments

After 1947 British cities were the subject of a statutory planning system, whereby the whole country was subject to planning control, its forward planning based on regularity and constance, and constantly reviewed Development Plans, and its day to day control of development exercised by local authorities who were given remarkable discretion by Parliament. That the system can readily be criticised for being unduly regulatory and restrictive, slow and cumbersome and a constraint on initiative and enterprise, should not detract from recognition of its potential for the sophisticated democracy, able to accommodate the checks and balances of private and public interests, has been able for nearly half a century to provide an acceptable measure of guidance over urban development in which individual freedoms can coexist with State control.

A national, land use map has emerged as the product of a remarkable planning system, built up from regional Town Planning programmes, particularly active with designations in the later 1940s and throughout the 1960s; its town expansion schemes from the mid-1950s; its countryside reservations of national parks; areas of outstanding natural beauty; green belts and the like now totalling 40% of the land surface of England and Wales; and its regional programmes structured around motorway investment, economic aid and inner city recovery schemes. A change of ideology over the last decade and a half has led to State-based programmes having lesser market made by British planning, post-war.

This very British feature of planning has had a particular consequence for UK-US intellectual relationships. A British profession, steeped in history and proud of its exclusivity, served the State, three quarters of its members for much of the period working in local government. It was never very good at being self-critical and is not renowned for its objectivity or analytical capacity. Its planning literature has no great strength of intellectual pedigree. The monolithic nature of the planning profession, wedded as it has been to a statutory frame of reference, has given little scope to academic research. But this is changing. Typically, academic contribution to planning has come from outside the planning discipline, particularly geography and the social sciences.

And some of the early post-war observers of British planning were in fact American - Harold Orans, Lloyd Rodwin, Donald Foley and Walter Creese. Moreover, the fruitful interchange of ideas seen in the 1920s between Steinitz and Wright from the US and Howard and Unwin from Britain, expressed in similar designs for residential communities, resumed after 1945. Steinitz's approach to pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems fed into British planning, particularly in New Towns, first of all at Stevenage, and then more generally into Redeveloped inspired housing layouts.

Thus it was perhaps that some US literature came to occupy a quite disproportionate place in the reading material of British planners. Jane Jacobs' The Death and Life of Great American Cities (1961) was a case in point. The subtitle accounts for the shock: 'the failure of town planning'. British architects could rally against British planners, but that was in the 1970s. In 1955 Ian Nairn and Gordon Cullen had surveyed the state of modern English landscape for The Architectural Review, giving vent to their reactions in an article called Outrage. The sense of anger about modernisation was certainly widespread, Peter Blake expressing it about American landscape in a letter to the Review in June 1964. But Jacobs went further. To read an attack on the principles and aims that have shaped modern, orthodox city planning and rebuilding (p.53) sounded like heresy. But the point was there: null, inert cities contain the seeds of their own regeneration. British planning had no critical dimension to challenge this.

Britain had caught up somewhat by the time of Robert Goodman's Planning and the Planners (1972). His argument, that planning had become an ossified weapon to maintain the existing order under a mask of rationality, efficiency and science (p.217) was that planning was not what it was. His call was that the critical gaze was dominated by US writers who for long had presented a rigorous, critical, enquiring mind to the profession. Writers including Paul Davidoff, Thomas Reiner, Melvin Webber, Martin Myerson, John Friedman, John Dyckman and others presented an intellectual face to planning, which the British profession badly needed. Britain's preoccupations remained with the practical work of planning, driven by the demands of local government, a rather turgid period of British planning in the 1970s when planning theory was fashionable, the British academic Andreas Faludi (Australian born), wrestling with the issues of planning policy and the structure of planning institutions, had to turn largely to US literature, rich in intellectual stimuli and accessible in language.

facilitators in a grossly manipulated system. This fuelled the enthusiasm for a Marxist view of planning, dominant throughout the 1970s, though to wither as a cur-de-sac in planning. But a preference for seeing planning not as an exercise in the arrangement and appearance of buildings and the manipulation of space, but rather as a social facilitator, helps to solve their problems and realise their goals, was to have a longer imprint. During this time a greater congruence emerged between British and American planning experiences. As Schaffer in his recent review of two centuries of American planning has remarked, Professional planners in the 1970s seemed not only to lose much of their purpose, they seemed to lose much of their constituency as well. Government bureaucracies stagnated. The poor were increasingly hostile. The planner's ability to deliver was in question. More people called for a direct role in decision making. Those who had tolerated planners as experts now looked to the market place and the corporate world to resolve problems. The planner's alienation in Britain was the more acute because of his prior protection in the welfare state, but both sides of the Atlantic presented a similar picture.

And so we see by the mid-1980s the pendulum of differentiation had swung. From the US, the Catanese in The Politics of Planning and Development (1964) proclaimed that the future will be neither a Big brother planner nor a laissez-faire oligarchy. It will be an earnest search for a process by which private sector goals can converge with widely held public goals (p.10). At about the same time, Harvey in The Politics of Town Planning (1982) put forward an enabling philosophy for a profession in change. But as the credentials and legitimacy of a formerly powerful group were eroded, the critical gaze was dominated by US writers who for long had presented a rigorous, critical, enquiring mind to the profession. Writers including Paul Davidoff, Thomas Reiner, Melvin Webber, Martin Myerson, John Friedman, John Dyckman and others presented an intellectual face to planning, which the British profession badly needed. Britain's preoccupations remained with the practical work of planning, driven by the demands of local government, a rather turgid period of British planning in the 1970s when planning theory was fashionable, the British academic Andreas Faludi (Australian born), wrestling with the issues of planning policy and the structure of planning institutions, had to turn largely to US literature, rich in intellectual stimuli and accessible in language.
A summing up

It would require a much longer article to examine at all adequately the full story of UK-US interchange in planning. The post-war story in particular requires much fuller treatment in order to explore the dominant themes of the last forty years: urban renewal, townscape and architectural design, traffic planning, community participation and advocacy planning, the computer revolution, modelling and research techniques, and the thrust of new popular concerns, including environmentalism and greening. The fact is that urban affairs do not stand still: circumstances change, attitudes come and go, and cultures are dynamic. The course of planning history is charted against an ever-changing pattern of social relations, a truism which provides the remit for an academic and professional curiosity about urban phenomena.

But even an unfinished paper has suggested a framework for continuing analysis. The planning historian seeks explanations for processes of change, or lack of it. Just occasionally, pivotal periods marked by the pursuit of radical alterations in urban form, assume great significance, when ideas are borrowed and transplanted in very different institutional soil. Just as a hundred years ago both our national societies were making a break with the past to forge a new future, so today we are looking at new ways of doing things. This time round, the ease of effecting a transatlantic dialogue may ensure common international styles in the architecture of the post-industrial city; however, the main dimensions of an urban environment will remain stubbornly shaped by the transitory intangibles of political institutions, legal and administrative arrangements and the broad departures in cultural outlook between our countries. In drawing up the UK-US balance sheet neither will be in the debtors' or creditors' prison; there will continue to be a fascinating interplay between two distinctive socio-political styles.

This article was first presented as a keynote address to the 4th SACRPH National Conference on American Planning History/Fifth International Conference of the Planning History Group, Richmond, Virginia, USA, November 1991.
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Reports

The Fourth National Conference on American Planning History/Fifth International Conference Planning History Group, Richmond, Virginia, November 7-10 1991

Stephen V Ward
Oxford Polytechnic, UK

The event was SACRPH's fourth national conference on American planning history and PHG's fifth international conference. It was also sponsored by the Urban History Association (UHA) and the Departments of Urban Studies and Planning and Art History of Virginia Commonwealth University. Approximately 150 papers were presented over a two day period, mainly in 56 simultaneous sessions. Most time slots saw six or occasionally seven sessions in progress concurrently, so that much inevitably had to be missed.

There were however three plenary sessions, associated with the Friday and Saturday luncheons and the Saturday evening dinner. At each of these the presidents of each of the three main sponsoring organisations, PHG, SACRPH and UHA, delivered addresses to the assembled diners. The first, our own Gordon E. Cherry, spoke on 'Transatlantic Exchanges in Planning: The UK-US Balance Sheet', a long term chronological review of the planning interchanges between the world's two main developed English speaking nations. The paper is reproduced in the present issue of Planning History. The following day, the retiring SACRPH president, Eugenie Ladner Birch of Hunter College, City University of New York, offered her 'Reflections on Planning History', a fascinating account of her work on the New York Planning Commission and its relationship to planning history. Finally, Zane L. Miller of the University of Cincinnati spoke on 'Planning History as Urban History', a thoughtful and thought-provoking reflection on the relationships between our two related but still distinctive concerns.
Analysis of the programme for the simultaneous sessions reveals that almost two-thirds of the papers were by Americans on US topics. This immediately shows that the conference was primarily focused on American planning history, the purpose for which it was initially conceived. However, further 16 US presenters gave papers on non-US or comparative topics. Moreover, of the 35 papers given by non-US presenters, all but two were on non-US topics. In all the papers dealt with aspects of planning history in at least 28 different countries, so that despite its understandably heavy US bias, it was also an impressively international affair. Proceedings of the whole Conference will be published at some future date, available via SACRPH. In the meantime, it is possible to give only a limited flavour of the sessions and the papers in them.

The Sessions: Individual Planners and Cities

Four sessions were focused explicitly on the impact of individual planners. Thus Cynthia Zaltlzevsky (Harvard University) and Jon A. Peterson (CUNY) presented papers in an early session on ‘The Olmsted Legacy.’ Another session, on Harland Bartholomew’s Contribution, included papers by Eric Sandweiss (Columbia University) and Eldridge Locklear (Harland Bartholomew Associates). Bartholomew featured again in the American Institute of City Planners-sponsored session on ‘Visions of Planning Pioneers: Nolen, Bartholomew, Whitten and Wilcox.’ Papers were presented by Bruce Stephenson (Rollins College); William A. Randle (Attorney, Lakewood, OH); Suzanne Suito (Montgomery County Planning Commission, PA) and Ronald K. Bednar (Pennsylvania Department of Community Affairs); and Daniel K. Sline, Attorney, Richmond VA.

Finally, in a session on Planner/Architects: Bullfinch, Tunnard and Hegemann, there were papers by Lawrence W. Kennedy (Boston College), Ralph Warburton (University of Miami) and Christian Asman (New York).

No less than eight sessions concentrated on the individual experiences of particular (mainly American) towns and cities. Thus Robert A. Burnham (Macon College) and Andrea Tuttle Kornbluh (Raymond Walters College) spoke on aspects of Planning in Cincinnati, while Peter D. Paul (Architect, New York) and Marc Hirth (Richmond Renaissance) spoke about Planning and Urban Development in Richmond. Deborah S. Gardner (Encyclopaedia of New York City), Robert H. Fairbanks, (University of Texas) and John Hancock (University of Washington, Seattle) considered Comprehensive Planning and Development: Seattle, Dallas and San Diego.

There was also another session dealing with a more detailed aspect of the host city: Planning the Avenue Richmond’s Monumental Avenue, with papers by Richard Guy Wilson (University of Virginia) and Robert Winstrop (Architect, Richmond VA). Meanwhile Kathleen Kelly Broomer (Consultant, Natick, MA), Thomas W. Pavyer (University of Massachusetts) and Mark Kenner (Spring Garden College) were considering The Logic of Richmond’s Eastern Seaboard Cities. The capital city received attention in a session on Washington, DC’s Plan, 1791-1991, featuring papers by Elizabeth J. Barthold, Sara Amy Leach, (both of the Historic American Buildings Survey), David J. Murphy (University of Maryland) and Pamela Scott (Art Historian, Washington, DC).

There were two non-US sessions in this group. One of these took in focus as Post World War II City Planning in Theory and Practice. It featured papers on Vienna, London and Moscow by Jeffrey M. Defendorf (University of New Hampshire), Michael Helbert (LSE and Sergey Sergeyevich Ozhegov (Moscow Institute of Architecture). The latter was concerned with altogether longer perspectives of planning change. Entitled Planning Processes: The Long View, it included the paper by Vilhelm Hastinglos-Martindzis (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki) which is reproduced in this issue of Planning History, together with papers by James Peter Higgins (University of Birmingham, UK) and John H. Martin (University of Massachusetts).

Suburbs and New Towns

Four sessions focused on the suburban experience, beginning with Suburban Planning in the Twentieth Century Metropolis, featuring papers by Greg Hise (University of California, Berkeley) and Thomas Hall (Stockholm University). Peter L. Goss (University of Utah), Ann Durkin Keating (APA), and Stanley E. Sokol (University of Maryland) presented their papers in a session called Planning the Post-World War II Suburb. The following day Robert Bruegman (University of Illinois) and William Sharpe (Barnard College) and Leonard Wallcock (Hunter College, CUNY) spoke on Defining the New Suburbia. The theme was pursued further in Planning the Ideal Suburb: Three Case Studies, with papers by Robert M. Moudry (Cornell University), Judith A. Quinn (National Park Service, Boston) and Michael A. Crites (National Archives and Record Administration, Washington, DC).

These sessions took the garden city/new town tradition as their subject. Thus Cathy D. Knepper (University of Maryland), Robert Wojtowicz (Old Dominion University) and Tracy Shew (SUNY) dealt with images of Radburn and the Greenbelt Towns. Elliott Schlaf (Columbia University), Anthony W. Schuman (New Jersey Institute of Technology) and Stephen W. Spear (Polytechnic) examined New Towns: Planning and Ideology. More recent issues were addressed in New Towns in the 1960s and 1970s with contributions by Robert Fishman (Rutgers University), Diane Kane (University of California, Santa Barbara) and Edgar Allen Pritchard (Attorney, Fairfax, Virginia).

Comparative and Cross Cultural Dimensions

Although these were addressed in a number of places in the conference there were several sessions explicitly set up to examine comparative and cross cultural questions. The first entitled Cross-Cultural Currents in Twentieth Century Town Planning featured papers by Robert Bevens (Historian, Oxford, UK) Jeffrey W. Cody and Kenneth C. Parsons (Cornell University). (The latter paper is featured in this issue of Planning History). A further session dealt with Town Planning in...
Comparative Perspectives with papers by David Hamer (University of Wellington, New Zealand), Laura Kolbe (University of Helsinki), S. Ilan Troen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev) and John Mullin (University of the Witwatersrand). The third of these sessions was on Regional Planning and Development in Comparative Perspective. Fred H. A. Aalen (Trinity College, Dublin), Mervyn Miller (Architect, Baldock, UK) and Robert E. Ireland (University of North Carolina) spoke on this theme.

Components of City Planning

Many of the sessions focused on distinct elements of city planning. There were two sessions specifically on transportation issues. Thus J. A. Chewning and Alice M. Cornell (University of Cincinnati and Gregory L. Thompson (Florida State University) dealt with The Challenges of Mass Transit in American Cities. Another session considered Expressways and Mass Transit Since the 1940s, papers by John F. Bauman (California University of Pennsylvania), Peter Derrick (New York Metropolitan Transportation Authority) and Owen D. Gutfriend (Columbia University).

Slum clearance, social housing and urban renewal featured in three sessions. Papers on Planning and Housing for the Poor were given by Michael Muruaca (CUNY) and John T. Metzger (Columbia University), P. J. Smith, (University of Alberta) and Michela Berzi (University of Geneva) considered Housing, Hygiene and the Industrial City. A more contemporary picture was offered in Urban Renewal in British and American Cities, featuring papers by Helen Meller (University of Nottingham), Madeline L. Cohen (Community College of Philadelphia), A. Tappan Wilder (Historian, Washington, DC) and Heywood T. Sanders (Trinity University).

Park Planning in Europe and the United States was the subject of one session, with presentations by Joan Draper (University of Colorado, Boulder), Galen Cranz (Architect, Berkeley) and Mauro van Rooijen (Erasmus University, Rotterdam). Another session examined Preservation Planning and Revitalization featuring papers by Ronald Lee Fleming (Towson Institute, Cambridge, MA), Robert Hodder (Cornell University), Susan Moffat (Swiss Bear Inc, New Bern) and Wes Hampton (East Carolina University). A slightly more unusual session was that focused on Private Interests and Public Spaces in Nineteenth Century Cities, with papers by Peter Coheen (Queen's University, Kingston), Timothy Gale (Loyola University) and David C. Sloan (Dartmouth College, NH).

Approaches to Planning Theory and Practice

The more theoretical end of the spectrum was reflected in Conceptualizing the City with papers by H. Gleye (Catholic University of Louvain) and Katherine Tehranian (University of Hawaii). A simultaneous session looked at Planning Theory and Urban Form with papers by Albert Gutenberg (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), David R. Hill (University of Colorado, Denver), Ed Traverne and Cor Wegenaar (University of Groningen) and Cliff Ellis (Columbia University). A more practical emphasis was apparent in Planning and Design and Society with papers by Tony Stulfit (University of Leicester), Eric Mundur (Princeton University) and June Manning Thomas (Michigan State University).

The nuts and bolts of detailed planning practice were dealt with in The Impact of Zoning and Building Regulations, with papers by Patricia Burgess (Japanese Land Housing Institute), Taehoon Moon and Akira Olgai (all of Kyushu University), Michael Holleran (University of Colorado, Denver) and Richard Harris (McMaster University). A related theme was apparent in the session on Planning and Real Estate Patterns in Historical Perspective, featuring contributions by Jeffrey A. Kroszner (CUNY), Albert von Hofman (Harvard University) and Marc A. Weiss (Columbia University). And there were echoes too in Urban Land Use Planning, with papers by John W. Reis (Cornell University) and Garrett Power (University of Maryland).

Regional, National and Imperial Dimensions

A further ten sessions focused on areas rather wider than the city. Martin Bierbaum and Linda Nowicki (New Jersey Office of State Planning) considered State Planning in Historical Perspective. Regional Planning in the Western United States included papers by Paul H. Giley (Montana State University), Patricia Matthews (University of Delaware) and David R. Long (University of North Carolina). The south received the attention of Charles E. Conney (Florida State University) and Thomas W. Hatchett (University of North Carolina) in the session Perspectives on Federal Policy and Planning in the South. The last of the US based sessions dealt with Planning and

Community Development in California, featuring papers by Carroll Brenner (University of California, Berkeley) and Henry C. Matthews (Washington State University).

Non-US examples were considered in three of the sessions. The first, Planning in the Balkans, included papers by Kiki Kafkoulou and Alexandra Varelopoulo (Aristotle University of Thessaloniki), Filippe Gorosita (University of Pennsylvania) and Felipe Prestamo (University of Miami) presented papers on Latin American Planning History. Finally Ursula von Petz (University of Dortmund) and Brian K. Lagg (Ghent University) spoke on Planning in Twentieth Century Germany.

On the colonial theme, Francois-Auguste de Montequin, John H. Hoogakker and Melanie A. Leqh (all of Virginia Commonwealth University) spoke on The Laws of the Indies and Spanish Colonial Town Planning. In another session Gilbert Stelter (University of Ghent) and Robert K. Home (University of Reading) offered their views on Colonial Town Planning: Comparative Views. Finally Goh Ban See (Universiti Sains Malaysia) and R. Gordon Ecclestone (Texas A & M University) considered Colonial Planning and Town Planning.

Gender and Ethnicity Issues

A welcome emphasis in US planning historiography was the attention given to gender and racial matters. Gender issues were apparent in Men, Women and Municipal Government During the Progressive Era, featuring Marsha Ritdidorf (University of Oregon) and Patricia Mooney-Melvin (Loyola University). They were also firmly on the agenda in Women and Planning in the Early Twentieth Century with presentations by Susan Marie Wicks (Illinois State University) and Gordon E. Cherry, conducted by SACRPH's Executive Secretary, Larry Gerckens. Gordon had in fact stood in at short notice for an unwell Carl Feiss and clearly found the situation a rather novel one. However the tape will doubtless form a valuable oral history source on the foundation and development of our subject and organisation. Future historians of PHG please note!

The remaining two programmed simultaneous sessions were not concerned with the presentation of papers, though were of particular significance to PHG members. One was an open discussion about the future relations of SACRPH and PHG, which came about no doubt, without a useful exchange of views. The other was, in some ways an even more extraordinary event, a taped open interview with PHG's President, Gordon E. Cherry, conducted by SACRPH's Executive Secretary, Larry Gerckens. Gordon had in fact stood in at short notice for an unwell Carl Feiss and clearly found the situation a rather novel one. However the tape will doubtless form a valuable oral history source on the foundation and development of our subject and organisation.

The Social Dimension

On a slightly different tack, the session on Planning for Lisbon and Central Tokyo After the Disasters included papers by John R. Mullin (University of Massachusetts), Yoichi Kubota (Saitama University) and Akira Koshizawa (Tokyo Institute of Technology and Nihon University).

Miscellaneous

The remaining sessions included two focused on industrial issues and planning. Thus Lynn F. Poarson (Architectural Historian, Newcaslte) and John F. Gilpin (University of Lethbridge) dealt with The Regional Impact of Industry on Town Planning: Two Case Studies. Lance Trusty (Purdue University), G. Joseph Socki (SUNY) and Takashi Yasuda (Setsunan University) addressed Company Influence on the Planning of Industrial Cities. The other two sessions where papers were presented were (Re)Reading Maps and Plans and the SACRPH Student Prize Winner's Showcase. The former combined the practical and the highly theoretical with papers by Steven J. Mandelbaum (University of Pennsylvania), James C. O'Connell (Cape Cod Planning Commission) and Carl Abbott (Portland State University). The latter included only one of the two winners, D. Holmes (Auburn University). (The other, by John T. Metzger, was presented in the session on Planning and Housing for the Poor).

The remaining two programmed simultaneous sessions were not concerned with the presentation of papers, though were of particular significance to PHG members. One was an open discussion about the future relations of SACRPH and PHG, which came about no doubt, without a useful exchange of views. The other was, in some ways an even more extraordinary event, a taped open interview with PHG's President, Gordon E. Cherry, conducted by SACRPH's Executive Secretary, Larry Gerckens. Gordon had in fact stood in at short notice for an unwell Carl Feiss and clearly found the situation a rather novel one. However the tape will doubtless form a valuable oral history source on the foundation and development of our subject and organisation. Future historians of PHG please note!

The Social Dimension

Not the least important feature of the Richmond Conference were the opportunities for social interaction. The walking tours of historic Richmond and Monument Avenue were both sociable and informative, belying European expectations of typical American cities by showing the extent of the surviving good quality historic built environment.
in the central area. However it was noticeable that many downtown buildings were empty, in some cases near derelict, showing that the ‘hole in the doughnut’ syndrome is apparent, even in Richmond.

On a more completely social note, two splendid receptions were hosted for us by the Anderson Gallery at Virginia Commonwealth University and the Valentine Museum in downtown Richmond. They both provided relaxed and extremely pleasant settings for informal discussion. The fine food and drink which was provided can certainly be reported with approval. In particular, the southern specialty of crab meat patties cooked for the reception were absolutely superb. The Jefferson also served two very acceptable lunches and the social highlight of the whole Conference was the excellent dinner on the Saturday evening in the splendid Empire Room opening off the upper balcony of the hotel’s pillared lower lobby.

However even then it seemed that the professional side of the conference would not easily give way to the social. As we waited to go in to dinner, lingering around the base of the famous statue of Jefferson himself, a piece of historical theatre began to play itself out in the lobby beneath us. A large group of local enthusiasts were engaged in a public re-creation of the ‘Old South’ of the Civil War era, the men dressed in grey Confederate uniforms and ladies in crinolines. However despite the authenticity of dress and manners, it was an eminently diverting and charming illusion - a played version of the ‘Old South’ parading itself in the extraordinary physical setting of the Jefferson Hotel, itself of course an embodiment of the post-civil war ‘New South’. Meanwhile both these historical reconstructions were located within the social and economic realities of the real ‘new’ ‘New South’ of the post-civil rights era. It was comforting to know that the waiters and waitresses serving them with food and drinks were not slaves, since it allowed us to enjoy the theatre of it without having to take it too seriously as a historical re-creation. Ultimately it was not history of the type that we had been intensely engaged in over the previous couple of days.

Accordingly we could all relax and appreciate this thoroughly post-modernist end to the conference. The end that is as I experienced it since I had to leave on the Sunday morning, missing the last fieldtrips, including that to colonial Williamsburg. However even without having the complete experience, I can report, without any qualification whatsoever, that this was a marvellous conference.

---

**Publications**

### Abstracts


Assesses economic, social and political trends of major significance to the capital’s future, in the context of both the city and its wider regional, national and international role. Chapters include ‘The metropolitan economy: continuity and change 1800-1939’ by David Green, ‘The emerging retail structure’ by Barry S Morgan, and ‘The borough effect in London’s geography’ by Michael Hebbert.


By the early 1990s, public health and housing reform had been followed by controls over the use and development of land, characterised as ‘town planning’. The best known pioneer was Sir Raymond Unwin. The design of twentieth century housing, new suburbs and new towns owes more to him, and to his great works in New Earswick, Letchworth and Hampstead Garden City, than to any other individual. The biography is both an appreciation of his life and a critical study of his works, encompassing his planning activities in Britain and more generally in America and international planning, his role in the founding of the Town Planning Institute, and contribution to the architectural profession.


Using Samuel Insull and the Chicago Edison Company as the means, the book explores the foundation of an energy-intensive society in the twentieth century. The author effectively weaves together economic, technological, political and social history to achieve his goal. Along the way he illuminates just about every major issue in urban history between the Gilded Age and the New Deal including the role electrical power in the emergence of the city planning profession’s community ideal.

---

**Urban History**

**Planning History Group members may be interested to note the following articles in Urban History**

**Vol 19 1992**

- Integrating architectural, social and housing history, Roderick Lawrence (Geneva)
- Geographical space, social space and the realm of the department store, Jeanne Lawrence (Yale)
- School in the city: educational historians and the urban variable, David Reeder (Leicester)
- Planning versus Administration: the Independent City Planning Commission in Cincinnati 1918-40, Robert Burnham (Macon College, Georgia)
- Special American Feature: International cities in the dual systems model: the transformations of Los Angeles and Washington, Carl Abbot (Portland State University)

---

**Vol 18 1991**


The essays in Our Changing Cities are rather diverse - from explorations of the role of transportation technology on urban development to an examination of the relationship between civil rights litigation and social structure and pattern in the American city. Most are authored by urban geographers and are concerned with broad patterns that characterise, and issues which affect, American cities. Being an anthology that developed from a lecture series, the book’s essays vary in focus and quality. Nevertheless, the book conveys something of the diversity and breadth of interests represented by urban geographers in the 1980s.
The Society for American City and Regional Planning History: Working Papers

The Society for American City and Regional Planning History: Working Papers

The aims of the SACRPH Working Paper Series. The WPS aims to circulate papers between the ‘mature draft’ or conference paper stage, and the accepted refereed journal article stage. The Series gives researchers review comments on the papers, publishes them, advertises them to a national audience, and markets them to interested individual buyers and libraries.

The general topics of papers that the WPS publishes. The policy of the WPS is to accept a broader rather than narrower range of research papers. In terms of time, papers are welcome from Native American periods up to recent events that are sufficiently distant to allow reasonable historical objectivity. Suggested topic areas include the historical dimensions of city, regional, state, and national plans. Also, when architectural, urban design, engineering, landscape architecture, and general urban form matters have physical or social planning implications, they are welcome. Further, investigations of major planning leaders, planning law, public policy, private development, social movements, and all the ‘sectoral’ areas of planning are very important. Studies of the history of American planning ideas with these topics are also of interest. Finally, of course, when in doubt researchers should call or write the editors.

Expected quality of the submitted papers. The papers should be structured as formal historical research papers, not book chapters or informal articles. Typically, the papers are written by planning professionals, local historians, historical agency administrators and researchers, advanced

Graduate students, independent scholars, or college and university educators. The papers should be carefully proofed, clearly typed and printed for future photocopying, and with standard margins. Single spacing is accepted, but with large lettering and spacing. An accepted and consistent system of documentation and paper formatting is required. Length is variable, but about thirty pages single-spaced begins to be an upper limit. Two photocopies should be sent for the review. Standards for evaluation are the usual: depth, breadth, documentation, relevance, originality, consistency, clarity, and so forth.

The evaluation process. The editors will make a first cut. In a few cases, the papers will be such quality, or have such obvious difficulties that the editors will be able to make early decisions themselves. In the vast majority of cases, the editors will send them to a WPS Advisory Board member for review assistance. Reviews are not ‘blind’, and the reviewer and writer are encouraged to communicate.


Sales List
The Working Paper Series

The Society for American City and Regional Planning History

WP 200 - Prelude to World City New York City from Dutch Colony to Economic Capital 1625-1860
Eugene A. Kranz Department of Urban Affairs and Planning Hunter College of the City University of New York December 1989, 30pp, $4.00

WP 201 - House Divided: Philadelphia’s Controversial Croystown Expressway
David Clox North Hollywood, CA 91601 December 1989, 28pp, $3.50

Madeline L. Cohen Associate Professor of Art History

Community College of Philadelphia
December 1989, 28 pp, $5.50

WP 203 - Tenement Reform in Boston, 1870-1920
Philanthropy, Regulation, and Government
Assisted Housing
Christine Cousseau Tufts University December 1989, 32 pp, $4.00

WP 204 - Reflections on the Politics of a Non- Political Planner
Mark Donchin Architect and City Planner Los Angeles, California 90048 September 1989, 16pp, $3.00

WP 205 - Planning a Municipal Airport: Dallas Love Field 1940-1962
Robert B Fairbanks Department of History University of Texas at Arlington December 1989, 19 pp, $3.00

WP 206 - A Note on the Idea of Cycles in American Urban Planning History
Edward Gutenberg Department of Urban and Regional Planning University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign December 1989, 12 pp, $3.00

WP 207 - America’s Disparate Organisms: From Frank Lloyd Wright to Paolo Soleri
David R Hill Urban and Regional Planning University of Colorado at Denver December 1989, 17pp, $3.00

WP 208 - How New York’s Developers Reshaped the Metropolis
Mollie Koller Trumbull, Connecticut 06611 December 1989, 21 pp, $3.50

WP 209 - Tragic 1313 Tums 50: The Golden Aniversary of the Meriam Center
Ruth Etkind Krack, Senior Editor or Planning Magazine Howard Rosen, Director of the Public Works Historical Society December 1989, 19 pp, $3.00

WP 210 - First Families of Greenbelt: Their Views of Life in a Planned Community
Cathy D Knepper University of Maryland December 1989, 12 pp, $3.00

WP 211 - ‘Associational Progressivism’ and the Shaping of Suburban Subdivisions in the 1920s
Carolyn Loeb Central Michigan University December 1989, 20 pp, $3.50

WP 212 - The Planning of Spanish Cities in America: Characteristics, Classification, and Main Urban Features
Francois-Auguste de Montequin Department of Art History Virginia Commonwealth University December 1989,34 pp, $4.00

WP 213 - Shaping the Regional City: 1983-1990
The Plans of Tracy Augur and Clarence Stein for Dispersing Federal Workers from Washington, D.C.
Kermit Carlyle Parsons Department of City and Regional Planning Cornell University December 1989, 32 pp, $4.00

WP 214 - The City Beautiful in Utopia A Study of Civic Center Designs in Southern California
Anna Scheid Senior Planner City of Pasadena, CA December 1989, 13 pp, $3.00

WP 215 - The Planning and Development of Atascadero, California
John W Snyder, Chief Office of Environmental Analysis California Department of Transportation December 1989, 11 pp, $3.00

WP 216 - Ask and You Shall Receive
Neighborhood Deterioration and Commercial Rezoning Columbus, Ohio 1923-1970
Patricia Burgess Stuch, PhD Assistant Professor Institute of Urban Studies University of Texas at Arlington December 1989, 16 pp $3.00

WP 217 - Attacking Economic Blight in Postwar Detroit
June Manning Thomas Urban Planning Program/Urbain Affairs Programs Michigan State University December 1989, 19 pp, $3.00
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Treasureer's Report

1. After the rise in subscription income in 1989, there was something of a fall back in both home and overseas receipts in 1990. The group continues to benefit, however, from the generally high interest rates experienced during the year.

2. The Bulletin Reserve Fund covered some transitional expenditure from 1989 on Vol XI of Planning History. Monies set aside in the Bulletin and General reserve funds are used to defray the Group's contribution of £186.00 to the expenses of the 1989 Bournemouth Conference. Among other expenditure items, the mailings to members included an additional mailing about the international conference in Japan. The membership list was renewed during 1990 involving a one-off payment for word-processing. There were no calls on the Thesis Directory Fund established in 1989.

3. The excess of receipts over payments of £1,501.26 for 1990 has been allocated to the Seminar Fund and held over from 1989 were used to defray the Group's contribution of £186.00 to the expenses of the 1989 Bournemouth Conference. Among other expenditure items, the mailings to members included an additional mailing about the international conference in Japan. The membership list was renewed during 1990 involving a one-off payment for word-processing. There were no calls on the Thesis Directory Fund established in 1989.

4. On behalf of the Group I would like to express our thanks to Mr E. G. Elms for once more checking the accounts and acting as our Hon. Auditor.

David W. Massey
University of Liverpool

Planning History Group: Accounts for 1990

1. Summary

   Balance brought forward from 1989: £7,837.20
   Receipts 1990: £3,033.42

   Payments 1990: £1,132.16

   9,728.46

2. Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31.12.90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts UK</td>
<td>978.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>1,123.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other years</td>
<td>52.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on deposits</td>
<td>871.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back issue sales</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£3,033.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin Production</td>
<td>239.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Mailing</td>
<td>561.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>145.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournemouth Conference</td>
<td>186.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of receipts over</td>
<td>1,901.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£3,033.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Balance Sheet as at 31.12.90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Fund</td>
<td>560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>168.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis Directory Fund</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reserve Fund</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin Reserve Fund</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£9,728.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Represented by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giro current a/c</td>
<td>63.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank current a/c</td>
<td>62.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank deposit a/c</td>
<td>9,602.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£9,728.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Audit Report

Audited and found correct 9 January 1992
E. G. Elms

---

Job Vacancy

The Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich invites applications for a position of

Professor of the History of Urban Design

The curriculum comprises urban history from antiquity to modern times and includes urban morphology and the typology of residential buildings. Focal points include the history of urban development from the industrial revolution to the present from a cultural point of view.

The teaching duties within the Department of Architecture include lectures and seminars in art history in close collaboration with the professors of design. Research should concentrate on urban investigation in the context of existing and new programmes at the Institute of the History and Theory of Architecture (gtu).

Applicants should have training in the history of art and urban design and be able to furnish proof of successful and independent research activities in these areas. Experience in teaching is an advantage.

Applications with a detailed curriculum and a list of publications (no publications) are to be sent by May 31, 1992, to the President of ETH Zurich, Prof. Dr J. Nüssli, ETH Zentrum, CH-8092 Zurich. In its effort to increase the number of women in academic top positions, the ETHZ specifically invites applications from female scientists.

---

Gregory L Thompson
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
Florida State University
December 1989, 25 pp, $3.00

WP 219 - Developing and Financing the Garden Metropolis: Urban Planning and Housing Policy in the Twentieth Century
Marc A Weiss
School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation
Columbia University
December 1989, 17 pp, $3.00

WP 220 - The Development of Baltimore's Northwest Corridor, 1919-1930
Michael A Groves
Archives of American Art
Smithsonian Institute
December 1990, 19 pp, $3.00

WP 221 - Cleveland's Man Light: Public Power, Democratic Promise and Political Conflict
Professors W. Dean Keating, Norman Krumboltz, and David Perry
April 1991, 38 pp, $3.00

WP 222 - The Olmsted Brothers and the Peripatetic Planning of Washington State's Capitol Campus: 1856-1928
Norman J Johnston
University of Washington
June 1991, 24 pp, $3.00

Jameson W. Doig
Princeton University
September 1990, 71 pp, $8.00

Orders for Working Papers should be sent to

David R. Hill, Editor
The Working Paper Series
Urban and Regional Planning Program
CU-Denver
Campus Box 126
P. O. Box 173364
Denver, CO 80217-3364
USA

Please make cheques payable to: 'The Working Paper Series/CU-Denver'
The Planning History Group, inaugurated in 1974, is an international body. Its members, drawn from many disciplines, have a working interest in history, planning and the environment.

Chairman
Professor G.E. Cherry
Department of Geography
University of Birmingham
PO Box 363
Birmingham
B15 2TT
021-414 5537

Membership
Membership of the group is open to all who have an interest in planning history. The annual subscription is £10 (currency equivalents available on request).

Membership Secretary:
Dr Pat Casside
Planning History Group
Department of Civil Engineering
Salford University
The Crescent
Salford
MS 4W
061-736 5843

Professor Gordon Cherry is Joint Editor with Professor Anthony Salclette of an international journal concerned with history, planning and the environment: Planning Perspectives. There is a link between Planning History and Planning Perspectives and members of the Planning History Group are able to subscribe to the latter journal at very favourable discount rates.