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This issue of Planning History typically ranges far and wide. Geographically, we move with our contributors from Milton Keynes to New Zealand via Poland and Turkey. In terms of approach, the articles include broad-ranging historical and political analyses as well as detailed case studies. They explore the ideas behind a variety of planning policies as well as the problems faced by those seeking to turn theory into practice. The time span covered by the pieces included in this issue is especially wide.

Stanimor Greif offers us a broad-ranging historical overview of the development of Warsaw. He explores, in particular, the factors which led to the choice of Warsaw as capital of Poland and the political and other changes which have shaped the urban landscape of Warsaw from medieval times through to the present.

Nur Ali provides us with a clear outline of the development of conservation policy in Turkey. He introduces us to the types of building and districts which come into threat in recent decades. Nur reviews some of the many problems faced by conservationists in Turkey and elsewhere.

He touches on many of the social, political and educational issues which are central to any realistic appraisal of the conservation scene.

Mark Clapson's case study of Milton Keynes addresses the important, but sometimes under-represented, theme of social analysis in planning. His article on Britain's largest and most recent town explores the social ideas behind the development plan for Milton Keynes. He relates the way in which the social thinking behind the plan for Milton Keynes led to a move away from 'neighbourhood units'. He believes that this kind of study can tell us much about late 20th century Britain. Indeed, he suggests that Milton Keynes might be seen as an appropriate paradigm for the period, just as Manchester was for the 19th century.

Roche and Miller's research essay offers us a case study of Sir John Vogel's plan for regional resource development and settlement in the 1970s. Vogel's broad strategies encompassed the physical, political and social aspects of planning. In reviewing these policies Roche and Miller open up new lines of research in New Zealand planning theory. They also challenge some of the broader generalisations about colonial planning. The emphasis on natural resource planning in those times has a particular resonance for those advocating 'sustainable development' today.

This is my last editorial. I would like to thank Peter Larkham, a lecturer in the School of Planning, at the University of Central England. As he is so close geographically, we hope that the changeover will go smoothly. I will be at hand if he needs one.

Peter Larkham, as many IPHS members will know, is an expert on conservation policy and practice in Britain. He has published widely on the subject, including pieces for Planning History and Planning Perspectives. Besides being an active IPHS member, Peter Larkham is a key figure in the world of urban studies. Members attending the Fourth International Seminar on Urban Form at Birmingham in July are sure to bump into him. I am certain that he has the personal qualities, the experience and the institutional support that will enable him to carry out the duties of editor of Planning History effectively. I wish him well.

As I, and my predecessors, have found out, an editor needs support. My colleagues in IPHS and at the University of Central England have been incredibly helpful. I would like to take this opportunity to thank some of them. Our late President, Gordon Cherry, invited me to become editor of Planning Perspectives. I have much to thank him for. Stephen Ward, his successor as President of IPHS and a former editor of Planning Perspectives, has offered me useful advice and sent me appropriate pieces over a number of years. Among the members of the Editorial Board of Planning History who have encouraged contributors to send work to the journal, I would like to thank all those who have contributed to the journal during my period in office. They have made the experience an enjoyable and educational one.

Planning History would never have appeared over the last three years if it had not been for the efforts of some of my colleagues at the University of Central England. Michael Hallett designed the new format (which, I think, will be retained). Jeremy Beach, Ruth Leys, Alice Clifford and Tony Davis have all provided much-needed technical and editorial assistance. I owe them a debt of gratitude. It is rather disappointing, therefore, that my last edition will reach you later than usual. This is due to family bereavements and technical difficulties.

Before I close, I would like to thank all those who have contributed to the journal during my period in office. They have made the experience an enjoyable and educational one.

Planning History would never have appeared over the last three years if it had not been for the efforts of some of my colleagues at the University of Central England. Michael Hallett designed the new format (which, I think, will be retained). Jeremy Beach, Ruth Leys, Alice Clifford and Tony Davis have all provided much-needed technical and editorial assistance. I owe them a debt of gratitude. It is rather disappointing, therefore, that my last edition will reach you later than usual. This is due to family bereavements and technical difficulties.

Planning History would never have appeared over the last three years if it had not been for the efforts of some of my colleagues at the University of Central England. Michael Hallett designed the new format (which, I think, will be retained). Jeremy Beach, Ruth Leys, Alice Clifford and Tony Davis have all provided much-needed technical and editorial assistance. I owe them a debt of gratitude. It is rather disappointing, therefore, that my last edition will reach you later than usual. This is due to family bereavements and technical difficulties.

Planning History would never have appeared over the last three years if it had not been for the efforts of some of my colleagues at the University of Central England. Michael Hallett designed the new format (which, I think, will be retained). Jeremy Beach, Ruth Leys, Alice Clifford and Tony Davis have all provided much-needed technical and editorial assistance. I owe them a debt of gratitude. It is rather disappointing, therefore, that my last edition will reach you later than usual. This is due to family bereavements and technical difficulties.
Gordon Stephenson's role as Chief Planner at the Ministry was to provide a series of plans that were presented to local planning authorities with their post-war and post-Depression reconstruction needs.

The most well-known of these technical contributions, Gordon Stephenson was closely involved with the development of the Metropolitan Town Planning Act of 1947. He was an ardent supporter of low density living and the development of Central London.

He began his career by working for the London County Council, where he handled the town planning aspects of the Act. He then moved on to work for the Greater London Council, where he was responsible for preparing the Metropolitan Plan.

Gordon Stephenson developed an extraordinary degree of loyalty among his professional colleagues, friends, and associates in Australia, as well as overseas. He supported them in whatever way he could. He was very adept at convincing government ministers (who were in awe of him), and his professionalism was such that he not only won the confidence and support of many senior public servants, but turned them into willing allies.

In coming back to Western Australia, Gordon was plumped almost immediately into the heady boom years of the 1960s and 1970s, and in time for him to make his special contribution to planning and development, without which, as the 1951 Royal Commission into Planning had already forewarned, there would have been preventable development of the worst kind, and above all, a public loss of confidence in planning. But he was not just a technician, he was a man of strong convictions drawn by the belief that architecture and planning were essentially moral propositions for the benefit of the people.

His imagination and output were prodigious. They ranged from the most minute detail, including designing the University of Western Australia Library's bookstacks and the position of the university organ, to the laying out of many university campuses, besides that of the University of Western Australia, designing buildings, planning and advising on new suburbs as well as new towns and, as he demonstrated in Metropolitan Perth, envisioning the breadth and scope of an entire region.

Yet, although he was no less conscious of his skills, he was never aloof. He remained always accessible and always ready to talk to others, especially to his family and grandchildren. He was a humanist, and in the 1930s, when he was not fashionable, he was one of very few who helped Jews to escape from Nazi Germany. Because of his views he was also discriminated against during the 1930s. McCarthy era.

In his age when there is an abundance of planners who mesmerize themselves with computers and each other, there is more than ever a need to understand history and use creative imagination. I have learned from experience to miss a main chance. And never did.

Christopher Wren's epitaph in St Paul's Cathedral translates as "If you seek his monument, look around you." With all modesty, I think that we in Perth can say that of Gordon Stephenson, CBE. If Utopia was to be a city, then Gordon Stephenson was destined to be its city planner. And if Utopia is a real city, which I think he wanted it to be, then thanks to Gordon, Perth, I believe we can share the benefit of the people, there.

The Urban History Association

Recipients of the Urban History Association's annual prize competitions conducted during each year's Distinctions are:

Best Dissertation in Urban History completed during 1995:
Max Page, The Creative City: New York City, Landscape, Memory and the Emergence of the Urban Landscape, 1900-1930, University of Pennsylvania, 1995

Max Page is Assistant Professor of Urban Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Best Book in North American Urban History published during 1995:
Carol Willis, The politics of Public Space: Skyscrapers and Skylines in New York and Chicago, New York, Princeton Architectural Press.
NOTICES

1995. (Carol Willis is Adjunct Associate Professor of Urban Studies at Columbia University.) Best Article in Urban History published during 1994-95, subsequent to H. J. Platt, Invisible Gases: Smoke, Gender and the Redefinition of Environmental Policy in Chicago, 1900-1925, Planning Perspectives 10 (1995), pp. 65-97. (H. J. Platt is Professor of History at Loyola University in Chicago.) Thomas J. Sargus is Assistant Professor of History at the University of Pennsylvania.

New Officers of the International Planning History Society

Following the recent amendments to the IPHS constitution, culminated with the last issue of Planning History, new officer appointments can now be formally reported. The Council provisionally endorsed these changes in a meeting held in October or subsequently by communications with the President. The complete list of officers of the IPHS, together with their full contact details, are attached for the information of members. As reported elsewhere in this issue, the new editor of Planning History assumes his duties for the next issue volume 19. We must record that the Conference Convenor, announced in the last issue, we are sure fortunate indeed to have assembled such an array of talents. The new Secretary General, Ursula von Petz, has written extensively on planning history in Germany, her current interests focusing on how Berlin has changed since German reunification. The Membership Secretary, Robert Home, is also a very active scholar in several aspects of planning history and current practice. His most recent book examines British colonial town planning and alludes to his very wide range of international contacts which will stand IPHS in good stead in his new role. Finally, as mentioned elsewhere in this issue, the new editor of Planning History is Peter Larkham, well known for his publications in the field of conservation and urban morphology. The President, on behalf of the membership of IPHS, also takes this opportunity to record our tremendous thanks for all the efforts of our outgoing editor, Michael Harrison.

We hope that we can continue to benefit from his experience and advice as editor. David Massey continues for the present as our Treasurer, though in view of his many other duties he has indicated a wish to step down when a suitable replacement can be found. (Restorers will know that in his much longest serving officer of the IPHS and its precursor, the Planning History Group, since the IPHS operates in British currency, this effectively limits the range of choice to the United Kingdom. Any UK member who is interested in taking over David’s role as Treasurer, or would like further information, should contact the President or David himself. Stephen V Ward

Current List of Officers

President: Professor Stephen V. Ward, School of Planning, Oxford University, Headington, Oxford OX3 0NP, UK. Tel: +44 (0)1865 345321, Fax: +44 (0)1865 435539, e-mail: sward@brookes.ac.uk

Secretary-General: Dr Ursula von Petz, Institut fuer Raumplanung, Universitaet Dortmund, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany, Tel: +49 231 755 2315, Fax: +49 231 755 4788; e-mail: uvp@ipap.rupplan.unoldortmund.de

Treasurer: Dr David W. Massey, Department of Civic Design, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L19 3BX, UK. Tel: +44 (0)151 704 3112; Fax: +44 (0)151 704 3175; e-mail: dmassey@liverpool.ac.uk

Membership Secretary: Dr Robert K. Home, School of Surveying, University of East London, Docklands, Essex RM2 2AS, UK. Tel: +44 (0)181 580 7722, Fax: +44 (0)181 589 3608; e-mail: home@nel.ac.uk

Editor, Planning History: Dr Peter Larkham, School of Planning, University of Central England, Perry Barr, Birmingham B42 2SU. UK. Tel: +44 (0)121 331 5145; Fax: +44 (0)121 336 9015; e-mail: peter.larkham@nce.ac.uk

Conference Convenor, Sydney, July 1998: Dr Robert Freestone, School of Planning and Urban Development, University of New South Wales, Sydney NSW 2052, Australia, Tel: +61 2 9385 4816, Fax: +61 2 9385 4531; e-mail: r.freestone@unsw.edu.au

Introduction

Every city has to live both through calm and dramatic periods which change its history or, at least, its appearance. The city of Warsaw is rich in those events. History has created fires, plagues and floods, and those induced by the people themselves. Wars, demobilisation as well as stupidity were part of Warsaw’s everyday life and contributed to its urban form (Fig. 1).

In 1556 this capital city was twice captured by the Swedes (who destroyed and pillaged everything, including stone floor tiles at the Royal Palace). Next, battles were fought in, or near, Warsaw in 1704, 1831, 1920 when the Russian Red Army was defeated by Polish soldiers near the city. 1939 and 1944 (to mention just the most bloody and ruinous conflicts). During the same period of time, only two battles took place in Warsaw (1612 and 1831) and only one in Berlin (1945). The Turkish Army did not manage to enter Vienna either in 1529 nor in 1683. Rome went through just a single Secco di Roma (1527), and Paris suffered physically only in 1870. So, it is no wonder that evidence of Warsaw’s experiences, “enriched” by the Russian Marshal Law, which lasted more than one century (19th), and the Communist regime (1945-1989) may be seen even now in the City’s architecture, its buildings and the behaviour of its inhabitants.

Kings, chiefs and a grateful nation

In 1998 we celebrated the 400th Anniversary of changing of the capital from Cracow to Warsaw. After the fire of 1596, the Royal Family came to Warsaw looking for a new residence, even though Cracow Castle was already being rebuilt. It could be said that Warsaw became a Capital City through pure chance, but that would be an immeasurable simplification.

In the 17th century, there appeared a possibility for a definite union between Poland and Lithuania, giving a real meaning to the name "Rzeczpospolita (Republic of Both Nations)". Warsaw was too far from the centre of such a State, and it was easier there to talk about more proximate Russian and Habsburg issues than activities up North, in Lithuania.

Further, the dynamic interests of King Zygmunt III, who was son of the King of Sweden, John III, evolved around the Swedish throne. He wanted to be nearer to the Baltic Sea. Maybe he was drawn there by the executors of his Baltic policy, who came from the North of Poland.

Perhaps the King, an introvert and a solitary figure, surrounded by the Kniasts, had had enough of Mazopolska and Cracow power, influenced by heresies and ready to encourage anarchy. He might have preferred Church-loving loyal noblemen. Maybe Warsaw, an average city in the Mazovian Region (a region which not long before was an independent state), was easier to accept both by Polesmen as well as Lithuans. Both were afraid that a new Capital placed in one of the large, Polish or Lithuanian, cities would destroy the balance of power.

Natural topography also helped. The main North-South crossroad was located here — the Vistula River connecting the Baltic Coast with South of Poland, and an East-West route land leading across the watershed line of the Drypez and the Niemen. It had been possible since 1596s to use a bridge across Vistula River in Warsaw.

So, in 1596 King Zygmunt III came to Warsaw. The city with difficulty prepared for its new role. For example, each National Council doubted the number of representatives, while during king’s election the city was overflowing with noblemen.

People lived wherever it was possible, more than often throwing out of homes their useful inhabitants. In time, noblemen began to build their own homes. By 1645, there were more than 60 large residences, out of which approximately 25 were classified as "jurydzys" (territories, where the city rates were not applicable). Fig. 2. So, by the end of 16th Century the second phase of Warsaw’s growth began. (The first being the Medieval City closed within the walls.) This period lasted roughly 100 years. As there were no planning rules, many decisions of that time still influence later and contemporary development of the City. The time of "jurydzys" was the period of partition of the Division of Warsaw into various regions, each living its own life. City walls were encompassed by a ring of noblemen’s residences, some of them located on plots of land comparable with the area of the Old City itself. The street network was subjected to the exterior street pattern, but this did not mean that they were a thought out, composed solution.

Only in the third development phase in the 18th century appear solutions consisting of large axial developments such as: the Sexton Axis of King Stanislas August Poniatowski (Fig. 4). Similar urban developments did not appear in Warsaw until the second quarter of 20th Century, and, paradoxically enough, they were designed to celebrate two declared governments. During construction, appeals were made to the non-material values, which together with their sponsors, would enrich the City of Warsaw.
The Masaryk Philharmonic Development started at the end of 1930s and was intended to become "a Memory of the Victorious Chief and Resurrector of Our Country". Independence Avenue (renamed), the Field of Glory and a Temple of Providence were going to be main elements to "hand down the Josef Philharmonic Style" to succeeding generations (Fig. 5).

The second development is related to the name of Josef Stalin the Maszaukiwnska Housing Development (MDM) with a Stalin Square and a Josef Stalin Palace of Culture and Science ("a gift from the Russian Nation to Poland") on its axis (Fig. 6 and 8). This gift, or, as it is now described, "a boot of a Soviet Soldier driven into the city centre", dates from the early 1950s. It is the largest Polish monument of Socialist Realism. For decades, this building has remained the main feature of central Warsaw and its last remains of art, and it has shaped the taste of provincial visitors as to what is considered beautiful. Yet, there is no other Warsaw edifice that is so close to the Romanticism search for a link between the present and the past. This was one of the reasons why Robert Krier took the role of a judge in the architectural competition for the square surrounding the Palace of Culture and Science. There is no evidence that this unwanted and unborn monster might soon change.

It also should be added that both developments were created on the basis of 18th century plan of King Stanislaw. Hence the smell of a king and nation, of chiefs - both wanted and unwanted, loved and unloved - became one.

Wars, ideologies and eager executors.

Wars were a part of the Second World War as a totally destroyed city. Nearly 90% of buildings lay in ruins. It is no surprise that in 1945 people thought about moving the Capital to Lodz or Cracow. Yet it was decided to rebuild Warsaw. This decision had its political and social aspect. It was not influenced by calculations, but much more by emotions. It speaks well of all those interested in the project - of those who had said "a whole nation is rebuilding its capital city", and of those who actually realised this colossal task.

War Warsaw was rebuilt from bricks brought from the demolished cities located in the West on Recaptured Lands. Fifty years later, even, known, that fact would not have meant anything.

The rebuilt Warsaw was going to be different. This information may be found in speeches made in 1945 by Communist politicians. "A whole nation should build a new Warsaw which had been destroyed by the German occupants and the treacherous policy of our reactionary movement" (as the results of the tragic Warsaw Uprising in August 1944 was judged by the Communist leaders).

Urban planners began their work. Actually, they had worked under cover during the war. Amongst them could be found such people as Jan Chmielewski and Szymon Syrokom, the creators of Functional Warsaw - one of the most interesting projects dating back to the epoch of CIAM and the Athens Charter. Hence, it is no wonder that new Warsaw was planned according to the new rules - landscape, functional division of districts, housing complexes with buildings standing freely in green areas - all in opposition to the Capitalist pre-war city. This plan was shown on 16 March 1945, in the Urban Department. Capital Reconstruction Office, by Zygmunt Skibniewski, partner of Jan Chmielewski. At that time in Warsaw was presented a delegation of Supreme Council of USSR led by Nikita Chruszcow. They were decide to devote that purpose the financial means given to Warsaw by the Soviet Government might be used. The sum involved was to be an equivalent of half of the payments needed to rebuild Warsaw! We don't really know if this sum was true. What we do know, is that the Chief Architect of Moscow came here often and in 1949, all that had a touch of "cosmopolitan western planning" was discarded, including Maciej Nowicki's designs (He later became the author of the Chablinski Plan). After 1949, all urban projects became different: gone were Chmielewski's large scale regional visions, Syrokom's housing complexes, Skibniewski's green belt along the Vistula escarpment, and Roman Podmorski's idea to prefabricate structural elements from rubble. Since 1990, urban thinking had to accord with the ideals of Socialist Realism introduced as doctrines during a National Meeting of Polish Architects by a 25 years old architect, just arrived from Moscow, Edmund Goldzmt. Henceforward, Warsaw was to be developed in the manner envisaged by Goldzmt in his diploma work made at the Moscow Institute of Architecture with large Banque-like axes and a tower - a symbol of freedom. By chance (?) the tower was designed more or less in the same place as, in the 1940 Hubert Gross Projekt, a tower showing a Gaudium of "A new German City of Warsaw". The Gross Plan, usually known as the Pabst Plan, as the project was found in January 1945 at Pabst's apartment. destroyed the existing Warsaw and planned a new City in its place. It was never realised (Fig. 7). Yet, it slowly became a reality, designed, or coordinated, by E. Goldzmt - hence MDM and the palace of Culture and Science - and it ended right there with the political changes of 1956, the end of the Socialist Realism (Fig. 6).

Unluckily, there was no new idea which would logically reshape Warsaw. The Athens Charter Codes returned with sitting force, but the comeback of prefabricated housing complexes was in fact just an artificial caricature (Fig. 8). What became important was quantity - the Communist policy of "giving" a flat to each family killed the quality of buildings and architecture. Warsaw flowed out into the surrounding fields. While having the same number of inhabitants as before, the city was spread over a much wider area (Fig. 1).

Problems appeared with transport, the infrastructure and commerce. Such a city emerged from the next political overthrow of 1968.

It should be mentioned here that only the Old Town remained untouched. Rebuilt in the early 1920s, accepted by the politicians, and related to such people as Jan Zachwatowicz, Piotr Biegalski, Wacław Ostrowski. It was also accepted by Edmund Goldzmt, as it was in accordance with the type of architecture he fought for, "National in form and Socialist in content". In the end it was blessed even by Charles Jencks, who located it among the ancestors of Postmodern in the Straight Revalidation branch of the Architectural Evolutionary Tree.

Political traps.

On 26th October 1945, the Council of Ministers passed a law which decreed all private land became the property of the City of Warsaw. It was further argued that there was a need to undertake fast decisions while rebuilding the city. At the same time, all buildings standing upon the plots remained private property. In this way Warsaw joined into a family of Socialist Cities, where an inhabitant did not own the land upon which he was living. He had no mortgage payments, but at the same time had to take care of building inhabited by people paying very low rent established by the market need. As the rent paid for one square metre was usually lower than price for refurbishment, the result was therefore obvious - whole districts became deserted, and in a short time bulldozer reconstruction was introduced. On such plots, new five or eleven storied high prefabricated buildings were constructed. Traditional streets disappeared, settlements and districts became alike. People stopped caring where they lived. Hence, in Socialist Warsaw, a Socialist Inhabitant lived indifferent to the
city that was being created around him (Fig. 8). Urban planning was characterized by the following:

Plans were created not as a tool for local administration, but for Central Government. Only large Government developers were introduced into plans which were totally dependent upon Government loans and large panel housing plants. Complexity and dynamic issues of the city life were non-existent, plans were simply a rigid view of the future - never to be achieved.

There was no private property, all decisions were undertaken centrally and placed within the environment. At the same time this type of planning was based on irrational political ideas and false statistical information.

Such a case was Warszawa Steel Mill constructed in 1950s in the Zoliborz District. The issues was to change the social balance of the district. The workers (regarded as the most important class of people) were to balance the high percentage of people with higher education (amongst whom the Government was seeking its opponents) residing in this district. (This was a mistake because, in the end, it was the workers from large factories who overthrew Communist Rule.)

While this Mill was being constructed, Warsaw was "cut off" from a large forest region (Kampinoski National Park - KNP). Part of the green area was destroyed together with one of the city's aeration routes and the possibility to develop Warsaw's North towards KNP.

Such a solution has a tradition in Warsaw; since 1830, after the anti-Russian Uprising, Poland was at that time divided between three countries. Warsaw became a small city on the outskirts of Great Russia and was treated as such by the officials. There were some exceptions, when the Russian President Sokrat Starykhewicz bought William Lindley, an Englishman who during 1876-77 designed the still existing sewage and water installations. In their honour a square and a street were named.

After 1830, to ensure dominance over Warsaw, a Citadel was built North of the Old Town, near the river bank. For the construction of this edifice Russians destroyed part of Zoliborz District. When 120 years later the Steel Mill appeared, we understood that this was to be an industrial equivalent of the 19th Century Citadel - chimney instead of cannons, a sanitary zone instead of an esplanade. Still, after 1918 (independence) the esplanade was used for the construction one of the most beautiful green residential Warsaw areas.

environment destroyed by the industrial plant will not revive for years to come.

In 1989 we won our independence once more, and Capitalism, awaited for 50 years, re-appeared. The general belief was that it was to become a remedy for all the city's troubles and a source of hope for the inhabitants. Everybody was to become rich and free to do as they pleased. In the beginning, the need to create any plants at all was discussed. It was said that they were the tools of oppression, and that all which was not forbidden was considered within the law. Hence, it is no wonder that after the transformation hundreds of undesigned buildings, with no building permits, appeared around Warsaw.

At the same time urban designers started a race "in modern planning". New words such as zoning, monitoring, negotiations and participation appeared. They were placed in the texts of plans without any real knowledge as to what they really meant. It was, and still is, a sad, "shallow westernization" of our profession. In three dimensional space this means a construction process of buildings unknown in the Socialist City - mainly banks and other financial institutions. They are accompanied by large malls on the city outskirts. These "Cathedrals of Money" are a very poor imitation of Grand Architecture. They are simply cheap, because financed by foreign capital in a country and city characterized by a high risk coefficient.

Another new, and more painful, issue for an average person is social stratification. It is no longer unimportant where one lives, and we cannot afford to live where we would like to. In the best located environments, indoor small housing complexes are being realised. There is a shortage of cheap homes, no social housing. The city has no money and fights to acquire some. While on the other hand it has no power to shape the level of tax in its area. At the same time the land and industrial plants which become privatized after 1945 are still not being returned to their rightful owners. Land speculation and unofficial contacts prevail.

The Division of Warsaw into 7 and then 11 (we are still waiting for a new division) independent districts, with power to lead their own policy and their own planning, does not help in the overall development of the city.

More efficient officials draw developers to their districts while the biggest square in Central Europe (a competition to Potsdamer Platz, Parade Square around the Palace of Culture and Science, is still empty. Not quite empty - it is a large bazaar.

Figure 5. Proposed Marshal Pilsudski Axis with Marshal’s Monument, Ale, Forum, and the Providence Church.

Figure 6. MDM I, former Marshal Pilsudski Axis, 2 Konstytucji Square as a main point of MDM, 2 Zbawiciela Square.

Figure 7. The new Deutsche Stadt Warschau on Warsaw plan of 1935.
where amongst disgusting barracks thousands of newcomers from the post-Soviet countries (including Vietnam and Mongolia) sell everything they have - false Addidas, Sony, Chanel, overterminated food from Germany, weapons and cheap Russian women. It is the area!

Is there a possibility of breaking this circle? As urban designers we should work more. Government should undertake better decisions and the inhabitants have more independence and patience.
HISTORIC PRESERVATION IN TURKEY: POLICY AND PROBLEMS
NUR AKIN, ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

In Turkey, the beginning of the conservation activities dates to the second half of the 19th century. The first law related to the architectural heritage dates from 1874 and it aimed to prevent the pillage of Anatolian archaeological sites and objects. With the extension of this law in 1906, Turkish Islamic buildings were included in the legal system. Actually, these buildings, such as the mosques, madrasas (Ottoman institutions for higher education), tekkes (devshirre lodges), tombs etc., were preserved in the earlier period by the Ottoman foundation system. In this foundation system, these monumental buildings used for public purposes were built by the sultans, as well as the important bureaucrats, and were conserved by means of some regulations. But with the establishment of the Republic in 1923, political changes caused the repeal of this system. However in 1935, a new Pious Foundation Act was agreed, and by this act, the General Directorate of Pious Foundations was responsible for the preservation of these Turkish-Islamic buildings. Thus, the same responsibility of the ancient foundation system continued for this directorate. At this time, apart from these non-Islamic historic monuments were the responsibility of the Ministry of Education. The only rule for the urban plan was that "at least 10 metres of the area surrounding the monuments should be kept empty".

In 1951, a new institution which was very important for the conservation of buildings and sites, was founded. Its name was the 'High Council for the Historical Properties and Monuments'. Until this time, the conservation of historical urban areas was not taken into consideration. This council was very restrictive in its policies for interventions affecting old buildings and areas, as well as their registration. From about 1955 to 1970, accelerated urbanization and economic pressures on the historical urban areas influenced the cities. Two main new facts affected this period: immigration from rural areas to cities, and the growth of a new upper class. The opening up of new broad streets and the increased of height of buildings caused great land speculations. In spite of the policies of the High Council, the developers, with the support of the politicians, began to raise the prices of housing, and to cause the destruction of old areas for new high and modern constructions. So, during this time, many historic urban sites lost their characteristic aspects. Regional differences, so important for the Anatolian settlements, began to change. The new and high constructions which replaced the old ones were very homogeneous and monotonous.

The image of westernization and modernization was related to the coexistence of the apartments. So, the local upper and middle classes of the settlements preferred to live in new apartments, which caused an important social change within the historical urban areas. Old historic houses were abandoned by their real owners, and used by totally different social groups from the rural environments. These new groups, unaware of the original use of these historical buildings and without financial possibilities for their maintenance, changed the physical appearance of these buildings and areas enormously. So, beginning with Istanbul, Ankara, other big cities and continuing throughout Anatolia, the historic urban sites became real transitional areas.

Meanwhile in 1973, the first important Turkish Preservation Act came into effect and included all modern terms and regulations relating to conservation. Besides single monumental buildings and large estates, the conservation of sites were divided according to their characteristics as urban, archaeological, historical and natural, and described in this act. So after the 1973's, according to the regulations of the Preservation Act, several conservation plans were prepared and applied under the supervision of the High Council for Historical Properties and Monuments, despite the opposition of municipalities and owners of the historical houses.

In 1983, a new Preservation Act—which is still current—replaced the former one. By this act, a new organizational system for the conservation of the heritage was established. According to the new system, instead of the High Council for the Historical Properties and Monuments, the regional councils (13 at this time) were established throughout Anatolia, their centres installed in historically important cities. In this act, the local authorities were also represented in the body of these councils whose members were restorer-architects, city planners, art historians and archaeologists. It appeared that this new system was an improvement over the former High Council which was established in Istanbul. Under these conditions, it is easier to control the changes of historic urban areas more closely, prevent demolitions and to maintain the old monuments in place. But since the number of
specialists, present in each of these councils is insufficient for the task, and their opinions relating to conservation policies differ. This system can be /vulnerable to local pressures. So, in spite of the obvious advantages of this new system, a sustainable cultural policy is still not established in Turkey. That is why, since 1995, several organizations are in the process of drafting a new preservation act and /organizational system.

In the new system, all councils are all connected to the Ministry of Culture which is responsible for the establishment of legal policies for the preservation of buildings and open spaces in Turkey (Fig.1), as well as around 3,000 archaeological areas (Fig.2), and museums. Another duty of this Ministry is the regulation of the historical city centers and other historic urban areas, through museums and local bureaus of conservation. The role of the Ministry is to support different projects at different scales, to increase public consciousness of the importance of conservation by means of exemplary restoration projects, congresses, conferences, exhibitions etc.

The second important organization related to conservation is the General Directorate of Public Foundations mentioned above. Its basic task is to conserve and maintain religious and public monuments, including mosques, madrasas, mausoleums, caravanserais, baths, fountains etc (Fig.3). Other official organizations such as the Ministry of Tourism (Conservation and tourism), the Ministry of Public Works (Conservation of old town halls, schools, hospitals), the General Directorate of National Palaces (19th century palaces and kiosks of Istanbul), the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (Conservation of national parks) have different responsibilities. As a result, the administration of monuments and sites are divided between these institutions that is usually difficult to reach agreements on basic policies for conservation.

Some private organizations are also interested in the conservation of cultural heritage. Among them, TURING (Turkish Touring and Auto Club) restored some important mansions and rehabilitated an historic street in Istanbul (Fig.4).

Educational Aspects of Conservation in Turkey
Since the 1950's, several graduate programmes in Historic Preservation were established in Turkey, in order to educate architects, city planners, archaeologists, art historians etc. The graduate programme of Conservation of the Faculty of Architecture of Middle East Technical University in Ankara was the first. Other universities in Istanbul, such as Istanbul Technical University, Yıldız Technical University, Mimar Sinan University, and the universities of İzmir and Ankara followed it. So, the number of specialists in conservation increased over time. Some conservation laboratories, such as the Laboratory of the Department of Restoration of MITÜ, and the Conservation Laboratory of the Ministry of Culture in Istanbul, are the basic centers for the scientific analysis of old buildings.

Preparation and Approval of the Restoration Projects and Conservation Area Plans
According to a recent regulation, the restoration project for a monument or an old house which necessitates certain specialties must be prepared only by an architect-restorer. The complete restoration project should be based on a detailed measured drawing of the building, as well as on its historical documentation and evaluation which is the Restoration Project. In the preparation of the restoration projects, the role of the Restoration Project, which is necessary for the analysis of buildings before the final decisions, is more emphasized now. When an old building is listed and registered, any intervention to it must be approved by the regional council. And when an area is designated as a 'Conservation Area' by them due to its dense architectural, historical or cultural characteristics, the councils must prepare 'Transitional Construction Rules' for this special area until the conservation plan is approved.

Figure 4 Historic street (Süleymaniye Street, Istanbul).

Most of the historical buildings were listed in this second group, which permitted the owner to make all kinds of changes inside the building, in order to keep its exterior characteristic appearance. It was the same for the third group of buildings which had lost some of their traditional exterior details too, as well as the interiors. Some changes and new interventions were permitted to their facades as well. That is why, most of the listed building owners avoided to represent the third group. There were also pressures to switch the preservation groups. While this categorization was in effect, the second and third group buildings lost many of their characteristics during their restoration.

The permission to change the interior gave to the owners and architects the possibility to tear down the original building, and rebuild it according to a new plan. During this rebuilding process, the building lost its original architectural characteristics, and sometimes its dimensions and proportions. In the case of timber-framed houses, a common building type in Anatolia, usually listed in the second or third group, the procedure approved by the councils was to reconstruct the building in concrete and cover the facades with wood. Finally, many buildings were "new" instead of "restored" and unfortunately were listed as "monuments". Thus, as they had no historic characteristics related to their past, the procedure was completely contrary to the meaning of "restoration" and "conservation".

At present, according to the current new regulation, there is no categorization of old buildings. Every part of the architectural heritage, once listed, must be evaluated according to its own characteristics. This not only prevents the building from the kind of applications cited above. So, every listed building will be preserved with its original historic architectural value, with authorized changes to its plan and it will be rehabilitated according to the modern needs of time.

The Present State of Conservation of Monuments and Sites in Turkey
The first decision to conserve an historic urban site was taken in 1978, for the conservation of historic timber-framed she-houses of the Bosphorus, in Istanbul (Fig.6). The major goal of this project was to keep intact the topography and the landscape of the Bosphorus. Eventually, the Bosphorus area had a Conservation Site Plan too, prepared by the Municipality of Istanbul. Since 1973, detailed conservation plans have been prepared for several Anatolian cities. Among them Antalya, a town of the south, on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea can be mentioned as the first. The shore district of the old town was rehabilitated between 1974-1985, for tourism purposes. It is now one of the preferred areas of the South Anatolians, especially for tourists who arrive there by yacht. However, in spite of isolated examples of conserved areas, generally the architectural heritage of the cities is deteriorating. The legal, administrative and educational aspects of conservation seem to be solved, but the available financial and technical sources are not necessary to the owners for the restoration of their buildings, as well as the governmental and public consciousness
conservation, are still missing. The historic urban sites, declared as ‘Conservation Areas’ by regional preservation councils are the central parts of the cities directed by the transformations due to accelerated commercialization. For example, the old districts of Istanbul are in such condition. The historical peninsula, which represents the most ancient core of Istanbul with the monuments dating from the Byzantine and Ottoman periods, as well as the residential areas of the 19th century, and Galata, a region located directly opposite the peninsula with its European appearance have lost their importance. As present they are occupied by a lower income group. The changes in the social structure of the residential areas, due to the people of lower income have a great impact on the architectural character of these areas. Many 19th century buildings of historical Istanbul are left to decay and so deteriorate rapidly. Also some conversions called ‘rehabilitations’ change the physical fabric of this architectural heritage completely.

These conditions are the same for the old parts of small Anatolian towns. Without the required conservation plan and governmental support it is impossible to conserve them. For example, Selanik or Kukla, two small Anatolian townscare changing rapidly, in spite of their conservation plans. In both of them, speedy urbanization threatens the traditional environment. The houses of the pre-industrial times which were too large for the nuclear family are inconvenient for their recent inhabitants. In this case, dividing the buildings into small units or reducing their height by one or two stories, means changing the exterior appearance of the building. So both ‘oversize’ and ‘underuse’ influence enormously the originality of the old buildings.

Either people do not value the importance of their heritage, or even if they want to conserve it, there are no financial incentives, like long-term, low-interest loans to create favourable conditions for preservation. The changes in the traditional construction systems and materials especially in most parts of Anatolia where the buildings are timber-framed need special treatment for their conservation. The kitchens and baths or restrooms are generally placed in the courtyard and therefore do not conform to modern living conditions. The renovation of an old house needs, first of all, the installation of modern sanitary equipment to the building. When it is divided into smaller units, it necessitates the addition of service spaces to each unit. And if this intervention is viciously done, without any restoration project and permission, as in the case of old buildings in most small towns, the buildings rapidly lose their historical characteristics. Beside all this, the insufficient infrastructure of historic sites is a very important factor which affects the deterioration of historic buildings. But whatever these great handicaps may be, the old buildings registered as historical landmarks must be conserved by their owners.

In Turkey, the government obliges the owners to conserve their properties without supporting them in anyway. The one aid is the exemption of the real estate tax. That is why the helpless lower income owners lose the buildings unused, and so they are left to deteriorate.

These are the most important current common conservation problems in Turkey which need to be solved. But it is apparent that, without any technical and financial aid to the owners for the conservation of their properties, and without any exemplary restorations (not as museum-houses or for tourist purposes but for private use and finally, without the consciousness of local authorities and awareness of the inhabitants of the architectural heritage, it will not be possible to preserve our historical properties.

**Figure 6.** Timber framed share-houses of the Bosphorus (Istanbul).

---

**Milton Keynes since the 1960s**

Mark Clapham, University of Luton, U.K.

Milton Keynes came into existence by the North Buckinghamshire New Town (Designation Order of January 1967). This was passed within the Labour Government’s commitment to extend the scope of the new town programme in order to accommodate the population increases forecast for the South East of England. The area designated for the new city comprised 44,000 people, the majority of whom lived in the existing towns of – order of site – Bletchley, Wolverton, Stony Stratford and New Bradwell. By 1991, Milton Keynes’ population had grown to over 143,000. However, whilst the architectural and planning history of this new city has drawn considerable attention, the ideas behind the social planning for Milton Keynes have been largely ignored. For example, the official historians of Milton Keynes have admitted that their work is “only very indirectly about the people who live in the city.”

Hence this article discusses the social thinking of the new city’s planners.

The article is in three parts. First, it highlights the transition in planning thought away from the idea of ‘neighbourhood units’ towards less prescriptive residential designs. This culminated in specific planning texts, notably the two-volume Plan for Milton Keynes (1970). This document was researched, argued over and finally written by the consultant team to Milton Keynes Development Corporation (MRDC) of Llewelyn-Davies, Weeks, Forester-Walker and Bore. David Downing, the Centre for Environmental Studies (CES), an advisor to the Llewelyn-Davies team, stated the problem, and as he explored ideas about social change in the social development programme of the Plan. The social dimension of the Plan was equally as important as the planner’s understanding of economic and technological change. Anticipations of social change explain why Milton Keynes looks so different to other new towns and established settlements. It is, after all, the ‘little Los Angeles of North Bucks’. Finally, in conclusion, the article argues that, Milton Keynes, or the built of popular jokes and misrepresentation, deserves serious interpretation as a city which reveals much to the social and urban historian of the late twentieth century.

Beyond the neighbourhood

The first generation of new towns resulted from the New Towns Act of 1946. Earlier practical garden-city experiments and ideological positions informed the Act. In terms of design, the cottage-style semi-detached and short terraces of houses, and the estate layouts of the proposed new towns, were influenced by the low-rise and low-density housing examples of the garden city and garden suburb movements of the Edwardian and interwar years. To be sure, there was apartment building in new towns, but it rarely exceeded 15 percent of a new town’s housing stock. Socially, the ethos of the new towns may be summed up in two key terms: social mix and social balance. As World War Two came to a close, many planners and politicians felt that a new spirit of cooperation between the classes had to come into being, a concurrence of the shared crises of war, and of class-cross mixing due to, for example, evacuation and war work. Planned new communities were intended to transcend class divisions. To this end, the neighbourhood unit was conceived.

The neighbourhood became the local residential area designed by the first phase of new town development corporations to incorporate manageable and integrated planned populations. For example, Lewis Silkin, the Minister for Town and Country Planning, hoped:

The towns will be divided into neighbourhood units, each with its own shops, schools, open spaces, community halls and other amenities. I am most anxious that the planning should be such that different groups living in the new towns should not be segregated. No doubt they may enjoy common recreational facilities, and take part in amateur theatricals, or each play their part in a health centre or a community centre, where they leave to go home I do not want the better off people to go to the right, and the less well off to go to the left. I want them to ask each other ‘Are you going my way?’

Before such cosy class relations could be realised in new towns, the economic imperatives had to be addressed. Development corporations were empowered to purchase land for construction, to get houses built, and to guide enough and varied employment into the new towns, so that them economically prosperous. New industrial units and offices, complete with highly competitive rental or purchase prices, helped these processes along. Workers, moreover, were to be emptied out of the poorer and often dilapidated inner urban areas of London and other large cities, by the Industrial Selection Scheme (ISS). If they took work in the new towns, they gained a new house. This process continued into the first decade of Milton Keynes’ growth. During the early 1970s, the ISS was replaced with the New and Expanded Towns Scheme (NETS), which guided or spelt Londoners, and others, from a wider South Eastern catchment area, into MK during the 1970s.
The concept of the neighbourhood emphasised localism. However, the impact of the motor car and of increasing mobility, widened people’s horizons: they did not have to use the pubs or shops within walking distance any more, because now they owned a car. Moreover, both voluntary and planned migration out of established town and city centres had widened people’s kinship and friendship networks, thus requiring more travel.10 There was a fashionable intellectual pessimism about such changes. Peter Willmott and Michael Young, of the Institute of Community Studies (ICS), argued that people felt a sense of spiritual emasculation at the loss of close-by extended family or community.11 Yet a considerable amount of lesser research in sociological research showed that most people were happy to escape from ‘traditional’ working-class areas for a materially enriched life on a new estate. For example, H. E. Bracey, J. E. Cullingworth, Norman Dennis and J. M. Mogy provided empirical and impressionistic evidence that once settled into a new home on a new estate, be it in a suburb or a new or expanded town, they enjoyed a new balance between privacy, sociability, family and community. Local orientations still persisted, but these too were balanced with a wider potential for family mobility through the possession of a motor car.10 Nor was there much evidence, in new towns, of class mixing, and of social class balance. Most were largely comprised of manual workers, the majority of whom were skilled and semi-skilled. The middle class presence was small.11

These observations were indicative of some critical and often explosive thinking about the nature of social relations. Hence, at the 1968 conference of the Centre for Environmental Studies and the Social Science Research Council, entitled ‘The Future of the City Region’, some planners spoke to the idea that local identities in the older-established urban-industrial communities were being replaced by newer and increasingly diverse points of collective reference. J C Amos, for example, argued that English society was witnessing a fundamental ‘transition from an urban society based on local industrial communities to a new urban society and society’. Such thinking was also evident at the sociological think-tank, the Centre for Urban Studies, Ruth Glass, for example, argued that planners should break free from outdated notions of community. Her celebrated attack upon the ICS was one example of her desire to make sense of what she called ‘the chaos of a new order’. The Californian cities of Los Angeles and San Francisco were paradigmatic of the forces making for a new order of urban diffusion. Greater affluence and mobility, and huge strides in transport and communications technologies, accelerated and expanded suburban sprawl as people migrated away from the town and city centres to settle in more peripheral residences.12

In California itself, the planning thinker Melvin Webber was busy thinking through the implications of such changes. Some of Webber’s key phrases will give the sense of his arguments. The city, he argued was becoming a ‘nonplace urban realm’, as communications technologies, notably the telephone, television, satellite and the computer, enhanced geographical mobility through faster transport, and enabled ‘community without propriety’. Instead, interests and tastes would increasingly cause people to communicate and associate with each other on the basis of shared enthusiasms. This felt Webber, was an expression of the freedom of choice allowed by affluence and progress. However, Webber was careful to point out that neighbourhood and locality as bases of community identification would not die; they would merely take their place among a range of variables which brought people together.13 In 1968, Webber was invited, by Douglas, to become an advisor to Llewelyn-Davies, Weeks, Foresters Walker and Boe. He informed them that Milton Keynes would be unique to ‘the town of the industrial era’. Instead it would be of the ‘post-industrial era’.14 This meant that planners had to think in terms of local communities, and in more terms of heightened mobility. They an urban design which kept abreast of technological developments in rapid communications. This, in turn, required new thinking about social relations in such a new urban framework.

Milton Keynes and the new thinking A 1969 briefing paper on social development demonstrated the importance which the Llewelyn-Davies team attached to the wider planning debates discussed here. First, unlike earlier new town development corporations, social aspects of the Plan were given equal emphasis to the physical. Second, the principles of choice and flexibility were stressed. ‘The city’s resilience’, it argued, should have freedom to exercise choice over as wide a range of options as possible. This is at one and the same time an imperative for social development action and the denial of any imposition of a given quality of life.15

This principle was to inform choices made in all areas of life, choices about social connections and relationships, work, education, leisure, shopping, and general movement around the city. It might be asked, were these ideas given expression in the new city’s urban fabric? There are two different answers to this question. One was apparent in the fate of the enigmatic Milton Keynes, of ‘Posleynville’. Second, the way in which social development was anticipated by MKDC, with qualifications born out of some of the key ideas of social development which fed into the Plan. Each area will now be discussed in turn.

Frederick Pooley, the Chief Architect and Planner of Buckinghamshire County Council, was the original driving force for a new city for North Bucks since the early 1960’s. He originally proposed a city not unlike a figure of eight in shape. This was a Corinthian ‘improved design’, of relatively high-density residential townships of blocks of flats and houses, and employment areas, joined together by a motorway (Fig. 1). Walter Boe, John de Monchaux and other consultants to the Plan have remembered how Pooley’s ideas were intellectually but humanly

designed in the early years of the Plan’s formulation. Pooley’s plans were criticised as territorially deterministic in an era of enhanced mobility, and included the concept of the ‘new town’ as a semi-rural environment.

Choice was the key word. For example, people could shop locally if they wished, and all goods could be provisioned with shops. Yet people could also shop in retail units dotted about the city. The motor car, and the ill-fated Dial-a-Bus system, were central to this vision.16 Choice, however, has proved to be greater with car ownership, a point emphasised by feminist critics of the spatial layout of Milton Keynes, and of the constraints of the built-environment on women, whose ownership of cars, and access to them in general, has remained considerably lower than that of men.19

These principles of choice and selection can be seen in the concept of ‘Activity Areas’. These were to comprise shops where necessary, but also meeting places and leisure facilities. These were not, originally, to have been sited within the centres of the grid squares, but on their edges. They were intended to draw people not simply from within a grid square, but from a wider area. They also held an orientation function: a distinctively designed Activity Centre, situated near to the main carriageways, was to provide a visual point of reference when navigating around the new city by car. North Hill’s Centre (Fig. 3) has been praised by planners as a realisation of some of the ideas they had in mind. But the frustration of the original planners with the
placement of some subsequent centres has since become apparent. Walter Box, one of the consultants to the Plan, has since castigated architects in MKDC for the 'Pavlovian reflex' of seeing a square and then automatically placing the centre in the middle. The need to accommodate greater levels of personal mobility than Poole had allowed for stemmed from Webber's ideas of social change, and the urban fabric of Milton Keynes reflects that. However, MKDC also attempted to discern the ongoing nature of social life in the new city, and to provide for it. Since 1946, all new towns were supposed to provide support for social development, but MKDC's social development programme went further than any previous or simultaneous new towns.

Social development in Milton Keynes operated on a number of different but interlocking levels. First, Peter Waterman, an ex-MKDC social development officer has summarised, it was directed to policies and programmes which aimed to meet social needs, notably education, health and community services.

Second, social development aimed to help newcomers to settle into the new environment of Milton Keynes, and to avoid the problem of urban disorientation known as the 'new town blues'. This was a myth fostered by media misinterpretation of a number of studies of migrants to new towns such as Harlow and Cranley in the 1950s and 1960s. For example, a Ministry of Housing and Local Government report, The Needs of New Communities, published in 1967, had found that of migrants to new towns the majority settled in relatively easily, and that 'new town blues' was an inaccurate and emotive term. Certainly, most studies of the 'problem' could not prove it. However, MKDC was keen to do as much as it could to minimise any difficulties that might occur. The development corporation appointed arrivals workers to help people to settle. They responded to the articulated needs and demands of newcomers, and assisted more active people who wanted to engage in building local tenants' associations, or to establish interest-based groups and organisations. By encouraging and facilitating organisations, clubs, societies or groups, of varying degrees of formality and informality, MKDC was keen to fulfil a third aim of social development. In the words of The Needs of New Communities, new communities should enable 'the growth of and participation in community activity while not imposing patterns of behaviour'. MKDC was strongly influenced by such thinking.

Social development was at the juncture between the planners and the people, and thus between planning and social action. But how can social historians research the connections between social change and planning intentions? Fortunately, a variety of sources exist for this purpose. The usual local primary sources are invaluable, notably the newspapers and oral history collections. And MKDC created an important archive. Its Household Surveys, undertaken in 1973, 1976, 1983, 1988, and its Annual Reports, provide important qualitative and quantitative data upon, for example, the number and nature of associations of the new city, on home-based and public leisure, and on the uses of the Meeting Places within the grid squares. Since MKDC wound up in 1992, such monitoring has been taken up by the Borough Council.

The voluntary act of association of committed individuals, and the interest-led movements of participants is central to associative action. It is pertinent to emphasise that 'neighbourhood' as a basis for such action has not withered away, as many tape recordings at the Living Archive Project in Wolverton testify. Nor did MKDC think it would organise neighbourliness within grid squares as in the form of tenants associations. In this, Milton Keynes shares in a wider national trend since 1970.

However, it is important to evaluate the significance of neighbourliness within social action. That neighbourliness as a basis for communal interaction has but one variable, and not necessarily the most important one, in the social formation of the city, is evident in the extent and nature of associations within the new city. Milton Keynes has a thriving associative culture based on voluntary action and commitment to a wide range of sports, leisure, religious, philanthropic and charitable groups, clubs and societies. Over 50 per cent of the city belonged to one or more groups by the mid-1990s. Some groups recruit more locally than others, depending on the organisation. However, membership or participation networks range from a few streets to city wide. In the case of national organisations, such as political parties, or the Open University, they involve networks beyond the city itself.

Conclusion: the relevance of Milton Keynes to social change in England since 1970

This final section is intended to be discursive.
It points to some, but by no means all, historically significant aspects of the accelerated social evolution of the new city since 1970. It is to be regretted, however, that the lessons we could already have learned from Milton Keynes have to some extent been obscured by music hall jokes and knocking comic which present it as a soulless concrete jungle. Moreover, the image of Milton Keynes has perhaps suffered from being born into the crisis decade of the 1970s, following the "golden age" of the 1950s and 1960s.

Milton Keynes, however, must have to tell us about social change in the late twentieth century. As noted above, one important approach is to compare the demise of what historians and sociologists have termed "traditional" urban-industrial communities for more affluent, more mobile, and less restricted suburban and new town patterns of social behaviour. These changes were intertwined with profound economic restructuring, as the deindustrialization of Britain accelerated from 1970. Milton Keynes reflects this. The proportion of those working in manufacturing within the designated area declined from 30 percent to 20 percent of the work force between 1967 and 1988. The majority of new workplaces have been comprised of small numbers of employees, and there has been a considerable growth of part time work, mostly within the expanding service sector of the local economy, and mostly filled by women. Due to these structural factors, trade union organization has been more restricted in the new town than in the old.

However, social action beyond the workplace is worthy of further historical analysis. A diverse range of clubs, organizations, societies and tenants associations may be interpreted as socially integrative, and whilst both men and women have been active in fostering such integration, women's contribution has been highest. Of 392 organizations in existence by 1988, and sampled by this writer, 56 per cent were co-ordinated by women. Women also spearheaded some of the most important informal local campaigns to fight for improved services, such as the new hospital, or more and better shops. These campaigns, moreover, cut across class and tenure, division, and transcended grid square (or new estate) boundaries. Such findings pose questions for the idea that social relations are becoming more fragmented by "consumption sector cleavages" such as private versus public transport, and public versus private housing tenure. It is no contradiction of Melvin Webber's ideas to argue that common interests have united people in a city of both diversity and of rapid change.

Of course, any contemporary historical evaluation of this new city in relation to wider social and economic changes requires qualification. For example, the role of an unrelated development corporation in interpreting and managing social and economic change and growth is one of the most local specificities that must be addressed. However, it is equally valid to argue that this new city enables the social historian and the planning historian to make some important observations about the relationship of the planning process to the social process.

Of course, any contemporary historical evaluation of this new city in relation to wider social and economic changes requires qualification. For example, the role of an unrelated development corporation in interpreting and managing social and economic change and growth is one of the most local specificities that must be addressed. However, it is equally valid to argue that this new city enables the social historian and the planning historian to make some important observations about the relationship of the planning process to the social process. Milton Keynes is stocked with a rich archive to facilitate this interpretative approach. For these reasons, the new city may yet come to be viewed as paradigmatic of key social and economic changes in late twentieth century England, just as Milton Keynes in the Victorian era, and Los Angeles has been for post-war America.
VOGEL'S FOREST SETTLEMENTS: A REGIONAL RESOURCE PLANNING EPISODE FROM 19TH CENTURY COLONIAL NEW ZEALAND

M. M. Rehe and C. L. Miller, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

This research note is anchored around two questions - when did urban dreaming about the future become for sighted regional and urban planning and when does economic development become incorporated into a form of national regional resource development planning? The setting in which these questions are explored is that of colonial New Zealand during the 1870s, particularly through Sir Julius Vogel's plans for region resource development and settlement.

Memorables of the 1870s-80s that "wider social and environmental issues, including utilisation and management of New Zealand's wealth of land, water, forestry, and mineral resources, appear to have been ignored as legitimate concerns" at the time in which national level, a financial resources of local government at the time have largely been perceived, responsibilities of regional planning in its broadest sense, in the period prior to 1870, then the nature of institutional arrangements would suggest that one looks at the national level. Central government initiatives were essential as encouraging and in turn shaping the nature of growth including its physical manifestation in the form of settlements. (Equality in the wake of the enactment of the Resource Management Act of 1991, with its emphasis on the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, it is important to track the development of national resource-based planning, particularly in the case where it interacts with the development of settlements).

The choice of Vogel's special forest settlement scheme therefore becomes clearer, as one of the early manifestations of concern for the efficient use of resources, and initiated at a national level. However, Special Settlement Acts specific to particular provinces were passed in the early 1870s so that Vogel's does not entirely conform to Memorables' categorisation of the 1870s and 1880s as an era when land and forest management has expanded. Vogel's Immigration and Public Works Scheme.

Sir Julius Vogel (1835-99) defines easy categorisation as a colonial politician (Fig. 1). Dalziel observes that "He was described as brilliant, a far seeing strategist and a clever politician, he was called a dangerous financier, a snake, a carpetbagger, and a corrupting influence in politics." Born in Germany and arriving in New Zealand after a spell in Melbourne in 1852, Vogel prospered as a journalist before entering political activity through the Wellington City Council. He was a member of the New Zealand parliament and subsequently moved to Wellington as "the path towards the national stage in 1870." The colonial economy stagnated in the late 1860s as the impetus of the gold rush was lost and wool prices were low. As Colonial Treasurer he was a decisive force in Fox's ministry.

In an attempt to stimulate the economy Vogel implemented a boldly conceived interrelated scheme of overseas borrowing to fund road and rail development in conjunction with an assisted immigration and settlement scheme. Dalziel reflects that Vogel's programme set New Zealand "on the path towards national unity and economic growth." Vogel's popularity waned in the mid-1870s and he resigned to become the New Zealand government's Agent-General in London before returning briefly to the national stage a decade later. His political significance rests largely on the public works and immigration scheme and his part in the abolition of provincial government in New Zealand. This latter event was triggered by opposition to his forest conservation proposal which, although passed into law, were stripped of their key provisions for acquiring forest land. Vogel had suddenly become interested in forest conservation attracted by the economic advantages of ending the wanton destruction of forests, although he did also seem to grasp the fact and erosion control possibilities.

Burdon, in an earlier biographical treatment of Vogel, concludes that he was very much a "big picture" strategist who was concerned more with the general interests of a land settlement and public works scheme than with its detail, of which he little grasp or interest. The boom economy of the gold fields era of the early 1860s Burdon sees as fundamentally informing Vogel's outlook.

Vogel was curious slow to perceive the inescapable connection between immigration and land settlement. He regarded them as natural evolutionary processes, which, once the situation favourable to their initiation had been created, might be expected to advance steadily under their own self-generated motive power with the least possible supervision and direction by the State. He seemed that he could never avoid looking upon those tumultuous irruptions of humanity which had invariably followed the discovery of gold, as models for the conduct of all subsequent colonisation. He had hoped, somewhat vaguely, that the problem of land settlement would solve itself, and that as the public works were completed the men who had been employed on them would become small farmers, buying land for themselves out of what they had saved from their high wages. The land boom forced him to realise that soon there would be no suitable land left on which to settle anyone at all, and, what to his mind was more important still, the last chance of securing a national railway estate would disappear. This assessment of Vogel and his evolving ideas about regional resource management forms an historical overlooked subplot of Vogel's immigration public works and land development schemes.

Regional Resource Development: The Forest Settlements.

Vogel's more detailed thoughts on forest settlement in Westland were outlined in a memorandum to the Superintendent of Wellington Province in 1874 and subsequently reprinted as part of the official correspondence relating to forests in New Zealand. When large scale European settlement commenced in 1840, some 50% of New Zealand was covered in forest. By 1868 the scale of deforestation attracted official attention, though with limited effective action. It was against this background of extensive deforestation, economic stagnation, and tensions between provincial and central government that Vogel developed his ideas on forest settlements. He began by outlining six principles on which they were based. These included:

1. Special settlements are to be used to concentrate settlement in thinly settled areas or those not yet settled.
2. Immigration policy is at least in part directed to the promotion of settlement in selected localities.
3. Special settlements are required to ensure that jobs are available for new migrants.
4. Immigrants recently arrived in the colony may volunteer to join special settlements.
5. Success of the settlements will depend on the first settlers paying the way for later arrivals.
6. Success will depend on employment being available during the first two years.

There are some familiar themes advanced in Vogel's list of principles. That concerning the concentration of settlement has resonances with Edward Gibbon Wakefield's settlement schemes given form by the operation of the New Zealand Company in the 1840s. Wakefield specifically identified the easy
Given the expense of clear felling and burning the forest prior to settlement, estimated at £2 to £2 10s per acre by Kelly, the notion of both recovering mosoans from the sale of forest products and of speeding the land settlement process was extremely attractive. Although Vogel specifically acknowledged the importance of location, in the sense of directing migrants to particular areas and his forests scheme was in effect a plan for settlement and natural resource use, he does not appear to have depicted his ideas in cartographic form. In his 'Memorandum as to the proposed settlement in Westland' he provided some important details against which the scale of his plans can be evaluated. He suggested that an area of 100,000 acres be made available, of which 50,000 acres be set aside as a Forest Reserve, and the other 50,000 acres as a settlement area. In 1873 the European population of New Zealand totalled 299,334 and the Maori 45,470. A settler population of 230 families (about 1000 adults) was envisaged for the 50,000 acres. Adults were able to purchase 50 acres per annum over a seven year period. The concern for promoting genuine settlement rather than speculative land aggrandizement is also evident in the arrangements for land purchase. But it is the interrelationship between farming and the timber industry which is notable. Vogel sought to bring together two enterprises, usually regarded as antithetical, to their mutual advantage. Sawmill ing at this time was a significant employer outside farming, even in districts where sawmilling was small but not necessarily important. A simple diagrammatic representation of Vogel's forests-settlement scheme is shown below (Fig. 2). For purposes of simplicity, the land and forest blocks have been represented on a grid as if the physical environment was uniform. Obviously this is a major simplifying assumption, but one which helps illustrate the fashion in which Vogel sought to link efficient use of the forest resources with the expansion of land settlement.

In the terms of one of the settlers established under special legislation in the years prior to Vogel's initiative, his 1874 scheme may be seen as an attempt, albeit modest, to improve the success of these efforts at town establishment and economic expansion. Special settlements legislation was enacted for Otago, Wellington, Nelson and Hawkes Bay provinces for 1871 to 1872. (Fig. 3) Although the schemes were not identical, they share a common philosophy of government assisted land development. The scale and duration of the Acts are laid out in Table 1.

### Table 1: Special Settlement Scheme Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Maximum Area per Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>200 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>200 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>200 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkes Bay</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>200 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attention was focused primarily on the area set aside and details of land acquisition. The special settlement established at Brux Bay in Westland was seen regarded as a failure. However, Vogel observed that: 'Conceived in the fertile, expansive imaginations of the politicians and nurtured during the boom of the early 1870s, the settlements were ill-devised, funded with little more than passing regard to their economic base, established in regions whose physical climate and resource character was little known but of which the best was believed.'}

Likewise the more successful bush towns of Dannevirke, Woodville and Norsewood situated in the Seventy Mile Bush on the line of the proposed rail-line from Napier to the eastern coast opened to settlement were neither models of efficient forest utilisation nor agrarian utopias. Although the forest industry was regionally significant much forest was felled and burnt to facilitate the establishment of pasture and the creation of a rural economy.
Conclusion

This research note does not attempt to promote Sir Julius Vogel as some pioneering and neglected figure in the history of town planning in New Zealand. We do, however, point to some blurring and overlaps between proposals for new settlements and regional economic and natural resource development and planning. Vogel's concern to see forests utilised rather than wasted was unusual, thought not exceptional, for the time when the general attitude was that they were virtually inexhaustible and a barrier to land settlement and infra-structural development. Vogel sought to bridge state legislation and the economy by making provision for the rational exploitation of forests for timber. He fully appreciated that timber would only have sufficient value for this to happen if transport networks were in place and there were urban or overseas markets in which to sell the timber. Vogel's vision of forest settlements is also of interest in that it foreshadowed by 50 years Sir David Hutchins' ideas. Hutchins, an eminent Colonial forest administrator, was commissioned to report on New Zealand's forests by the government in 1919. His report was largely mainstream forestry science but he did touch on the sorts of forest communities that his proposals for indigenous forest management would produce.

State forest employees are settled more permanently on the land than most farmers; they earn more than the average dairy farmer, and, settled in model homesteads, escape the isolation and monotonous life of the isolated farmer. 20

This examination of the forests scheme also throws additional light on Burdon's judgement that Vogel hoped "the problem of rural settlement would solve itself." In one very major way he is correct. Vogel was stronger on the big picture than on the fine detail, but this is a criticism to which many politicians of the 19th and 20th centuries remains open.

There is, however, another unintended meaning to Burdon's assessment, for by coordinating population, infra-structure and efficient natural resource utilisation, Vogel could not without justification believe that land settlement could "solve itself" in the sense of the colonial state providing conditions for creating growing rural settlement and economies. In effect, Vogel's settlement schemes can be viewed as part of the patchwork of developments which would eventually turn the attention of the central state to the need for systematic town planning which was first achieved in the 1926 Town-planning Act. By addressing such diverse elements and relating them to the wider issue of the state's involvement in resource use and management in its broadest sense, it is possible perhaps to more clearly discern the inspiration for much later developments and to suggest a much wider research agenda for the planning history of 19th and 20th century New Zealand. This does not deny the significance of Schrader and Hamer, 21 who have contributed much detailed analysis on the establishment and development of New Zealand's urban fabric, or of Memen and Scott's overview of the origins of planning in New Zealand. Rather, we advocate the adoption of an eclectic approach with perhaps less emphasis on "town planning" and more on resource use in its widest definition. In this way it is possible to encompass the town planning aspects while looking forward to the resource focus of the most recent legislation.

There is a substantial literature on early town planning and the city beautiful movement in the British Empire. One example is provided by Home, writing in Planning Perspectives in 1990. It is useful to compare how Vogel's initiatives conform to the broader pattern of colonial town planning that Home discusses. Home's account of the development of town planning in the British colonial empire on the careers of Albert Thompson, who worked in Africa and Charles Reid (1863-1953) whose professional career was spent in Australia, Malaysia and Northern Rhodesia. Their work is placed against a backdrop of A.D. King's writings on colonial urban development. It is considerably worth noting here that Reid was New Zealand born and that he published the garden city/garden suburb movement on a New Zealand tour before World War I. Home deliberately focuses attention on "the conflicts created by the relationship of British town planning activity to the politics of colonial rule." 22 Given that the model of colonial town planning activity (based on King) laid out by Home suggests that in white settler colonies, town planning activities were typically company towns and garden cities, with the usual mechanism being the private sector, the present focus on Vogel and state initiatives is important in that it indicates that the scope of "planning" in New Zealand was somewhat wider than the New Zealand company settlements or the garden suburb movements of the early 20th century. Freeman and Hutchings' review of the state of Australian planning history has some significant resonances for New Zealand readers, particularly their final statement about the main challenges ahead: "more original research, more integrative effort, a touch more national cooperation, more applied analysis, more contribution to current and emerging issues." 23 Thus the observation is an agenda which is not restricted to planning historians.

An Act to provide for the Sale of Land in the Province of Hawke's Bay on Deferred Payments, and for the setting apart of Land in the Province for Special Settlement.

[25th October, 1872]

BE IT ENACTED by the General Assembly of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:

I. The Short Title of this Act shall be "The Hawke's Bay Bella Title, Special Settlements Act, 1872," and it is divided into two Parts, as follows:

PART I.—Land on Deferred Payments.
PART II.—Special Settlements.

Figure 5. Special Settlements Legislation for Hawke's Bay, 1872
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Melbourne from the River Yarra in the late 1950s

REPORT


This is a book based on a research project taking a critical look at mixed use development. It examines the history and development of land use zoning and the reasons why concerns about more sustainable cities lead to a greater mix of uses. Mixed use development is about retaining or creating a mix of different uses in cities or neighbourhoods. This study examines examples of policies and schemes which have created new mixed use developments and the attitudes of developers involved in such schemes.


During the 19th century many of Europe's capital cities were subject to major expansion and improvement schemes. From the boulevards of Paris to the Vienna Ringstrasse, the townscapes which emerged still shape today's cities and are an indelible part of the cultural heritage of Europe. Thomas Hall examines the planning process in fifteen of those cities. His detailed analysis shows us that the capital city projects of the 19th century were central to the evolution of modern planning and of far greater impact and of importance than the urban theories and experiments of the Utilitarians.


This is the first book to cover the whole sweep of British colonial urbanism — from the plantation of Ulster in the 17th century through to the era of denationalisation after the Second World War. The colonies of the British Empire gave rise to many of the biggest cities in the world. Colonial policy and planning had a profound effect on the form and functioning of these cities. In this critical assessment of the impact of British colonialism on urban development Robert Home addresses a number of themes: the legacy of Shaftesbury's Grand Model in the New World and elsewhere; the origins of racial segregation from Raffles' Singapore to apartheid South Africa; the building and renewal of port cities across the continents; the neo-urban forms devised, from the grandiose town to the barrack block, the control of space by engineers and doctors.
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This is a comparative study of urban development in London and Hamburg from the mid-19th century through to the period after the Second World War. A comparative analysis of slum clearance programmes in the period forms the basis of the study. Slum clearance is presented as a multi-faceted form of modernisation, and it is discussed within the framework of the urban development policies of the time. The many illustrations and maps help to document the different renewal projects in both cities. The study verifies that the causes, forms, perceptions, measures and results of slum clearances were subject to several historic shifts. The book also reviews the discussions and conflicts about urban renewal that took place in the scientific community in both countries, for example, at international conferences. Dirk Schubert presents us with a detailed assessment of the wide-ranging and multi-faceted perceptions of the problems and practices of urban renewal as a strategy for modernisation. He also believes that the study of past problems can shed light on current debates.


This book tells how the new town of Columbia was planned and built in the early 1960s. The editor, Robert Tennenbaum, the developer's chief architect and planner during the early years and a long-time resident in this idealistic settlement. The sixteen chapters in the book were written by fourteen people actively involved in creating Columbia. They provide first-hand accounts of the rationale, conceptualising, managing, planning, design, marketing and construction of this experimental town.

This well-illustrated set of personal recollections does not claim to be a scholarly history based on extensive research. This fascinating and wide-ranging account of the aims and objectives of the idealistic founders of Columbia and their early trials and tribulations will provide future historians with a starting point for reviewing the dreams and realities of this "new city".

PUBLICATIONS
between powerful metropolitan states and colonised territories, the Balkan countries. Alexandra Yerolomos rightly suggests, provide an intermediate link in the history of town planning which deserves our attention.

This well-illustrated study introduces us to the process of urban restructuring that took place in the Balkan countries in the 19th century. The early chapters contrast traditional layouts with the new planning values penetrating the Balkans during a period of dramatic political change. Yerolomos exposes in more detail the decline of the traditional city of Adrianople at the turn of the 20th century. Taking her analysis a little further she looks at the transition from the traditional to the modern city by studying the urban expansion and changing uses of city walls in the late Ottoman Balkans. This attractive and useful book concludes with a finely illustrated account of the replanning of Thessaloniki after the fire of 1917 and the beginning of modern town planning in Greece.
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