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I t is now finally time for me to take over the baton from Stephen Ward. Having successfully served his apprenticeship on Planning History, Stephen has now taken up a position on the Editorial Board of Planning Perspectives. On behalf of the members of the International Planning History Society, I would like to formally thank him for his efforts on our behalf. With typical generosity and modesty, Stephen paid tribute to his predecessors at Middlesex University, Dennis Hardy and Steve Chilton, and his colleagues at Oxford Brookes University, Sue Bartlett and Rob Woodward, in the last issue of Planning History.

The notion of the citizenship of Planning History means that the joys and burdens of task can be shared. I am already aware of some of the pleasures and challenges that the job entails. The pleasures come from receiving interesting new material and from corresponding with people with similar interests. The challenges are associated with the responsibilities and duties of putting the Society's bulletin together. (I am also acutely aware of the high standards set by Dennis Hardy and Stephen Ward.)

Like my predecessors, I have the advantage of the moral and practical support of the Board of Management, the Editorial Board and colleagues. Two fellow members of the School of Theoretical and Historical Studies in Art and Design at the University of Central England have been instrumental in helping me to put together my first issue of Planning History. Michael Halden has been responsible for producing the bulletin in a timely manner. He has been instrumental in bringing the journal to life. Readers will already be aware of their efforts in producing the "new look" bulletin. I hope you approve of the new format.

Planning History now comes to you via ARTIC Press, the publishing arm of the Department of Art in the Birmingham Institute of Art and Design at the University of Central England. The fact that the bulletin now has an ISSN should make it easier for institutions and libraries to order it.

Besides such obvious changes, I also expect to maintain a fair degree of continuity with the recent past. Like Stephen Ward before me, I see Planning History as a medium for communication between people interested in planning history, especially members of the International Planning History Society. I want the bulletin to retain its regular features: Notices, Articles, Research Notes, Conference Reports and brief Abstracts on recent publications. I would like to remind potential contributors that material can be published quickly in Planning History. I will also strive to maintain the international flavour of the journal. Members of the Editorial Board have traditionally been the willing conduits for ideas and contributions from their own parts of the world. Of course, pieces of all sorts (in the appropriate format) can be sent direct to the Editor for possible inclusion in Planning History. I look to try to maintain a journal that is useful to its readers, accessible, varied, informative, wide-ranging, stimulating, visually interesting and up-to-date. The best way for me to do this is for scholars and professionals everywhere with an interest in planning history to supply me with challenging and relevant material.

Generally, the International Planning History Society seems to be in good health. The Society organised two important conferences during 1994, and material from these events will be found within this edition of Planning History. Two pieces from the London conference, "Seizing the Moment—London Planning 1944-1994," are included here, but a book, edited by Michael Hebbert and Robert Home, containing some of the other papers is also likely to appear in Spon's Studies in the History of Planning and the Built Environment series. John Rep's fascinating personal account of the early years of the London New Towns brings into focus the voices of the key figures involved in this important planning episode. Reps came to Britain as a research student during those years. His piece provides an interesting picture of a meticulous scholar at work, but it is also an important document in its own right. In the second paper from the London conference, Tim Catchpole elaborates on a design that he brought to the public's attention a few years ago by the Prince of Wales—the rise of the high-rise office block in Central London. He worked for the Greater London Council before taking up a post as Deputy Head of the Environmental and Development Studies Group at the London Research Centre in the late 1980s. As Catchpole shows in his article, and as the 1987 Piano cartoon illustrates, concern about the area around St Paul's is not a new phenomenon.

The other article published in this edition of Planning History was a useful by-product of the London gathering. It is by Leonid Raputov of the Department of History of Architecture and Town Planning at the Moscow Architectural Institute. Professor Raputov brought this piece on Siberian Garden Suburbs as well as his conference paper to Britain, and we are happy to widen our geographical coverage by including such work.

The Sixth International Planning History Conference was held in Hong Kong in June 1994. Because the papers were of a very diverse nature there are no plans for a specific Conference publication. A list of the papers presented and the authors' institutions/addresses is therefore included so that interested readers can contact those involved. A report on this important conference will, I hope, appear in due course in Planning History.

Such conferences are a clear indication of the breadth and strength of the Society. We can only hope to build on the contacts made at such events and pick up and develop the ideas and approaches presented at such meetings. From its new home and in its new format I hope that Planning History continues to contribute to this building process.

My first editorial must end on a more cautious note. In his last editorial, Stephen Ward noted that Planning History had always been very good value. This, as he acknowledged, was because Middlesex and Oxford Brookes Universities were not only supportive bases for the bulletin but also because they seemed to forget to present bills to the Society. My immediate successor at the University of Central England are encouraging my efforts as Editor of Planning History, but the budgetary constraints under which they work will mean that the current host institution will probably not be as generous as previous ones.

This means that, in future, the International Planning History Society will have to face up to the fact that the cost of producing this bulletin will increase. The Board of Management (and members) will, no doubt, be watching trends carefully.
NOTICES

The Third International
DOCOMOMO Conference
Barcelona, September 14-17
1994

The Conference will address the following questions: "What aspects of the cultural legacy of the Modern Movement live on in contemporary architecture?" The papers will address this issue and hopefully prompt a discussion about concepts, authors or episodes in relation to reconsideration of interventions in particular Modern Movement works.

Some concrete cases of interventions in particular Modern Movement works will also be studied.

Libraries DOCOMOMO,
Fundacio Mies van der Rohe,
Bulevard 25, 08010 Barcelona, Spain.

Environments for Tourism Conference
Las Vegas, October 3-4 1994

"Creating Environments for Tourism: Architecture, Engineering, Resort Hotel and Convention Administration" is the theme of this International Conference at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Architecture, Engineering and Hotel Administration units. The conference will be organized around three sub-themes: The Architecture, Design and Planning of Tourist Facilities; Engineering, Technical Innovation and Entertainment Technology; and Tourism Development, Economics, Marketing and Management. The conference will focus upon tourism development as a major economic activity: the largest single source of income in the world's foreign trade and, for some countries, the most important export industry and earner of monetary exchanges.

Environments for Tourism Conference,
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-4023, U.S.A.

Second Australian Planning
History Conference
Canberra, June 12-16 1995

The International Symposium on Chinese-American History and Community Development Corporations
Beijing, August 16-20 1995

The Urban Research Program of the Australian National University in Canberra, Australia, will be hosting a national conference on planning and urban history which follows the successful first national conference on planning history held by the School of Town Planning at the University of New South Wales in Sydney in March 1993.

The Canberra conference will be in two parts. An urban history component will focus on Australian urban history, although other subject areas may be appropriate. The planning history section will concentrate on the history of planning in Australia. Major themes will be the history of Canberra and its planning as well as the influence of ideas embodied in the international competition of 1911-12 on the development of other Australian cities.

The timing of the conference coordinates with a major exhibition on the planning of Canberra to be organised by the National Archives and the National Library. This exhibition, co-sponsored by the National Planning Association and the Urban Research Program, will review the original submissions to the international competition.

Expressions of interest and proposals for papers for either the urban planning or urban history sections of the conference are welcomed from international scholars.

Inquiries and proposals can be made to Mr Pauline Huntley, Urban Research Program, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia; Phone: +61-6-232-2287, Fax: +61-6-234-0112

Second Australian Planning History Conference
Canberra, June 12-16 1995

The Urban Research Program of the Australian National University in Canberra, Australia, will be hosting a national conference on planning and urban history which follows the successful first national conference on planning history held by the School of Town Planning at the University of New South Wales in Sydney in March 1993.

The Canberra conference will be in two parts. An urban history component will focus on Australian urban history, although other subject areas may be appropriate. The planning history section will concentrate on the history of planning in Australia. Major themes will be the history of Canberra and its planning as well as the influence of ideas embodied in the international competition of 1911-12 on the development of other Australian cities.

The timing of the conference coordinates with a major exhibition on the planning of Canberra to be organised by the National Archives and the National Library. This exhibition, co-sponsored by the National Planning Association and the Urban Research Program, will review the original submissions to the international competition.

Expressions of interest and proposals for papers for either the urban planning or urban history sections of the conference are welcomed from international scholars.

Inquiries and proposals can be made to Mr Pauline Huntley, Urban Research Program, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia; Phone: +61-6-232-2287, Fax: +61-6-234-0112

'The Urban History Association and the Beijing Academy of Social Sciences will jointly sponsor an International Symposium on Chinese-American Urban History in Beijing in 1995. The conference focuses on the Historical Experiences of Urbanization: Chinese and American Patterns in Social and Cultural Development, and welcomes papers dealing with any aspect of the theme broadly defined. Papers can be of a comparative nature or can be case studies that lead to potential comparisons between Chinese and American urban history.

The Urban History Association is actively seeking funding for the conference to support scholars who will present papers. Further information on travel support can be provided when available. One page abstracts and a single page curriculum vitae must accompany all proposals, which should be sent no later than 30 October 1994 to:

Professor Bruce Stale, Chairman, Organizing Committee, ISCAUH, Department of History, University of Cambridge, 241 Grange Road, Storrs, CT 06269-2103, U.S.A.

'Women of Hull-House'

Chicago's Jane Addams Hull-House Museum has produced a documentary video. It explores the story of Hull-House through the contributions of Jane Addams as well as Ellen Gates Starr, Florence Kelley, Dr. Alice Hamilton, Grace Abbott, Edith Abbott and Mary Kenyon.

The video is available for $35 from Jane Addams Hull-House Museum, University of Illinois at Chicago (MC 1035), 800 S. Halsted Street, Chicago, IL 60607-7017, U.S.A.

Building Hope': A Film on Community Development Corporations

'Building Hope' is a one-hour documentary that traces the evolution of the Community Development Corporation (CDC) movement in America over the past 30 years. The film was produced by Charles Robinson of Vanguard Films and presented by WETA, Washington D.C. Building Hope' is part of a larger CDC Oral History Project documenting the origins and early history of CDC, with videotaped interviews with dozens of key leaders of the movement being conducted by the Pratt Insitute Center for Community and Environmental Development (PICCED). The transcripts and videotapes are currently being cataloged and distributed to research institutions in the U.S. so that they can be accessed by community development practitioners, public educators and researchers. Based on this material, PICCED is also producing profiles and case studies on CDCs for use in training and education.

Pratt Center for Community and Environmental Development (PICCED), 379 DeKalb Avenue, Brooklyn, New York 11205, U.S.A.

Environment and History
An International Journal of Environmental History

Editors: Richard H. Gomez, University of Cambridge, U.K.

ANNOUNCEMENT AND CALL FOR PAPERS

A rapidly growing interest in the state of the global environment has developed in the last two decades, together with a feeling that we have entered a period of environmental crisis. This has encouraged a wide range of scholars, including historians, to reassess their concerns in a much more ecological light. As a result, previously marginal or non-existent areas of scholarship, for example, in colonial, Commonwealth tropical and suburban history, are now starting to move towards centre-stage. An understanding of the history of human interactions with all parts of the cultivated and non-cultivated surface of the earth, and with living organisms, is increasingly seen to be essential to more conventional economic and cultural projects in history, history of science, anthropology, geography and sociology, while "environmental" history can also be of considerable assistance in efforts to comprehend the intrinsic environmental difficulties facing us today.

As an interdisciplinary journal, Environment and History aims to bring scholars in the humanities and biological sciences closer together, with the deliberate intention of constructing long and well-founded perspectives on present day environmental problems. An international editorial team is being appointed, and Environment and History will enjoy informal links with the European Association for Environmental History, whose Newsletter it supplements. The journal will be fully refereed, and indexed by leading abstracting services.

Authors are invited to submit four copies of papers for Environment and History to the Editor, c/o The White Horse Press, 10 High Street, Kingsbury, Cambridge CB3 8NR. U.K. Submissions should be in English and typed with double spacing. A style sheet is available on request.
**Siberian Garden Cities in the Early 20th Century**

Leonid B. Rapoport, Moscow Architectural Institute

In the preface to the Russian edition of the book *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*, published in St. Petersburg in 1911, Ebenezer Howard wrote: “I realize the importance of the existing cities improvement, but the main, most essential aim of my book is the creation of New Towns (author’s emphasis) which are to combine as fully as possible the advantages of the urban and rural life and at the same time to stop and then to reverse that flow of population, which now rushes to the overcrowded cities.” His words can be justly applied to large cities of Russia, whose overcrowdedness had been caused, mainly, by the quick industrial development of the country. By the early 20th century the ideas connected with the limitation of city growth and the creation of favourable living conditions for the urban population had been widely spread. Works by Russian and foreign public figures, philosophers, economists and writers outlining various planning projects had contributed to the widening debate on the urban environment. For example, theopian novel by American writer Edward Bellamy *Looking Backward*, who described Boston of 2001, was translated into Russian in the late 19th century on the initiative of the great Russian writer Lev Tolstoy, who helped to publish the book and to spread its ideas among the intellectuals.

The theoretical opinions of E. Howard and the planning concepts of the first garden-city in England were reflected in projects for new types of settlements in the first decades of this century in Russia, especially on the lands owned by the state. The majority of these new settlements were founded by the Societies which were building the country’s railways. So, for example, the widely known settlement near Prozvotovskaya railway station (now Ostyokh and Krasno) near Moscow was founded in 1913 by the Moscow-Kazan Railway Society after the design by V.N. Semenenov and A.I. Tamansov. The physical structure of the settlement of Prozvotovskaya, which was similar to the Y-shaped planning layout of Letchworth, gave an impulse to the creation of these new types of settlement.

Residential settlements on the railway lines were built for employees of the Ministry of Communications, which used for this purpose Government funds. In 1916 the Ministry decided to construct garden-settlements for its employees near Moscow and St. Petersburg as well as along the Omsk and Tomsk railways in Siberia. The decision to found garden-settlements along the Great Siberian Railway Main Line, the longest line in the world, was caused by the recognition of the important role which the main line was playing in developing the richest areas of that region and in helping the relocation of large masses of people from the central areas of Russia to the new settlements in Siberia and the Far East. However, the demand for settlements had appeared at the beginning of the construction of the Great Siberian Railway, in May 1891. At first settlements and houses were projected on sites parallel to the lines near to the railway stations. In 1899 at the railway engineer’s Congress the idea of founding so-called railway colonies near large stations was expressed. In terms of their planning requirements they only suggested the possibility of laying out building sites in future colonies and indicating streets and squares on the plans. The characteristic feature of the first railway colonies, built along the Ekaterininskaya railway, was a regular plan. There were 70 houses in the colony founded near the city of Chita. The colony consisted of eight town blocks (six blocks measuring 128 m x 128 m and two blocks measuring 128 m x 64 m each). The driveways were 21.5 m wide. Blocks were subdivided into equal lots and had houses placed along their perimeters on the building lines. The development of this colony, like the colonies near Omsk, was characterized by a uniform style of architecture and buildings.

One of the first Siberian garden-cities was projected near Kuznetsk station (Fig. 1). The design, made by the civil engineer A.D. Kryakhkov in 1916, recalled Letchworth’s planning scheme in many respects. The focal point of the city was a railway station circus, oval in shape. There were railway and public buildings here: Railway Administration, church, People’s House and school. Three avenues ran from the city public centre, main streets which were to be lined with commercial and public buildings. The central avenue led to a vast landscaped park through which a small river flowed. At the intersection of the outer thoroughfares with one of the circular streets, crescents were to be laid out for selling agricultural goods. Residential street blocks were subdivided into lots of various sizes and differed as house types. The construction of the garden-city was begun, but in the 1920s it was absorbed into the expanding Kuznetsk, an enlargement caused by the erection of a huge metallurgical plant in the city.

One more garden city was built in Barnabath where a Branch of the ‘Russian Garden-City Society’ was established (Fig. 2). It was headed by the manager of the Altauiskaya railway at that time, A.V. Lanov. The garden-city was laid out on the city’s outskirts near the railway, where there still was a considerable area of birch trees. According to the design worked out in 1917 by the architect, I.F. Nosovich, the garden-city was...
 included into the planning structure of the North part of Barnaul, where the future city centre was to be placed. The focal point of the garden-city was a shopping square with radial streets running from it and connected with the city’s thoroughfares, which encircled the town. On two sides, six radial streets were crossed by circular streets, creating street blocks with various lots for residential buildings. There were to be 1640 lots, each measuring 600-1300 square metres. The design provided for the network of blocks of greens, parks and landscaped spaces inside street blocks, which were private property.

In 1921 the architect P.A. Paramonov from Tomsk took part in a competition for a garden-city for Shchelavoglu and was awarded the first prize (Fig. 3). His design displayed a stiff regular layout for the town plan with a radial street system and gradan out of street blocks. One part of the new town was planned in the neighbourhood of the bank of the river Tom, where a park was located, and its greater part was placed along the tributaries of that great Siberian river. From the town centre thoroughfares led to the industrial zone, railway station and to the landing stage on the Tom. The town was divided by linear parks, where schools, kindergartens and various public buildings were to be erected. The town was built according to this plan up to the late 1920s. However, since that time multi-storey buildings have replaced the original wooden residential and public buildings.

At the present time almost no traces of these garden-cities are left in Siberia. Their sites were built over during the period of Siberian industrialisation with high buildings placed adjacent to giant industrial plants. Now it is difficult to imagine the partial simplicity of the garden cities with their small houses and parks and green spaces. They were replaced by huge, heavily built-up residential buildings and industrial enterprises, creating the present-day industrial townscapes of Siberian towns. The extreme concentration of industry and population in these towns again makes it too the problem of limiting industrial centre growth by means of creating a new type of settlement able to combine the favourable conditions of both urban and rural life, which was the main purpose of Elencez Howard’s proposal.

![Fig. 3. Prizewinning plan for the Garden City of Shchelavoglu](image)

---

**FROM STEEPLES TO TOWER BLOCKS: THE METAMORPHOSIS OF LONDON’S SKYLINE, 1944 - 1994**

Every city has its own image. Key elements in that image are landmarks and skylines. London’s image problem was that of a building with a dome prominently sited on a hill overlooking the river, around it a forest of steeples, bell towers, clock towers. Today the dome seems to dominate; the steeples are lost amid a jungle of tower blocks.

Why do we object to this? Presumably because domes and steeples represent spiritual values which have, in the post-war era, been upstaged by material values. Presumably because the tower blocks that represent these material values do not have the same aesthetic appeal. They are tall, but not handsome; stunted landscapes (Fig. 1), like a “posing rugby scrum” (to quote the Prince of Wales). Other cities have clusters of tall buildings but their skylines are exciting and positive. Why? All the concern about appearances in London? Presumably because our skyline is viewed across a sensitive landscape, punctuated with historic landmarks, viewed across the river, across parks and trees, from hilltop to hilltop.

How did the tower blocks emerge? Are they here to stay? What can be done to improve them?

Between the Great Fire of 1666 and the Blitz of 1940 the heights of buildings were controlled by considerations of daylighting and fire fighting given in the London Building Acts. The maximum height in Victorian times was 100 ft and any building exceeding that height required the sanction of the Metropolitan Board of Works and its successor the London County Council (LCC). In the early part of this century a number of buildings exceeded this height, notably the London University Senate House and the Faber Building Building in the City, albeit the fire fighting regulations insisted that any floor space above 100 ft had to be for storage purposes only. The Faber Building and others on the City riverside began to intrude into views of St Paul’s Cathedral and prompted the Surveyor to the Cathedral and the City Corporation to introduce height limit controls along the City riverside. These controls, known as St Paul’s Heights, have been in effect since 1934 and all new development has kept to within these limits over the last 60 years.

Following the Blitz and the Abercrombie Plan for reviving London there came a new generation of developers and architects who were inspired by the American Deans, ready to face new technical challenges, and eager to build a Brave New World on London’s battered and decaying land. Their recipe was the tower block; it offered the advantages of light and air, increased circulation space at ground level, good views from windows, conspicuousness and prestige.

In 1954 the Building Acts were amended to allow fire fighting through lift access within the building rather than from the ram table ladders on fire engines. In the same instant Shell UK presented the LCC with a proposal to build a 350 ft tower block on the South Bank. The LCC caved in under pressure; the fewflades burst open and the firemen had to pull the South Bank. The London skyline had become totally transformed.

The first buildings to appear stood in solitary isolation. Their visual impact was tremendous, but not always comprehensively. Both the Shell Centre and Milkbank Tower were considered landmarks at pivotal points on the riverside, but their impact on St James’s Park was unexpected. By contrast the impact of the Hilton on Hyde Park was both expected and fought against; however, the decision maker in this case was not the LCC but Central Government, who were keen not to damage any relationship with our wealthy friends from the other side of the Atlantic.

The LCC introduced criteria for assessing high building proposals in terms of both location and design. Over the years buildings began to form clusters notably near railway stations, but none of the clusters has been particularly compact. The City cluster seems a little spread out and amorphous, partly due to the constrains of its medieval street pattern and groups of listed buildings, and it lacked any focus until the Nave West Tower was completed in 1983. The Green Park skyline is possibly the most compact in London but the uniform height of roofline is exceedingly dull; this satellite centre is in desperate need of a focus. Building designs have been varied, both towers and slabs have been erected, although the Royal Fine Arts Commission clearly favoured the former. Some buildings have been distinguished, but the overwhelming majority have been nondescript. The worst blots on the London landscape have been the Government department developments, such as the Knightsbridge Barracks, the Marsham Street towers, Guys Hospital, St Thomas’s Hospital, Charing Cross Hospital. Most of these buildings stand in isolation and in each case the Government department was able to over-ride any reservations expressed by the LCC.

The LCC’s replacement by the Greater London Council (GLC) in 1965 heralded the start of more comprehensive planning at a wider metropolitan scale. The whole Greater London landscape from hilltop to hill was the subject of detailed studies, and areas were identified which were considered inappropriate for, or particularly sensitive to, high buildings. They included historic premises, parts of the countryside, the environs of the Royal Parks, prominent ridges and important visual cones and corridors.

The outcome of this exercise was a large scale sensitivity map that the GLC hoped would be adopted as statutory (Fig. 2). The important visual corridors included the views of St Paul’s Cathedral from...
Westminster Pier, Primrose Hill, Parliament Hill and Greenwich Park. The first two visual corridors had already been well protected from development. The GLDP Development Plan (GLDP) found the sensitivity map to be too detailed and the Secretary of State opted instead for the Urban Landscape Diagram (Fig. 3) which would serve as a framework for the 33 London Boroughs' own plans and policies. This diagram, however, because of its geometric grid layout, did not show up the zones and corridors, let alone the precise boundaries of sensitive areas, and it became a useless tool for planning control. As for the Boroughs' plans, very few showed the information they were expected to.

The GLDP policies and the Urban Landscape Diagram were put to the test at a number of planning inquiries between approval of the GLDP in 1976 and 1984 with the GLC's abolition. A major issue was the impact of the television studio on the backcloth of St Paul's Cathedral seen from King Henry VIII's 'Mansion in Richmond Park; the Secretary of State supported the GLC and insisted on the height being lowered* (Fig. 4).

The Secretary of State also supported the GLC's objections to the Green Giant at the Vauxhall Bridgefoot and Hay's Wharf (Fig. 5) near Tower Bridge on the grounds of their adverse impact on the riverside. The Green Giant has since been superseded by the new MI6 headquarters (which is also green) while Hay's Wharf has been redeveloped with a varied assortment of medium-rise buildings known as London Bridge City.

The most celebrated planning inquiry was Mansion House Square in 1984 (Fig. 5). The tower block, designed by the late Mies van der Rohe, was hailed by Roger, Foster, Stirling and Co as a masterpiece. The opposition was led by the City Corporation, the GLC and ultimately by the Prince of Wales who dubbed it the 'glass coffin'. The Secretary of State was under pressure to approve the scheme but rejected it.

In the wake of Mansion House Square there followed the most controversial scheme of all. The scheme did not have to worry as it enjoyed special exception due to its Enterprise Zone status in London's Docklands. The Canary Wharf development flew in the face of GLDP policies because it came crashing into the important visual corridor from Greenwich Park including the visual corridor through the Queen's House and Royal Naval College to St Anne's Lighthouse, that is through Inigo Jones and Christopher Wren to Nicholas Hawksmoor (Fig. 6). The GLC objected to the scheme but the government was able to overrule the objection by abolishing the GLC.

The year that followed the GLC's abolition was the year of the deregulation of the Stock Exchange, a boom year, the age of the 'yuppies'. A vast amount of extra office floor space and several buildings were granted planning permission without any strategic control. There were several protests for mega-buildings on a par with Canary Wharf including two at Kings Cross and one at Aldgate. This anarchic situation was rectified a year later when a small team of planners was appointed to service the London Planning Advisory Committee (LPAC) whose role was to advise the Secretary of State on strategic planning matters. One of their first actions was to commission a study of London's high buildings and views.

The LPAC study reviewed the GLDP policies and considered the procedures adopted in certain other cities, notably Paris. The citizens of Paris had been shocked in the 1970s by the emergence of the Tour Montparnasse.

---

* The GLD was the London Development Plan, a comprehensive planning framework for the City of London.

---

**Fig. 3. Sensitivity to high buildings in central London.**

---

**Fig. 4. The City skyline from Waterloo Bridge, 1957.**

---

**Fig. 5. The City skyline from Waterloo Bridge 1987. The tower blocks appear 'decapitated'.**

---

[Image of the City skyline from Waterloo Bridge, 1957. The tower blocks appear 'decapitated'.]
Maine-Montparnasse; it rose its head above Les Invalides and the Champs de Mars. The statutory plan for Paris now gives a clear indication of building height limits and protected visual corridors. The LPAC study recommended similar controls in London. The Secretary of State's Strategic Guidance for London now includes a plan for ten protected views (Fig. 7). The plan, alas, does not define areas that are inappropriate for, or particularly sensitive to, high buildings and the ten protected views are but a small number compared with the 35 recommended in the LPAC study, but the plan is nevertheless to some extent an improvement on the Urban Landscape Diagram.

The LPAC study also did something novel; it drew up the first all-time comprehensive list of high buildings in London that had an adverse impact on important views. The publication of the study coincided with Peter Shaffer's West End play, Lettuce and Luring, where the two heroes drew up a hit list and exited the stage at the end of the play loaded with dynamite. Top of the list in both the LPAC study and Shaffer's play were the Marisham Street towers which the Secretary of State has since declared will be demolished. Many on the list are high-rise flats considered by some to be disastrous experiments visually as well as socially, and several have already been...
was consumed to demolition. In the London Borough of Waltham Forest there are 13 tower blocks, all 21 storeys high, which are about to be pulled down to make way for 2-storey housing.

Some buildings are being renovated rather than demolished and their new cladding is a considerable improvement on the old. At the same time, the new generation of high buildings includes several of distinction.minster Court at Fenchurch Street Station and the Ark at Hammersmith provide proof that translucid cladding can have aesthetic appeal. A new generation of high-rise housing has emerged with Cascades on the Isle of Dogs and Belvedere Tower in the Chelsea Basin.

Let me conclude on this note. The metamorphosis of the London skyline has not been a success story. Cities such as New York, Toronto, Hong Kong and Singapore are dramatic, powerful, awesome. Such skylines cannot be imposed successfully on cities with historic constraints unless the development is confined to the fringes, as in Paris. In London a skyline has emerged at half cock. It would be premature to remove it: we must try and improve it. But to what extent will improvements affect the City skyline and the relationship between the dome and its surroundings?

The dome has hitherto had an uneasy relationship with the cluster of nondescript tower blocks, but at least it stands out. Will the improvement of tower blocks serve to enhance the dome or will they compete with it and thereby detract? (fig. 8). What sort of image will such large-scale improvements convey? This is a thought for the next 50 years.

The Strategic Views. View points for St Paul's Cathedral.

Fig. 7. This paper was presented at 'Seizing the Moment: London Planning 1964-1994'. The following notes were prompted by discussion with delegates at the conference.

1 One delegate pointed out that there was also a Russian Dream and that certain architects were inspired by the spectacular high-rise buildings erected in Moscow in the 1930s.

2 Walter Borr elaborated on this point. The LCC planners had to listen to the arguments of the LCC members. The Town and Country Planning Act of 1947, while strengthening planning controls, had a sting in its tail: it gave developers the incentive to redevelop undamaged sites by allowing them an additional 10% floor space. Walter Borr pointed out that it was still possible to redevelop without high-rise as has recently been demonstrated at Broadgate but the demands for high-rise were very powerful. For further details of the situation at the time see Walter Borr's article, 'High Buildings, a blessing or a curse', Architectural Design, September, 1964.

3 George Nicholson, former Chairman of the GLC Planning Committee, raised the issue of the extent of the GLC's powers. Whilst the LCC had had full development control powers, the legislation that established the GLC handed most powers to the London boroughs but allowed the GLC the powers of direction over certain development proposals including high buildings (over 150 ft/45 m in Central London and over 125 ft/38 m elsewhere). In 1980 these powers of direction were changed. The GLC could no longer direct refusal for high buildings per se, but still had powers of direction over any proposal that constituted a material departure from GLDP policies.

4 William Tanton-Brown indicated that little recognition had been given to the significance of the Civic Am Act of 1963, while Professor Peter Hall was sceptical about protecting long distance views when London today is often engulfed in a photochemical haze. The developers at the Liverpool Street Station inquiry had made the same point as Peter Hall but research carried out by the GLC into the Air Office records showed that St Paul's Cathedral was visible from King Henry VIII's Mound, Richmond Park, 10 miles away, for nearly 300 days of the year. (see 'London Skyline', (see bibliography).)

5 Michael Hebbett asked whether the L PAC study had considered the view of St Paul's Cathedral along Roman Road to Stepney-Byplace. The L PAC study had considered a very large number of views but the Secretary of State was insistent on protecting only a few of key importance. These were views of national significance from well-known public places, cherished by both Londoners and visitors, and featuring an...
Present at the Creation: London New Towns in the Early 1950s: Through the Eyes of an American Planner

John W. Reps, Cornell University

Fifty-seven years ago I was settling into my Liverpool digs preparing to spend a term at the Department of Civic Design. The two great postwar plans for London had caught my eye as a graduate student at Cornell. Their proposals for decentralization, reconstruction, and new towns differed so greatly from typical American urban plans that I decided to spend six months in Britain to look at the system that had produced such concepts. It was already time for planners. The New Towns Act was only a year old, and Lewis Silkin was then guiding the Towns and Country Planning Act of 1947 through Parliament. My diary records discussions of its provisions with planning officers in Edinburgh, Lincoln, Liverpool, Bath, Oxford, Bristol and Southampton, as well as at the Ministry with Gordon Stephenson. In 1947 planners enjoyed the public's respect. Everyone seemed to feel that a new and better urban world could be created. Of course, this did not prevent planners and others, from poking fun at the planning ministry and its expanding bureaucracy. I collected these cartoons (Fig. 1), copies of such town plans as those for Plymouth and Hull, and more sobering documents, like the Bartow, Uxbridge and Scott reports from returning to America.

Three years later my increasing interest in what was taking place in Britain coincided with the establishment of the Fulbright scholarships. I applied to study the British New Towns programme, and in September 1950 my wife and I boarded the America bound for Southampton.

In London, as elsewhere, large areas devastated by the war lay virtually untouched. Looking north from St. Paul's one saw the results of the blitz. Brick buildings and construction labour were in short supply. All manufactured items of any quality were exported to make room for the exchange reserves. Food was still rationed, and there was a shortage of housing and fuel.

From one flat in the northern extension of Hampstead Garden Suburb I travelled daily to the London School of Economics or to University College. At LSE, William Robson agreed to be my adviser. My familiarity with his book on London government may have convinced him that I was not an entirely hopeless case.

At University College, Professor Holford allowed me to sit in on his evening class in the factory town used by the Department of Town Planning. Holford dazzled me with his mastery of detail and his fluently articulate presentation of planning issues that he confronted as a practitioner.

In one of the rare office meetings Robson granted me, he volunteered to write to Dame Evelyn Sharp in the Ministry of Local Government and Planning asking her to arrange interviews for me at the New Towns. Dame Evelyn, a formidable character as the Crossman stories testify, questioned me at some length. Apparently satisfied, she agreed to write to the managers of the eight London new towns asking them to receive me.

An earlier interview provided practice. A chance meeting with Elizabeth McAlistier, known to me as the joint author with her husband of a book on planning, led to an introduction to Dr. Monica Felton at her McAlister home. A former member of the Reich Committee on New Towns, Dr. Felton was then chairman of the State Image Development Corporation.

When asked how the New Towns Act might have been improved, she declared "it had been a mistake not to provide for local authority and authorized associations along with the public development corporations. She also believed that "new town functions should be handed over to (local) authority gradually rather than dumping the entire project on them after development was complete. Such gradual development would enable the authority to build up staff and make it feel as though it had an immediate stake in planning and development, and would make the eventual complete transition much easier."

Mr. Felton complained about "disappointingly slow" growth and excessive "embarrassment" on preparing ideal master plans. Construction of portions of neighborhoods, even if the results did not turn out to be perfect, should have been pushed. Local authorities were able to bring pressure on Ministry of Health for building licenses (New Development Corporations, with all the weight of public policy behind them) were developing faster than Welwyn in a comparable period. She also believed "some of the pioneering, idealistic spirit was lacking in the staff and board."

That winter I wrote what would have been the first half of my dissertation at LSE. Eight chapters traced the history of the new towns movement in Britain, concentrating on the years 1920-40. They summarized and evaluated everything available to me on new towns. Not many persons could claim to have read all the evidence submitted to the Barlow Commis-
The plan was to call a meeting of the managers (who were also the board of directors) of those large enterprises to discuss the proposal. The managers were all generous with their time and then agreed to see officers in charge of design, estate management, legal affairs and public relations.

In the evenings, while my memory was still fresh and using notes taken during the interviews, I typed extended summaries of what I had learned. I then reviewed the minutes of the meetings and added them to the article. All the managers complained strongly about Ministerial interference, which had extended to even minor details of design, finance or procedure.

W.O. Herb at Hertford, long experienced in local government affairs, said in substance that "he and board members had been led to believe that we would have a great deal of opening freedom, with Ministerial control largely limited to general budgetary supervision. In practice, supervision had been extended to details and had become time-consuming. In two cases he had found it necessary to see the Assistant Secretary and demand approval of details which had been held up."
and Harlow were the places that gave me a partial sense of the eventual results. My visits to both these infant towns in May 1951 let me see them very shortly after their birth. Crawley had perhaps the most advantageous site of all, sitting as it did beside the main rail line to the south coast and with good road access as well. The division of the town into neighbourhoods made sense to me on social grounds and as a way to phased construction. I also liked the proposal to incorporate the shops of the high street into the new town centre (Fig 2). The design of residential areas seemed well thought out, although the dwellings themselves appeared a bit too conventional for my taste, then highly biased towards modern design. Nevertheless, I awarded extra points for the variety of accommodations that were being provided within a fairly standard set of facades. It was also good to find cottages for the elderly attached to some of the row houses. Crawley excelled in attracting industry, and their sectional plans to serve as incubators for small enterprises - a practice that Welwyn had followed much earlier - seemed a good policy. The sign marking the entrance to the first industrial estate proudly showed initial progress (Fig 3). On a return trip in 1954 I photographed that same sign to record how the changes had taken place. And by 1964 this thriving industrial estate at Crawley showed no signs of its frontier days little more than a decade earlier.

I puzzled over Harlow's plan with its wide strips of open land dividing neighbourhoods into sub-neighborhoods and those in turn into much smaller residential groupings. This was clearly a different kind of town plan, and Frederick Gibberd's design for the first neighbourhood promised more architectural variety than at Crawley. I was eager to have a look, although construction was then confined to the area shown here (Fig 4).

Partly because approvals had not been secured from the Ministry for the main part of the town and also as a kind of practice ground, a small development (Chippingfield) was undertaken on the eastern margin of the existing small town. Two-storey row houses fit the scale of old Harlow and appeared to me to be a comfortable addition although hardly matching the appearance of a traditional London street.

The first sub-neighborhood, Mark Hall North, was under construction at the time of my visit. The eastern section included a housing group known as The Lawn. This consisted of semi-detached and row houses, two-storey flats, and a six-storey block of flats. The Estate office had opened the tower block because they felt all families wanted a house and garden. Gibberd, who won a Festival Award for this design, intended it for single persons. I found it a welcome contrast to the prevailing horizontal character of development elsewhere in Harlow and in the other new towns. Returning a few years later, I noted that a few other point blocks had also been built elsewhere.

From the top of that first point block one saw another part of the neighborhood located to the west. Two-storey, angled row houses lined the gently curved street leading to it from the Lawn. This second part of Mark Hall consisted of fancy-long rows of two-storey dwellings designed by the Maxwell Fry and Jane Drew office.

The Shopping centre in Mark Hall was begun in the year after my visit, unfortunately not built as a pedestrian centre as Gibberd wished. In 1959 bicycles still outnumbered automobiles, so the pedestrian-vehicular conflict was completely intolerable. By 1966 traffic barriers, closed the roadway and protected pedestrian access to the shop fronts.

What is now a large industrial estate, in May 1951 offered only 30,000 square feet of standard factory units built by the corporation in hopes of attracting industry. That gamble, requiring not only ministerial but Cabinet approval, paid off. By the end of 1952 the estate had some 300,000 square feet of industrial space, and the industrial future of Harlow was assured.

Later visits in 1959, 1964 and 1966 confirmed my first impressions of Harlow as a new town of outstanding design with a diversity of dwelling types.

The pedestrian town centre seemed to me well, although of course I had no chance to experience that until many years after my first visit. Gibberd had designed a smaller version of this kind of centre as part of a major Festival of Britain showcase — the Landbury neighborhood in East London. I was eager to see this first demonstration of blue and white reconstruction on density standards that met these proposals in the County of London Plan; in this case, 196 persons per acre.

Lansbury demonstrated how this could be done with an admirable mix of dwellings that included semi-detached dwellings, row houses, three and four-storey flats, and higher slab buildings. Churches, schools, pubs and Gibberd's shopping centre were all part of well-considered design. The centre was not quite finished at the time of my visit in the spring of 1951. A second look on a dark, February day in 1958 indicated that the centre and the neighbourhood had lived up to expectations.

My photographs of Hemel Hempstead in 1951 have been lost, but in the late summer of 1964 Wyn Thomas, then the town mayor, proudly showed me what had been accomplished. I had always thought this strange location since 21,000 persons lived in this ancient borough when designated a new town. Wyn showed me how the new neighborhoods were embracing the older community and demonstrated that it was
possible to grant new accommodations onto the shops,
ing an ancient High Street. On that occasion we also paid
courts in Welwyn to F.J. Olsbro.

In the summer of 1955, preparing to leave
Britain for America, I reflected then, as now, on
the irony of how fate distributes resources. Britain had not
only a rational concept of how to deal with metropolitan
growth and reconstruction but also overwhelming
political support and the necessary legislative and
organizational machinery. How clear that this rare
convergence of theory and policy coincided with a
shortage of materials and money.

By contrast, my country was each year relent-
lessly converting 1,000,000 acres of vacant land to
urban use. No national or state urban development plan
existed. No metropolitan plan had any legal authority
whatsoever. Zoning by cities, counties, and a host of
smaller jurisdictions sometimes could prevent the
worst from occurring but had no power to mitigate
development. Your tragedy was lack of material
resources; ours was lack of desire and will. 11

Another month-long stay in London in
the summer of 1956 provided an opportunity for repet-
ever-dense districts and removed elsewhere, about
half of them in completely new towns. These were not
exactly the kind of reading available to G.I.s of the U.S.
Military bases schools. I was still a student for three
years beginning in 1943. So it was not until 1946 following
my arrival at Cornell as a graduate student in
planning that I had the opportunity to explore three
remarkable plans for how a great metropolis should grow and change.
At Cornell I also wrote a long and immediately
obscure paper on the origins and development of British
planning law. With that background I looked forward
eagerly to Liverpool to the course taught by J.C. Clarke,
the author of a number of books on the subject. Clarke
was a charming and articulate man, but for his lectures
he read at dictaphone speed entire chapters from his next
book. This included identification of all the section and
sub-section headings: “(x),” “sub-section 6 (c),” etc. We
soon learned to ask a question early in the class because
Clarke’s material was often so dense, and entertaining
responses taught us more than his formal classroom
presentations. Of course, my classmates all had to face
the law section of their examinations as I did not.

Students elsewhere must have had this same experience,
for Clarke lectured at several planning schools. I met
him later in 1951 at London. He was very kindly took me
at his club. Perhaps someone has written about his
career, but if so, it has not come to my attention.

The programme in the Department of Civic Design at
Liverpool was directed by W.A. Eden, Lecturer in
Charge. His main interests were in history and preserva-
tion of historic monuments. I remember him clearly
for lectures that, with their long Latin quotations, seemed
worth the price of all his books. However, Eden
encouraged me to pursue my own interests, and he was
also responsible for my first published journal articles:
reviews of two American books for the Times Planning
Review, the distinguished journal that he revived from
its wartime suspension.

My story tells me that on Friday March 2nd 1941 I
had an interview with Gordon Stevenson after having
checked enough to ask someone in the American Embassy
to arrange this. In preparation, I had been reading the
town and Country Planning Bill of 1947, comments
on it in the press, and the appropriate debates as recorded
in Hansard. I saw no loss of my leadership in establishing
the first post-graduate degree course in planning in the
UK and admiring students with undergraduate degrees
in planning, architecture, or engineering, my entry for
that day is of some interest: “He [Stephenson] thinks the
new planning bill [Town and Country Planning Act
of 1947] provides a real legislative potential for the first
time, but is fearful of the shortage of trained planners.
Even so, he still seems to feel that the town ‘town
planner’ should be reserved for the architect
and engineer who have additional training. I’m ceasing to
be astonished at this attitude but just a bit disappointed.
The shortage of planners may be a good thing if it
results in breaking down the old prejudices by forcing
the admission of the social scientist into the picture.”
On 8 July 1947 Gordon Stevenson officially became
what he had been in fact: Chief Planning Officer for
Planning Technique in the Ministry of Town and
Country Planning. On January 1st 1948 he became
Lever Professor of Civic Design at the University of
Liverpool. I met him again when he was one of
the speakers who addressed the American Urbanists
who came to Britain in the fall of 1950. His recent book
recalls his work with the Ministry and other aspects
of his career in Britain and elsewhere: Gordon Stevenson,
On a Human Scale: A Life in Urban Design, Freerange
Arts Centre Press, South Fremantle, 1992.

My title was Executive Director of the Bureau of
Community Planning Board. This was located in Binghamton,
New York, sixty miles from Cornell where I invested one
week as a Visiting Lecturer in the Department of City
and Regional Planning. This gave me access to the
growing collection of books on city and regional
planning and made it easy to keep up with the English
planning scene.

In this respect not much had changed during my three-
year absence from the UK. Those too young to recall
these years will find it difficult to appreciate the
desperate shortages of nearly everything. Experts to
explain depleting currency reserves did little to satisfy
domestic needs for consumer goods. Most foods were
still rationed: two slices of bacon, an egg or too, a slab
of fat, a small portion of cheese, a tiny amount of meat,
a few pats of butter and equivalent amount of other
staples per week. My 1947 diary reminds me of other
conditions in the household of an upper middle-class
family in Cambridge where the English-speaking Union
had arranged for me to be a guest. The father warned
about taking too many matches to light his pipe.
One daughter was patching up an old handbag and lining it
with cardboard, another daughter was making her
household underwear from a white silk parachute, and
her fiancée was catching a fish rag because none
could be found in the shops. The rationing system
did not favour the nobility. A set of curious circumstances
led to my visit to Borough House where Lady Easter
excorted me through this treasure trove whose odor was
leaking, the windows were shuttered, and where all
the furniture was covered. In the front room there were
more rooms, Lord and Lady Easter lived in two in three.
The great hall with its majestic fireplace, the two
oversized occupied chairs drew close to a small grate
where they had exactly the same, small amount of coal
to warm them in as the bumbling cottage in the nearby
city. In 1947 at Liverpool any fire place had to be
forty refilled past scores of rubble-heaped sites on
the short journey to Abercriche Square. At my digs in
Wallasey, across the Mersey, I was once advised not to
push more than four inches of warm bath water because
of the heat shortage. My mother had asked me to find and print a Royal
Doulton dinner plates in her pattern. After vainly
searching from shop to shop, she told me that
everything had been marked for export to America.
My mother that the only attractive Royal Doulton I had seen
were the elaborately floral earlins in the men’s town of
some hotel or restaurant possibly a Lyons Corner House.
Inter-city travel was a desperate adventure. Leaving
London from Lime Street Station on Saturday, I found
myself in a three or four person deep throng of anxious
passengers extending the entire length of the platform.
When the train stopped, I was opposite the door of a
luggage van. Over the guard’s protest several of us
pushed inside before he could close the door. In
the absence of seats, I spent the seven and one-half
hours to Liverpool on my head and legs dangling
over the sides of a huge wicker plan.

Robinson was an aspiring architect who seemed to
labour the obvious. In seminars, he was something of an
impatient tycoon who often brusquely interrupted

---

Fig 4 Mark Hall North Neighbourhood (Harlow Development Corporation Third Annual Report, year ending March 31st 1950).
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characteristic nationalist historicist model of the English home was temporarily challenged. The speaker 
explained that in 1934 the Ideal Home Exhibition announced the dawning of a new and 'Wonderful Age.' 
To the British public. The exhibition was dominated by 'Savoy City,' the spectacular projection of an urban 
and domestic future transformed by the technologies of stainless-steel and electricity, promising (in a manner reminiscent of Rousseau) a technological 
upside. However, the speaker argued that here the dialectic between modernity and anti-modernity, at a time when 
the Nazis were already promoting fascism, sought to 
produce a hybrid nationalist and capitalist 'utopia' that 
would subvert modernism and the women's struggle within the domestic sphere. 

Two papers examined the experience of Weimar and Nazi Germany - Martin J. Gaughan's 'Utopia and 
Reality: Erich Bloch and Neurath Culture' and Monika 
Paley's 'Ideology Salted Away: Adolf Hitler's secret 
collection salvaged in a mine in the Austrian 
Salzkammergut 1943-45' - further illustrated inter-war 
tensions over the issues surrounding modernity. Martin 
J. Gaughan (Cardiff Institute of Higher Education) 
showed how Weimar society grappled with 
technology. In its early post-November Revolution 
period, Expressionism offered a programme which 
looked back to the tradition of the Arts and Crafts in building the 'Cathedral of Socialism,' a programme 
which was displaced by the more technologically based utopianism of the later 1920s, embodied in design and the 
Nerart Bauer. Bruno Taut and Walter Gropius being 
two figures, amongst others, who made the transition. It 
was a transition met with unease by the Marxist 
communist Ernst Bloch, Hitler, however, was 
unambiguously anti-Nazi. 

Monika Paley (University of Hertfordshire) described 
the absolute rejection from the Führer's collection, as far 
as we can tell from the partial inventories which survive, 
of modernist tendencies. The resultant collection would 
instead 'manifest' the nativism of German culture 
in antiquity and confer upon the Reich a role as the 
utopian culmination of great European culture. 

Papers by David A. Wragg (Nene College 
University of Nottingham / Open University) and Colin 
Rhodes (Loughborough College of Art and Design) 
closely complemented the theme of modernity and anti-
modernity with papers which problematised the city as a 
site for utopias. David A. Wragg, in 'Wondrous Lewis 
and the City: Between Dystopia and Utopia, focused 
on images of the urban environment produced around 
the time of Vorticist as representative of a dystopic 
prognosis about modernity's impact on the human 
subject, images through which Lewis used his 
engagement with Fauvism and Cubism to depict and to 
distance himself from the contemporary world. But 
the speaker was keen to emphasise the complexity of 
Lewis's 'solution' to the 'project of modernity,' since 
whilst it included a moral agenda, it also espoused 
Nietzschean aesthetic individualism as a 'utopian' 
alternative. In his paper 'One's well to sing,' Brücke 
Attempts to Reconcile Freedom and the City, Colin 
Rhodes discovered similar complexities in the German 
Brücke project: inspired by sources as diverse as 
Walt Whitman and Nietzsche. Here community and 
democracy, justified with absolute freedom for the 
individual and disdain for the masses. Principally, the 
paper showed that despite the fact that the artists of the 
Die Brücke group were famous for their involvement in 
the German back-to-nature movement, they 
continued to live and work in the city, where they 
embraced modernism simultaneously, though without reconciling them, ideas of the 
natural and of modernity. Although Die Brücke 

studios scenes are usually regarded as primitivist 
extensions of the 'natural' landscapes of the group's 
bathtime pictures, Colin Rhodes argued that the studio 
scenes represent the clearest attempt by the artists to 
offer their audience an urban urban alternative to the 
conventional and legal construction of city life. 
Nonetheless, Elisa Oliver (University of 
Sunderland) was wary about the utopian authenticity of 
the city's 'other' nature. Her paper 'Gardening and the 
Fall of Eden' argued that since the Fall and the expulsion 
from Eden, man's sense of loss and desire for the 
reclamation of utopian Eden has been articulated 
through the activity and imagery of gardening. 
The speaker showed that from the description of Eden 
contained in Genesis, to that contained in Milton's 
Paradise Lost, the visualization of Eden has attained 
a specific iconicity reflecting the function of the 
pastoral as microcosm. Yet even Eden has not been an 
entirely stable place, becoming an increasingly fractured 
and hollow representation: a fact now recognised by 
some contemporary engagements with landscape. 

Re-building Sarajevo: Post-war Reconstruction and 
Development Unit Workshop, Institute of Advanced 
Architectural Studies, University of York, U.K., 16-20 
May 1994. 

Twenty-four Bosnians, five breaking the Sarajevo siege, 
accepted invitations to the York Workshop. There they 
met with fellow professionals and organisations, mainly 
from Britain, to focus on a number of essential post-war 
issues faced by reconstruction planners. 

Even before the war, Sarajevo was undergoing upland. 
From State control to market economy, and 
privatisation of land and property ownership, the radical 
changes had already begun. Add to this the intense 
physical and psychological destruction of war, and the 
extent of the task of re-building Sarajevo becomes 
apparent. 
The aims of the Workshop were: 

To provide a forum for the needs and priorities of 
Bosnian war reconstruction could be expressed; 

To receive reports on the experiences of settlement 
reconstruction following war in Europe and other 
continents; 

To explore the ways of protecting cultural heritage 
and ensuring cultural continuity; 

To foster professional and personal relationships 
between Bosnian, British and other participants; 

It would be easy, then, to cast a postmodern gaze 
over the session and declare that it confirms the 
hopelessness and fragmentation of the utopian cause. 
Yet utopias have always existed as an arena for debate, 
and as such disputes have to exist. And if the existence of 
the philosopher's utopias, as Pliny and Pliny, 
modernity and anti-modernity, and cultural 
anything but the fanciest imposed upon the session by 
the convenor, or the results of certain research 
paradigms set by the speakers, then it may be that even 
in these certain parameters to utopian debate. Of 
course, the problem of the desirability of utopia remains; 
after all, this was a session which encompassed models 
of outright inequality. That utopia is more often than not an 
unattainable, even impossible, prospect is undeniable. Yet the interest that this session attracted 
confirms that utopia remains a tantalising concept and, I 
would like to think, not simply for its obvious academic 
interest or fresh appeal. Utopia keeps alive the 
tory anti-postmodern discourse of improvement, of 
the planning of a better place by the will and ingenuity of people. 

To reach conclusions on ways of co-ordinating a 
joint response, and initiating international action and 
finding for coherent reconstruction. 

Sarajevo already has institutions, organisations 
and a skilled workforce which must be involved and 
utilised in any reconstruction plans. What it lacks 
is practical advice in reform of land ownership, banking 
systems, housing co-operatives and general management 
tools. This is an area where the West can help, both 
by exchanging expertise and contacts and setting up 
local training Workshops. 

The source of the key utilities — electricity, fuel and 
water — all lie outside the city and are Serb-controlled. 
Masonry and materials allowed into the city 
are Serb-controlled. Heavy industry within the city 
was, in decline before the war. The future of 
Sarajevo must be 

as a service centre for all Bosnia, a headquarters for 
financial, legal and insurance services and major 
companies. A service centre and its hinterland strongly 
depend on one-another. 

Light industry has less demand on power and 
water supplies. In this way the re-building of a 
capital city and its economy can begin. 

The participants made the following 
recommendations: 

Future investment should not encourage further 
divisions within the city;
Wherever possible, existing institutions and labour within Bosnia should be utilised.

The overseas Bosnian network should be informed of, and invited to participate in, the reconstruction;

Those who left the city should be encouraged to return;

The main services should be developed underground. This will provide safety against further attack, and create immediate employment;

Local advice centres should be set up immediately to inform communities on matters such as healthcare, finance, civil rights and property rights;

Local professionals should start to prepare reconstruction and development projects;

A manual of building repair techniques should be prepared for property owners;

Material stores should be established, although salvage from historic buildings must be resisted;

A body should be set up to promote and co-ordinate local interest in heritage;

A legal framework for the rights and responsibilities of NGOs should be produced;

A full and detailed survey of land and property ownership should be carried out immediately;

Investment will not occur until ownership issues are settled;

A Government Development Agency should be created from existing resources to oversee land development. Western expertise can be brought in if required;

The Government should consider setting aside land for leasehold only, to be used to encourage industrial and commercial development in the city;

Where appropriate, construction projects started before the war should be completed.

For further information about this and earlier reconstruction workshops in Croatia, Iraq, Yemen and Belfast contact Post-War Reconstruction and Development Unit (PWRDU), Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies, University of York, The King’s Manor, York YO1 2EP, U.K., TEL: 0904 433967, FAX: 0904 433949.
ROBERT FREESTONE, School of Town Planning, The University of New South Wales, Australia. "Australasian Modernism: Post-War Planning and Walter Burley Griffin (1869-1937)."

JENNY GREGORY, Centre for Western Australian History, Department of History, University of Western Australia. "The Australian Middle Class and the Management of Space."

The March 1994 issue of the American Quarterly features a forum on the circumstances and representations of post-1970s suburban development in the USA. In the lead article, "Bold New City or Built-Up 'Burbs: Redefining Contemporary Suburbs," William Sharpe and Leonard Wallock dispute claims by Robert Fishman, Joel Garreau and others that traditional suburbs are no more. Sharpe and Wallock present a wide-ranging, strongly worded interdisciplinary critique of the recent literature on contemporary suburbs, pointing out that if the new edge cities and growth corridors multiplying on the metropolitan periphery have a different morphology than traditional suburbs, they nevertheless exhibit many of the same old social dimensions. How scholars and the general public think and talk about city and suburb blurs, and lead us to certain ongoing problems inherent in those social and geographical forms, the authors argue. Sharpe and Wallock's indictment of scholars and observers of post-1970s suburban development who, by endeavouring to reject edge city on its own terms, have abdicated the role of grappling critically with its underlying problems is challenged, in turn, by four scholars who apply different disciplinary perspectives to the issues. Bold New City or Built-Up 'Burbs raises the resonances are architectural historian Robert Bruegmann, social historian Margaret Marsh, urban historian Robert Fishman and planning historian Jane Manning Thomas. The forum concludes with a spirited reply from Sharpe and Wallock. (Mary Corbin Siek, The University of Maryland.)

Abstracts


This book provides a new and authoritative historical introduction to urban planning in Britain from its origins in the 19th century to the current directions of the 1990s and beyond. Three basic themes run through the book: ideas, policies, and impacts. The first involves an examination of the origins of planning and development of the major aspects of planning thought. Second, the importance of ideas in shaping policies is discussed, tracing the growth of the planning system and detailing major policy initiatives. Third, there is an overall assessment of the actual impacts of planning, showing how powerful economic and social forces have interacted with planning intentions in the actual patterns of urban change. The book ends with a call for a renewed planning vision for the 21st century, embracing not only the new concerns for sustainable development, but planning's original, though often forgotten, project for radical reform.
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- welcomes members from both academic disciplines and the professions of the built environment. Membership of the Society is both multi-disciplinary and practice orientated.

- encourages and gives support to networks, which may be interest based, region- or nation-based, working in the fields of planning history.

- provides services for members: publishing a journal, promoting conferences, and providing an international framework for informal individual member contact.

- invites national organisations, whose work is relevant to IPHS, to affiliate status.

- administers its affairs through an elected Council and Management Board.

The Society was inaugurated in January 1993 as a successor body to the Planning History Society, founded in 1974. Its membership is drawn from several disciplines: planning, architecture, economic and social history, geography, sociology, politics and related fields. Membership is open to all who have a working interest in planning history. The Society for American City and Regional Planning History (SACRPH) and the Urban History Association (UHA) are American affiliates of IPHS.

Members of IPHS elect a governing council every two years. In turn the Council elects an executive Board of Management, complemented by representatives of SACRPH and UHA. The President chairs the Board and Council.

PRESIDENT

Professor Gordon E Cherry
School of Geography
University of Birmingham
PO Box 363
Birmingham B15 2TT
UK

Tel: 021-414 5538
Fax: 021-414 3971

EDITOR OF PLANNING HISTORY

Dr. Michael Harrison
School of Theoretical & Historical Studies in Art & Design
Department of Art
University of Central England
Birmingham Institute of Art & Design
Corporation Street
Birmingham B4 7DX
UK

Tel: 021-331 5882
Fax: 021-331 5569

MEMBERSHIP

Applications are welcome from individuals and institutions.

The annual subscription is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>24.50 $ Aus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>21.50 $ Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>90.00 FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>27.00 DM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>23,500.00 Lira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1700.00 Yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>30.00 Fl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>17.00 $ US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10.00 £</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further alternative currencies available on request from:

Dr. David W Massey
Secretary / Treasurer IPHS
Department of Civic Design
University of Liverpool
Liverpool L69 3BX
UK

Tel: 051-794 3112

Applications for membership should be sent to Dr. Massey. Cheques, drafts, orders etc should be made payable to the 'International Planning History Society'.
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