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1.0 Introduction
The biennial international conferences of the International Planning History Society (IPHS) are its flagship event. The 2008 conference will be the thirteenth in the regular biennial conference series since the Planning History Group was reconstituted into the IPHS in 1993. The recent programme has seen conferences in Hong Kong (1994), Thessaloniki (1996), Sydney (1998), Helsinki (2000), London/Letchworth (2002), and Barcelona (2004). New Delhi will host the 2006 Conference. All the conferences have been successful in drawing 200-300 delegates from around the world. The IPHS is looking to continue this tradition of inclusive, enjoyable and stimulating gatherings. Bids are now invited to host the 2008 conference. Bids will comprise in the first instance a brief but substantive "Expression of Interest" (EOI). One or more short-listed bids will then be invited to submit a more detailed proposal.

2.0 Two stage bidding process
This new two-stage process is intended to stimulate as much interest as possible in realistically hosting the conference but without requiring the detailed documentation that a full proposal would entail. Stage 1 thus only calls for summary Expressions of Interest (EOI). These will be used to identify one or more bids for a more detailed Stage 2 proposal, to be finalised within a two month period. Ideally, one preferred bid will be identified from Stage 1 to avoid expending resources in competitive bidding.

3.0 Deadline
The deadline for the EOI is 30 March 2006. Anyone interested in submitting an EOI should be in ongoing contact with the President well before this deadline to discuss the development of ideas in outline form.

4.0 Timeline
An indicative timeline of the process is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By late November 2005</strong></td>
<td>Invitation for EOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By 30 March 2006</strong></td>
<td>Deadline for EOI (stage 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By 30 April 2006</strong></td>
<td>Selection Committee evaluates EOs and makes recommendation to IPHS Council to invite a formal bid or bids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By 30 June 2006</strong></td>
<td>Deadline for bids (stage 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By 30 July 2006</strong></td>
<td>IPHS Council decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2006</strong></td>
<td>Announcement at New Delhi conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Evaluation Process
EOIs are submitted to the President of the IPHS by the deadline date. They will be distributed and evaluated by a selection committee chaired by the President. The Committee comprises the Society’s Management Board and two other Council members invited for geographical representation and experience in conference organisation. This Committee makes a recommendation to the IPHS Council for one or more of the EOs to proceed to a detailed proposal.

6.0 Selection Committee to Review EOIs and proposals for 2008
Robert Freestone (chair), Management Committee (all office holders ex officio), Cristina Leme, and Laura Kelbe. Other Council members may be co-opted to assist in decision-making.

7.0 Eligibility to make EOIs
Any financial member of the International Planning History Society is entitled to make an EOI. IPHS members may do so individually or as a consortium. Non-IPHS members of a consortium are permitted. However, one IPHS member must be designated as the IPHS Conference Convenor for the period 2007-2008. Co-convening is possible if lines of authority and reporting are transparent.

8.0 The form of EOIs
These should be succinct statements in electronic form (as a Microsoft Word email-attachment) anticipated to be no more than 4 A4-sized pages in length. They should attempt to anticipate key organisational matters (see 11.0 below) as best they can at a preliminary stage. Early indication of likely institutional and other financial or organisational backing is considered a crucial factor.

9.0 The form of the invited proposal
These will be more substantial documents with a core text of approximately 10 pages. However, supporting descriptive and explanatory material would be appended. These formal proposals should attempt to address all major conference theme, facility, financial, organisational and marketing questions as comprehensively as possible. It is understood that many of these responses may be basic even in this expanded format given that the conference will be at least 2 years away from the time of submission.

10.0 Submission of EOIs and detailed proposals
Stage 1 EOIs should be emailed to the President of the International Planning History Society by the deadline date. The detailed Stage 2 proposal will be emailed and posted/couriered to the IPHS Council for one or more of the EOs as appropriate. The form of the invited proposal should comprise (a) one original and complete hard copy document, (b) an additional ten hardcopies, and (c) an electronic version of at least the core text (as a Microsoft Word email-attachment or disk).

11.0 Matters which EOIs (in outline) and proposals (in more detail) should cover

11.1 Dates
When in 2008 will the conference be held? It is preferable that this be specified as exactly as possible. In determining dates, proposals should have particular regard to events that may compete directly with the IPHS Conference, either locally or internationally. This would include other academic planning, history and urban studies conferences such as ACSP, AESOP, World Planning Schools, Urban History Association, etc. There can be advantages in being scheduled close to what might be seen as another comparable event in a way which enables travelling delegates to attend two conferences in a short time period. Local considerations such as University dates and seasonal factors will obviously be important. Proposals should also consider the impact of timing on visitors from other countries which may have different University terms, public holidays etc. Middle of the year timing has been thought most convenient for attracting delegates from around the world through university breaks and vacations, but this is not a requirement. Most conferences since 1998 have been held in July, one in August, while the New Delhi meeting will be in December 2006, mainly for climatic reasons. Some leeway for refining exact dates is also permitted.

11.2 Location
Accessibility by air from different parts of world is essential. The general suitability of the locality and region for a planning history conference (in terms of subjects of local interest, fieldtrips etc) is important. A central concern of the IPHS has always been to ensure successful events in a variety of locations that fully express the international spirit of the society and facilitate the global development of planning history. In deciding the location for the 2008 conference, preference may be given to a bid representing new territory for the Society but this will not be an overriding consideration. The choice of locations is ultimately determined by the willingness of members to produce proposals. A secure location where the health, safety and security of delegates can be secured is obviously essential.

11.3 Organisation
Who is actually organising the bid? Who are the key people and what will be their responsibilities? Constituting a local organising committee and an international advisory committee has emerged as a standard organisational template for recent conferences. Also, input from professional conference organisers has been secured. However it is important to differentiate the scholarly components (e.g. assessment and programming of presentations) from the logistical ones. An IPHS Conference Convenor needs to be nominated. A single point of contact at least during the early organisational phase is desirable.

11.4 Institutional support
Some forms of institutional support (variously financial, in-kind, logistical, venue etc) is seen as essential to guarantee the viability and professional organisation and credibility of the conference.

11.5 Venue
Where will the conference be held? For cost reasons, previous conferences have been mostly based on university campuses but with a variety of other private and public venues used for particular special events. Both the 2002 (in part) and 2004 (completely) conferences were held in off-campus locations. Bids will need to bear in mind the need for a mix of venues to host various events: plenary sessions, simultaneous paper sessions, business meetings, public exhibits, space for breaks and meals, basic amenities, proximity to accommodation and general ambience.

11.6 Accommodation
Is there sufficient quantity and variety of accommodation at different price levels (first class, moderate, economy, student) in reasonable proximity to the conference venue? How will arrangements for
accommodation booking be handled – separately or in conjunction with conference registration? Can special rates be secured for delegates in a range of institutions?

11.7 Themes of the Conference

What will be the central theme or themes of the conference? These should be related to planning history and framed sufficiently broadly to allow the widest participation by delegates from all parts of the world. Bids should indicate whether it is intended to combine the conference with any other event, for example, a national conference on planning or urban history. If such a joint event is envisaged, it is important to show that the international planning history dimension will not be compromised.

11.8 Outline of the Conference

Bids should include an indicative timetable and outline of the conference programme. The core conference would normally be envisaged as a 3 day event. In framing the program, holders should bear in mind that each IPHS conference needs to include a plenary lecture to be called the ‘Gordon Cherry Memorial Lecture’. Support for this is effectively offered through the conference subsidy (see 13.0). The lecturer will be chosen by the conference organizers, in close consultation with the IPHS President, and taking advice from other officers, council members, and advisory committees as necessary. The program will also include a time for an IPHS Council Meeting immediately before the main conference. The model used for recent conferences provides a guide with their mix of plenary and parallel sessions, opening reception, conference dinner, fieldtrips, business meetings, and other special events.

11.9 Fieldtrips

It is the custom of IPHS conferences to include local fieldtrips during the conference programme, perhaps with optional longer visits pre- or post-conference.

11.10 Language

The principal language used at IPHS conferences is English. Most IPHS conferences are held entirely in English. Occasionally, however, for local reasons, organizers have provided simultaneous translation facilities for plenary events and/or included some optional sessions in other languages. Bids should indicate if they have any intentions of this kind. Both non-English and multi-lingual plenary sessions need to be indicated in conference documentation.

11.11 Website

It is essential that a conference website be established at an early stage, for both marketing and information purposes. This will need regular updating if it is to be a fully effective means of communicating with potential and actual delegates. Bids should indicate who will be responsible for website preparation and management.

11.12 Conference publications

A detailed program and book of paper abstracts including contact details of all delegates is essential. The IPHS also strongly encourages publication of conference proceedings to include full versions of all papers presented (whether in printed, CD-ROM or other form).

11.13 Refereeing of abstracts and papers

Either one or the other, preferably paper refereeing, is desirable. The certainty that papers will be published, along with some form of quality control, is often mandatory for paper authors seeking official travel assistance from their employers.

11.14 Financial support

The financial performance of the conference is the responsibility of the Conference Convenor and is in no way guaranteed by the IPHS. A pledged or guaranteed level of sponsorship is likely to ensure viability. Letters of support for resourcing should be attached to the detailed proposal document.

11.15 Finances (detailed proposal only)

An outline financial plan of the conference is required. This should cover such issues as projected registration fees (with different categories such as IPHS members, non-IPHS members, students and retirees, early bird discount, etc.), estimates of numbers attending (broken down into local, international and other relevant delegate categories), projected fee income, possible sponsorship income, and major outgoings, identifying fixed and variable costs. Indications of what the standard registration fee will and may not cover are important. Conferences should be planned to at least cover their costs. Any surplus after relevant expenses and administrative costs have been paid should be used to repay the IPHS subsidy. If any additional, substantial surplus remains, some contribution to IPHS funds would normally be anticipated.

11.16 Marketing (detailed proposal only)

An outline marketing plan for the conference should also be included. Marketing would be expected to include a mix of promotional methods (internet, fliers, published notices etc) appropriate to an international audience. The publicity effort should formally begin with an announcement at the New Delhi Conference in December 2006. Note because of this timing, there may be less than the normal two years to the 2008 event.

12.0 IPHS subsidy

The IPHS will provide an advance of £1000 (repayable if sufficient surplus is generated) to the successful bidder. This can be made available at an early stage in conference planning following the New Delhi conference.

13.0 Caveats

The conference should be self-funding and cannot rely on the financial guarantee of the IPHS. The Society further reserves the right to amend the timetable as indicated in Section 4.0, determine which EOI should proceed to a formal bid, invite more than one detailed proposal if necessary, and consider staging its international conference in association with another organisation.

14.0 Contact Details

Dr Robert Freestone
President, IPHS, 2002-2006
Faculty of the Built Environment
University of New South Wales
Sydney, New South Wales, 2052
Australia
email: r.freestone@unsw.edu.au

Tel: +61-2-9385-4836; fax: +61-2-9385-4507
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Abstract. By mid 19th century Riga's designation as a fortress started to unduly restrict its physical development and its economic activity. An important urban reconstruction followed when Tsar Alexander II allowed removal of the city's fortifications in 1856. In the same year a special Commission prepared a brief for the redevelopment of the area of the fortifications and the esplanade. The document stated that the area must be developed as a new city centre for Riga. The City Architect J D. Felisko worked out a design for the redevelopment in 1857. Contrary to widespread opinion that Felisko design was based on a semi-circular form and his concept was yet unfamiliar and fresh, the aim here is to show that Felisko's original concept was based instead on a linear W-E direction composition unifying the medieval city with its suburbs. Furthermore his proposal was much influenced by Western European theories of urban design and contemporary reconstructions of large cities in Western Europe. Felisko's design and its implementation is analysed here, also paying attention to processes, which encouraged the coming of Western influences to Riga and what hampered their realisation. Furthermore the question of how Riga could have been redeveloped and how it actually was done is analysed here. In order to accomplish these aims first a short overview of the historical and political background to the redevelopment process will be given. Then a careful examination of the redevelopment proposal submitted to the Government in 1857 will be presented. It will be continued with an examination of changes introduced into the proposal with the aim to simplify it and the implementation of the revised proposal will be considered. Finally the main findings reached in this paper will be summarised.
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Introduction

In the mid 19th century Riga was still a heavily fortified city, surrounded by large quantities of land occupied by the ramparts and a spacious, 400m wide area containing the glacis and the esplanade (fig. 1, Map of Riga in 1843, VRVM 53743-10). Beyond the esplanade there were suburbs, restricted by military requirements to be built up with only one-storey wooden houses without basements, so that in case of war it would be easy to destroy buildings to clear the territory for military needs. Inside the fortifications there was the medieval city, with narrow, winding streets, densely built up, having no possibility to develop and to expand. Imperial authorities hampered the city's development, requiring Riga to remain a fortress, although abolition of the fortress status was crucial for the city's industrial and commercial development.

In the mid 19th century Western Europe had already some experience in redevelopment of fortified cities. In cities, whose fortifications were dismantled during the second half of the 18th century and in the beginning of the 19th century, the redevelopment area was densely built up and fully amalgamated with the rest of the city, like in Paris, Berlin, Turin etc. The redevelopment of fortified cities, which took place later in the 19th century, differed from that of the previous period. Then the redevelopment area was not fully built up and some space was left also for greenery there. It seems that several philosophical theories on urban development matters, particularly the English theories on landscape gardens, influenced this change.

Relatively little research has been done on the redevelopment of the fortification area in Riga. The only attempt in explaining the process of development of the area is presented by Krastins. He claims that authors of the redevelopment design presented in their proposals a large number of completely unfamiliar and fresh urban ideas. Krastins describes the urban redevelopment concept as based on a semicircular form, determined by the shape of the fortification area and considers the development between the two separated parts of the city, as an infill composition, the backbone of which was the fortification moat converted into a canal. His account arguably is based on analogies of infill concepts in Gothenburg (Sweden) and Graz (Austria).

Contrary to the existing explanation of the development process referred to above, this paper aims to prove that the original concept of the redevelopment design was quite different from the concept of infill and that it was much influenced by Western European theories of urban design and contemporary reconstructions of Western European cities. In order to do so I will first provide a short overview of the historical and political background to the redevelopment process. Then I will proceed with a careful examination of the redevelopment proposal submitted to the Government in 1857. I will continue with examination of changes introduced into the proposal with the aim of simplifying it, and finally consider the implementation of the revised proposal. I will conclude with a brief overview of the findings reached in this paper.

Redevelopment of the fortification area in Riga 1856-1867

Historical and political background

Urban reconstruction of the city was possible only when Tsar Alexander II allowed removal of the city's fortifications in 1856, although he still required the retention of the Citadel. In the same year a special Commission of Riga City Council, led by Mayor E. Grunow, prepared a brief for the redevelopment of the 400m wide strip, which separated the medieval city from the suburbs. The document stated that the former fortification zone must be redeveloped into a city centre, be provided with new public buildings, and that the moat must be converted into a canal surrounded by greenery. The brief applied only to the part of the fortification area, which enclosed the medieval city, and this occupied only two thirds of the whole fortification belt, separating the fortified part from
suburbs. The members of the Council were mainly of German origin. They maintained inclinations towards Western European lifestyle and innovations, hence their attitude towards Riga’s future urban development. Arguably their preferences were based on the philosophical ideas of the Enlightenment and influenced by several examples of already redeveloped cities in Germany, as well as Haussmann’s reconstruction of Paris.

A plan for the redevelopment was worked out in 1857 by the City Architect, J. D. Felsko, together with an engineer O. Dietze. Felsko, who graduated from the Academy of Arts in Copenhagen in 1840, was thus educated in Western European traditions of urban planning and architecture. The most prominent theorists, whose writings were studied in Europe of the time, were F. Algarotti (1712-1764), A. H. Quatremere de Quincy (1755-1830) and H. Repton (1752-1818).

Felsko’s architectural legacy proves a good knowledge of the classical architecture of Rome and Paris, and it proves also his familiarity with the reconstruction of Paris of the beginning of the 19th century, when industrial, commercial and transport development needs created a large number of new building types like covered markets, warehouses, stock-exchange buildings etc. It seems that Felsko was influenced by Repton’s theoretical writings and by the already implemented redevelopment plan for Gothenburg, prepared in the first decade of the 19th century. There are some analogies in the designs of Riga and Vienna too, but it is worth noting that Felsko’s design predates the international competition for Vienna Ringstrasse development by at least a year (fig. 2).

Redevelopment scheme of Vienna in 1859, Kratins, 1968, 101). There are no analogies Felsko’s urban redevelopment proposal in Russia of the same period. A characteristic feature of the Russian towns during the 19th century was their development without an urban development plan, by merely extending the street system created in the 18th century.

Felsko’s proposal for the city’s redevelopment was finished in January 1857 and submitted to the Tsar in May 1857. Full costs of the implementation were estimated at 1.5 million Russian Rubles. The Tsar approved only the most urgent part of the proposal concerning the dismantling of the fortifications. The Russian government did not provide funds for the redevelopment of the city and imperial authorities considered Felsko’s proposal too expensive and suggested the design should be simplified.

A team under the supervision of architect J. von Hagen, who was in the service of the Government-General of Livland during the demolition of Riga’s fortifications (1857-1863), made several changes to the plan to simplify it. The revised design preserved Felsko’s proposal in broad lines but also lost several of its significant aspects.

Plan form and street network designed by Felsko. According to Kratins, Felsko’s urban concept was based on a semicircular form determined by the fortifications and was an infill composition. My aim is to show that Felsko’s concept, which was based on the necessity to amalgamate two separate parts of the city, was more far-reaching, and hence his proposal for a central boulevard as the main W-E axis for the city’s complex development and unification of the medieval city with its largest, St. Petersburg Suburb. The redevelopment of Riga presented a rare historical opportunity to integrate the hitherto separated medieval city and its suburbs, and to design a modern city centre there. Felsko did it by connecting the street of the medieval city, leading eastwards from the Town Hall Square, to the main suburb of the St. Petersburg Suburb by a broad central boulevard. To emphasize the significance of the W-E axis a proposal based on Italian urban composition principles was prepared, the design of which included a large circular piazza situated along the central boulevard (fig. 3). Felsko & Dietze project 1857, VRVM 30553, This piazza, like similar examples in Rome and Paris, was designed as a focal point, with five boulevards and streets radiating star-like out from it. It seems that a sixth boulevard would also be intended to make the whole design symmetrical about the W-E axis, provided the area of “The Esplanade” would not continue to be used for military purposes. It was the first bold attempt to introduce such a street system in Riga. The piazza was the also public central square instead of the medieval Town Hall Square, which was too small for the developing city.

Felsko’s plan encompassed only the area along the eastern and southern side of the medieval city because the northern part could not be changed due to the continuing fortress status of the Citadel’s fortifications. Felsko divided the area possible for the redevelopment into two distinct parts, which differed functionally. The eastern part, on both sides of the central boulevard, he designed as several strips set roughly perpendicular to the boulevard. These strips included rows of residential blocks separated by two belts of open space envisaged for public greenery. Altogether four streets connected the medieval city to the St. Petersburg Suburb on the east – the central boulevard, one street to the north of it and two streets to the south of it. For these connections Felsko partly utilised former tree lined alleys, which were replanted as the esplanade since the beginning of the 19th century. The central boulevard and the southernmost street, which separated functionally different zones, were designed twice as broad as the two other streets connecting the medieval city with the suburbs. By increasing the width of the central boulevard and by designing the central public square on its axis, Felsko clearly emphasized the significance of the W-E direction. It is an aspect, which contradicts Kratins’ account that Felsko’s design was an infill, based on the semicircular form of the fortifications.

The southern part was separated from the eastern part and the medieval city by a wide street to emphasize its specific function, and had only two streets connecting it to the medieval city. The area contained several interrelated parts envisaged for railway transport development, commercial harbour, markets, and warehousing.

Public spaces and public building sites Felsko’s design proposed two interesting major public spaces – the previously mentioned circular piazza, situated on the axis of the central boulevard, and a large, pentagonal public square, located on the site of the former Christian Ravelin between the south-eastern corner of the medieval city and the railway station area. The large circular piazza was to have crescent-shaped buildings forming a background for a monument placed at its centre. It is possible that Piazza S. Pietro or Piazza della Repubblica in Rome served as prototypes for this design. The monument was to be a focal point for several radiating streets, and the piazza faced the open space of “The Esplanade” and Wöhrmannscher Park (now – Fermanov dars) – an English style landscape park planted on the esplanade from 1815.

The pentagonal square, which was designed for a large Meat Market, was to have a large semicircular building in its centre with arcades along both facades. In front of the building was proposed a round basin. Three
sides of the square were to be built up with new buildings but the back of the semicircular building opened onto the canal and greenery. In both cases one can notice some Parisian influence. Both of Felsko’s piazzas, like Place de la Concorde in Paris, faced an open space. 

A very important aspect of Felsko’s design for the eastern part was the wide space envisaged for greenery. To reserve so much space for greenery within the city’s built up structure was certainly influenced by Repton’s writings and by the popularity of landscape gardens in Riga since the beginning of the 19th century. Felsko’s inner greenery belt, which ranged in width from 160m to 200m, contained differently sized and shaped areas on the banks of the winding canal. Within this parkland setting Felsko provided sites for several new public buildings – a theatre, two administrative buildings, a gasworks for street lighting purposes, and some reserved sites for future needs. Every particular building with its close surroundings was subordinated to the whole ensemble of the inner park belt and also to the general urban proposal, as was propounded in Quadrangle de Quincy’s and Repton’s writings.

The outer open space belt, which ranged in width from 210m to 260m, was divided into three sections by the street system radiating from the circular piazza. The southern section incorporated the previously established park – Vermanes dārzs with two sites for public buildings in it. The northern section was kept as an open area for military exercises and parades, retaining the name of “The Explanade”, while the triangular area between them was set aside for an octagonal circus building situated in a public garden.

The southern part of the redevelopment area Felsko designed for the growing and anticipated transport and commercial needs of the city, providing space for a railway station, new warehouses served by railway spurs, and a large water basin, at the eastern end of which was a site for a public building, acting as its focal point.

The basin, connected to the Daugava River, was to be a harbour with several wharves, allowing nine commercial ships to be discharged simultaneously. Felsko’s plan provided also a covered fish and vegetable market designed as a commercial arcade to be built along the whole riverside edge of the medieval city. Here one can detect another Parisian influence – the St-Germain Market (1816, architect B. Blondel) in Paris was also designed that way.

Felsko prepared detailed drawings for the commercial arcade, gasworks and warehouse buildings. These drawings show his appreciation of the Gothic style propounded by Repton, although for residential, administrative and school buildings he preferred the Classical style, as recommended by Algarotti.

Von Hagen’s revisions of Felsko’s proposals

Russian Imperial restrictions hampered the implementation of Felsko’s redevelopment proposal. Although von Hagen tried to preserve Felsko’s original concept in broad lines, nevertheless in his revised plan Felsko’s design was noticeably simplified and many particulars were omitted. Von Hagen made the following modifications to Felsko’s proposed street and block system.

The alignment of the most southern street connecting the medieval city with suburbs was changed to follow the former plan designed in 1815 probably because of difficulties in crossing a low, damp area.

Because of this return to the 1815 plan, the residential area of four trapezoidal blocks in the south eastern corner, between the railway area and Vermanes dārzs, was simplified in form and provided with only two prolonged blocks:

- Blocks and open space belts were given more simplified shapes and even widths;
- The medieval city was given a more continuous edge with a block strip of even depth;
- The total number of blocks was reduced from twenty to fourteen, and von Hagen showed only block outlines.

Von Hagen also made significant changes to the planning of the public spaces and buildings. The circular piazza was reduced to only a small rond-point, and the polygonal square was simply abandoned and its area incorporated within the inner greenery belt. The number of public building sites in the parkland area was reduced.

The most radical changes were made in the southern commercial and transport zone. The water basin was altered to reflect the former shape of the moat, and the public building at its end was abandoned. The warehouse area, elaborately designed by Felsko, was not detailed at all in von Hagen’s plan. Felsko’s proposed triangular space in front of the railway station was much diminished in size, and several railway lines, which according to Felsko had to enter the city, were also lost, so that only one railway line entered the city on von Hagen’s plan. The commercial arcade on the riverside was completely abandoned (fig. 4, Hagen’s project of 1858, RACNA 257).

Clearly the scope of public works in Felsko’s proposal was not only very expensive but was also seen as too radical. Felsko had even envisaged pedestrian and vehicular traffic separation by introducing two levels, so pedestrians could move along the park belt without crossing streets – a modern approach that seemed too sophisticated to the Imperial authorities.

Implementation of the plan

The project, as revised by von Hagen, was submitted to the Tsar in June 1858 and the Tsar approved it in July 1858. Implementation of the revised redevelopment plan started soon after. The fortifications continued to be pulled down after 1857 and the moat was narrowed into a canal. Planting of the inner park belt along the canal was commenced in 1859. A. West, who was previously a garden designer in Lübeck, Germany, worked out the design for the park planning. The planning of the park is shown on the maps produced in 1860 and in 1864. In general lines the park planning followed that designed by Felsko in 1857. As the central circular public piazza was abandoned and the development in general much reduced in scope, the main redevelopment activities took place in the eastern part on both sides of the canal. Nevertheless a broad central boulevard with a tree-lined median strip was laid out to cross the inner greenery belt, to emphasize the W-E direction of further development. Felsko continued to be the City Architect and to direct the redevelopment process till 1879.

It was in 1860 that the private residential building development started along the boulevards in accordance with regulations issued by the City Council. The regulations determined the depth of lots, but their street frontage depended on purchaser’s wishes. The minimum frontage allowed was 50 Russian feet (about 15 m). Only a ground floor might be erected, and the street frontage had to be fully occupied by a building or at least a fence 9 feet (about 2.7m) high. Each lot had to have a courtyard not less than 91 sq. m in area, and at least 8.5m wide, to allow light into all rooms within a building. The height of buildings was not to exceed six stories (21.3m from street level to the cornice and 24m to the roof top).

These boulevard development regulations were similar to building regulations issued in Paris in 1823 and 1829. It seems Riga’s planners were influenced by Paris, where demands of standardisation and unity in overall street design overrode the architects’ interest in individual creativity, attention was focused on the effect that a street of continuous, similar buildings could create.

The regulations prohibited development of industrial and warehouse buildings within the boulevard zone – a novelty for Riga. Previously small industrial enterprises and warehouses were not separated from living houses, creating a mixed development.

Several new buildings in the redevelopment area were designed by Felsko himself, some of them being situated on sites envisaged by him in his proposal, although several of building sites proposed by him were changed. The first public building set in the parkland area was the German Theatre (now the National Opera), designed in the Classical style, and completed in 1862 on the former site of the Panacee Bastion, although Felsko had located the theatre on a different site. In the same year a gasworks for street lighting was built according to Felsko’s design on the former site of the Jacob Pillin, as had been envisaged by his own proposal. In 1861 the first railway line into Riga was completed under the supervision of English engineers and a passenger station was built as envisaged by von Hagen’s proposal. Removal of the city’s fortifications was finished by 1863. In the same
year important improvement was carried out for the city’s water supply and sewerage system. Only a few Russian cities had similar facilities at the same time.

By 1864, as shown on the map produced by W. Weir, not many of the residential buildings were built along the boulevards yet. Several lots within blocks situated between the park belts were transformed from residential to public building sites, where an Eye-Hospital was built in 1863 and three high schools between 1868 and 1875, one of them designed by Felsko in 1874. A full block was also reserved for a Polytechnic, which was built during 1866-1869. By 1864 only three of the 39 envisaged warehouses were already built and two were under development in the commercial zone. The site of the former Christian Ravelin by that time changed its use to a Flax Market with a large, long building for flax weighing (fig. 5. Map of Riga in 1864) that was different from the proposal designed by von Hagen.

By 1867 several other modifications were made to von Hagen’s plan, but in general the implementation of the revised redevelopment proposal went successfully and the area changed quickly under supervision of the Riga Building Commission. It is worth noting that the combined Felsko and von Hagen redevelopment proposal established for the first time a clear functional zoning for the city, and the design also achieved a significant integration of the city and its suburbs, which could form a coherent and developed as a unified urban structure.

Redevelopment of the Citadel’s fortification area 1872-1875

In 1871 the Russian government finally surrendered to Riga City Council the land occupied by the Citadel’s fortifications and its esplanade. Several planning proposals were prepared for the redevelopment of this newly incorporated area. In 1872 the Governor-General approved the proposal submitted by City Surveyor R. Stegman, but again von Hagen, by now an architect with the Government of Livland, was asked to modify it. The plan was based on similar principles to the 1858 plan, and extended the boulevard and park zones to the north.

Plan form and street network

The plan provided four new streets, which connected the Citadel’s area with the medieval city to the south, and placed several residential blocks to the north and in between the Citadel and the city. To the east, on both sides of the moat, the plan provided a parkland area, which included German Riflemen Society garden planted on the esplanade’s area in 1863. The garden together with the moat area formed a widened extension of the inner park belt.

To the north east of the garden Stegman designed a new residential area. By including five residential blocks in the area between the garden and Elizabetes Street, Stegman effectively closed off the northern edge of “The Esplanade” as had already been done at the southern edge of Vermanes dārzis. In this way he emphasised the symmetry of Felsko’s proposal for the open space belt on both sides of the central boulevard. The round-point, designed by von Hagen instead of Felsko’s circular piazza, was abandoned by 1876. The widened boulevard with a tree-lined median strip was laid out to continue the park already implemented during the 1860s. Thus the central public piazza designed by Felsko was replaced by a widened boulevard, stretching from the canal to Elizabetes Street.

Block form and size

The new residential area north east of the inner greenery belt was designed following Felsko’s design of the area between the railway station and the park Vermanes dārzis. Two perpendicular streets, creating four new blocks of trapezoidal form, crossed the large block. Another, triangular block was later crossed by a narrow street, giving back access to stables. The average size of lots was similar to those, designed by Felsko, being 25-35m wide along the street and 35-45m in depth, although the corner lots were designed larger 30-45m by 45 x 60m.

Implementation

Development of the new residential area was started already in 1873. Apart from the apartment houses there was also a large number of luxurious private villas like the mansions built in Paris during 1850s and 1860s. Most of them were situated on the corner lots of the new blocks, facing two streets. Villas occupied only part of the lot, and space was left for stables in the back and for a fenced garden in front. Villas didn’t exceed three stories and were designed to have two or three richly decorated facades seen from the streets.

Several high schools were also built in this newly redeveloped area by the end of the 19th century. The redevelopment of the Citadel’s fortification area was based on the same principles as the original Felsko proposal. Arguably Felsko, as the City Architect, influenced also the redevelopment activities of the Citadel’s fortification area.

Conclusions

Although several architects during a long period of time worked on the urban redevelopment plan and its implementation, all of them followed the same general idea – to create Riga a modern city based on Western European examples. The rich citizens of Riga, mainly of German origin, could never forget the city’s past times of independence and there was constant, although hidden, disagreement between the City Council and the Imperial authorities. Riga tried to oppose Imperial restrictions and to follow everything new coming from Western Europe. So new urban ideas to redevelop the Russian military stronghold into a modern industrial city were much welcomed in Riga.

It is clear that Felsko’s redevelopment proposal was based on several urban theories dominant in Western Europe since the 19th century. His planning concept was influenced by Italian urban composition principles; the building form followed French canons of regularity, based on building regulations; but the English influence appeared in the unity of the architectural design and the landscape garden.

The lack of Imperial backing forced the city to implement less ambitious projects than first envisaged by Felsko, and the city lost several essential public spaces, at least three large squares, which could much contribute to its architectural and urban quality. Nevertheless the basic urban concept designed by Felsko withstood all changes and even nowadays contribute to the city’s environmental quality.

Although the area of the former fortification zone nowadays appears redeveloped according to one comprehensive design, concept as suggested by Krastins, it was actually designed in several stages and consisted of three quite different parts – the central residential and public building zone, proposed by Felsko as the most significant, public part, and two smaller parts – the southern commercial and transport zone, and the northern residential zone. Such zoning still exists today, the widened central boulevard still forms the main connection of the medieval core with the rest of the city, and emphasizes the main direction of its development.

As a result of these 19th century urban projects the former “fringe belt” around the medieval city was redeveloped into a modern city centre. Building regulations assisted in creating a homogeneous character of the built area. Furthermore, Riga was provided with new recreation opportunities and modern public buildings. Contrary to most European cities, where the fortification zone was redeveloped into a homogeneous built up area, Riga achieved a striking impression of the extent of the former belt by the widened, central boulevard connecting the city’s medieval edge with the former suburban edge, by introducing two belts of greenery and by preserving the moat’s configuration in the layout of the canal.

Notes

1 I am thankful to Dr Arnis Siksna (The University of Queensland, Australia) for his very useful comments during preparation of this paper.

2 According to the philosophical writings of Francis Bacon.
This paper sketches concepts of culture as they have evolved in Australia and Britain from the beginning of the twentieth century up until the current day and examines the impact of these concepts on planning.

To begin this account, however, I first look back over the history of the last century in some detail. In overall terms, the first half of the twentieth century saw the dominance of the concept of high culture in society. High culture was expressed in bourgeois and elite terms that stressed perfectionism in individuals and societies. Planning concepts of culture reflected this. With the advent of the period following the Second World War, change was in the air and the 1970s represented a clear watershed. A more democratic concept of culture broke through, associated with the work of the cultural theorist Raymond Williams. This perspective emphasised the interrelationships within culture and culture as 'a whole way of life, material, intellectual, spiritual' (Williams, 1966, p. 16). An anthropological perspective to the study of culture was also propagated, stressing the importance of systems of meaning, the role of the symbolic and the significance of interpretation (Geeertz, 1973). These perspectives were dominant in the humanities and the social sciences and Williams’ view went on to influence planning. It did so first in the ‘softer’ areas of social and cultural planning, while not usually displacing the less critical concept of high culture in other planning sectors that it challenged. Development planning and most statutory planning remained at least in the unconscious grip of the concept of high culture. A close nexus to land, power and capital served to ensure the continuity of the more conservative conceptualisation of culture.

By the late twentieth century, however, with the acknowledged decline of ‘culture’ (Chaney, 1994) in the social sciences the overall philosophy of culturalism had triumphed, based on the concept of culture as ways of life and as systems of meaning. In addition, the flowering of the Information Age, occurring in tandem with the maturing of the cultural economy (Hall, 1998), meant that up-to-date concepts of culture could never realistically be over looked. 

Culture and Modern Planning

The relationship between planning, as it emerged in a highly developed form in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and cultural concepts up until the period of the 1970s and the onset of ‘the condition of postmodernity’ (Harvey, 1989), was one of strong correspondence. For the totality of the period of planning tended to reflect the concept of culture dominant in modern society. Following the 1970s the arrival of emergent concepts about culture was not necessarily announced or reflected in mainstream planning, introducing a lag between emergent concepts in the social sciences and humanities as they rose to dominance and their integration in planning processes. Such provision was in principle governed by considerations of equity – equity of access for the disadvantaged working classes unable to source ‘high’ culture from the private market. The elitist paradigm of culture and planning remains relatively more unmodified most often in bourgeois cultural terms. The concept of ‘high culture’ is best exemplified in Matthew Arnold’s Culture and Anarchy published in 1869 (Arnold, 1979). The work identifies ideal norms of human perfection and uses these as the basis for education and emulation. In Arnold’s ringing words, culture was ‘contact with the best that has been thought and said in the world’ (Arnold, 1979, p. 6). Selective and ideal in nature, and based on universal values, this eco-Platonic culture; ‘indefatigably tries, not to make what each raw person may like, the rule by which he fashions himself; but to draw ever nearer to a sense of what is indeed beautiful, graceful and becoming, and to get the raw person to like that’ (Arnold 1979, p. 50).

This was a long way from the ‘beer and games culture’, the everyday culture of Australian and British workers in the cities and suburbs, on whose improvement the early planners set in competition. This was a concept of culture focussed on aesthetics and the high cultural works of literature, music, painting and architecture, and was transmitted through a classical education (for
a male minority), ‘civilised’ values and standards and, the concept of ‘taste’. This pervasive model of culture was embedded in the middle class culture of planning and was reflected in planning priorities and practices that favoured the moral improvement to be gained from the cultural provision of education, museums, libraries, public gardens, art galleries and concert halls.

Much of this landscape changed profoundly in the period that followed the Second World War, with a broadening and democratization of culture. In Britain in the 1960s, the lives and culture of the working class emerged anthropologically in cultural and social research and professional history. For example, E. P. Thompson published *The Making of the English Working Class* in 1963 and (Hartley, 2003, p. 24) the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies was established at the University of Birmingham’s English Department, by Richard Hoggart in 1965 and founded a British discipline (Hartley, 2003, p. 26).

Raymond Williams worked throughout the post-war period redefining culture and its understanding in Britain. In Australia he was widely taught and read as were his companions E. P. Thompson and Richard Hoggart. Williams publicised and expounded the concept of culture as a way of life. This concept ‘new enquires a more or less canonical status as the founding concept of cultural studies’ (Bennett, 1998, p. 10). Williams *Culture and Society, 1780–1985* (Williams, 1986) was first published in 1958 (as a Penguin book in 1961) and charts changes in the meaning of the key word ‘culture’ for the period reviewed. In the text, Williams gives his much-quoted account of the meanings of the word culture cultivating in culture as meaning ‘a whole way of life, material, intellectual, and spiritual’ (Williams, 1966, p. 16). Williams was the most prominent advocate of his time for this position and his ideas have been influential in Australia and Britain ever since.

Apart from overturning the Arnoldian, or selective view of culture, Williams’ view had widespread influence in democratising the appreciation of the culture of all social groups and classes. At the global level this view is reflected in current UNESCO ideology and policy, as it has evolved since the 1970s. In Australia it is reflected in the Commonwealth’s first national cultural policy, *Creative Nation* (DOCA, 1995).

The 1970s watershed

By the 1970s popular culture and broader concepts of anthropological culture and popular culture derived from Williams’ work and the so-called ‘Birmingham School’ were responsible for topping the old ‘high’ culture from its pedestal. The universal standards of modernism in planning and architecture were also challenged by popular culture and more communitarian values as they emerged in the 1960s and 1970s. The ideas had an important impact on planning in terms of the development of community development philosophies and social planning practices.

The social revolution of the 1970s expressed and was itself an expression of more evolved ideas about culture described as culturalism. They were also perhaps a ‘bridge’ period in which competing ideas about culture were current and emergent and broader forms or categories of culture emerged in planning in an uneven fashion. At the same time, by the late 1970s the formerly dominant rationalist and positivist model of planning was being questioned and attacked from within planning itself (Searle & Cardew, 2000). The claims of culture were asserted in a segmented or ‘niche’ fashion through new ideas about the value of community culture. In Australia, Community Cultural Development (CCD) began to emerge as a planning philosophy and practice related to the development of communities through arts practices. Participatory community arts projects began to be undertaken in everyday places, seeking to involve all groups in the community – indigenous groups, migrant groups, women, men, children and the elderly.

The 1970s also saw a wave of innovation in relation to the conservation of cultural and natural heritage. At the international level, in 1978 the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), under the terms of the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, inscribed the Galapagos Islands as the first property on the World Heritage List. In Australia the *Commission of Inquiry into the National Estate* (1976), the Hope Inquiry, identified the importance of heritage and recommended heritage measures and legislation.

In particular, in NSW the *Heritage Act* (1977) and the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* (1979) represented an innovative framework for the development of new planning activities and practices. The concepts of heritage and of environmental planning were given broad definitions by its legislators. For example, environmental heritage was defined in the *Heritage Act* 1977 as ‘those buildings, works, relics or places of historic, scientific, cultural, social, archaeological, architectural, natural or aesthetic significance for the state of NSW’ (Young, 1985, p. 8). This definition offered broad scope for the accommodation of culture as ways of life, in society and in history and to a limited extent this vision was realised.

The 1980s & 1990s – Cultural and Heritage Discourse in Planning in Australia

In NSW, with the *Heritage Act* and the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act* in place from the late 1970s, planning moved out into a consideration of the discursive realities that the new legislation permitted. For example, the 1980s saw the introduction in NSW of a system of heritage studies based on multidisciplinary documentary and environmental research. The purpose was to identify a cultural bias in heritage assessment that split the tangible culture of buildings, works and places from their context of intangible cultural qualities. To remedy this, a heritage study methodology was designed ‘to implement a holistic environmental philosophy for the human-adapted environment’ (Young, 1984, p. 11). Also in NSW a useful prototype for the integration of culture in planning was developed in 1991 as the first NSW Cultural Heritage Strategy (Young, 1991). The Strategy promoted planning connectivity between departments of state and a holistic concept of culture, including Williams’ culture as ‘ways of life’, ‘heritage’ and ‘arts’. Indigenous and non-indigenous cultural maps were proposed for all local government areas in NSW, as a means to determine this.

At the federal level, the history of the early years of the 1990s in the context of culture is the history of the publication of a number of key Commonwealth policy documents and a subsequently influential model for cultural mapping. In 1992 the Commonwealth Department of Arts, Sport, Environment, Tourism and Territories (DASETT) issued a discussion paper *The Role of the Commonwealth in Australia’s Cultural Development*, which linked culture as an intellectual and artistic activity with culture as a whole way of life, in the spirit of Williams:

> The Government encourages and supports culture in its more specific sense (the practice and appreciation of music, the visual arts, literature, theatre, cinema, the preservation of our history and heritage) because of its fundamental importance to culture in a broader sense—that is, because of its importance to our whole way of life (Bennett, 1998, p. 89).

In defining culture as a whole way of life, the everyday lives of a multicultural society in all of their diversity were laid open to planning and interpretation. This concept of culture enabled the culture and values that inhered in working class lives, in indigenous culture and in residual centres to be taken into consideration and valued as important. This concept of a way of life was pluralised and extended into minorities represented by ethnic, migrant, and gay and lesbian communities. For example, in Sydney migrant culture and the cultures of home (Thompson, 1993; Armstrong, 1994) have been the subject of collaborative studies using focus groups and phenomenological and hermeneutic theory sensitive enough to capture neglected community values.

Planning for indigenous culture in the postcolonial context of Australia has also achieved notable innovations especially in relation to understanding the importance of variations in cultural meaning. Again, in post-industrial planning, such as for Sydney Harbour, planning strategies have sought to integrate regional and local culture in the form of traditional and contemporary ways of life, history, heritage, cultural meanings and cultural representations in the arts. Additionally, post-modern cultural and elsewhere has provided new interpretive categories and themes in the realm of strategic planning for marketing, tourism and heritage interpretation purposes.

The year 1994 was something of a high watermark for Commonwealth cultural initiatives. It saw the launch of Australia’s first National Cultural Policy *Creative Nation* and the initiation of a landmark cultural mapping project. *Creative Nation* accepted the anthropological view of economic development and referred to Australian culture as ‘the work of Australians themselves through what they do in their everyday lives, as communities and as individuals (whether it be as writers, workers in industry, farmers, parents or citizens)’ (Bennett, 1998, p. 89). The cultural mapping project resulted in a published guide, *Mapping Culture – A Guide for Cultural and Economic Development in Communities* (Clark, Sutherland & Young, 1995) that operationalised Williams’ concept of culture as ways of life and defined itself as a planning tool for cultural and economic development. Based on an ethical methodology it promoted the development of themes to characterise the culture of an area and to introduce perspectives from cultural theory and postmodern interpretation.

In overall terms, the pilgrimage of heritage discourse in planning since the 1970s in Australia has been an
important cultural journey. This story commences with Australia ICOMOS' adoption of The Australia ICOMOS Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance, (the 'Burra Charter'), in 1979, drawing on the 1964 Charter of Venice. The 'Burra Charter' was a major influence in establishing a more consistent process for preparing conservation plans, based on a sequence of assessing cultural significance, developing a conservation policy and strategy and implementing the strategy. However, it was not until the 1990s that community values and cultural diversity were accorded a fuller place in heritage policy. The development of indigenous cultural rights in Australia and the effects of the 'Mabo' decision of the High Court on land rights, however, quickened considerations of social value and a process to enforce this. The decision had the High Court of Australia recognised native title to land manifest for example in the pastoral industry. The United Nations founding documents and Declaration of Human Rights or humanity and UN documents and Declaration of Universal Declaration of Human Rights occupied a key, catalytic role here. This Declaration identified cultural rights as one of the fundamental rights of all human beings. These rights and related cultural policies for that purpose (Young, 1988, p. 39).

UNESCO's early normative struggles, based in rhetoric, laid the foundations for later developments. The concept of sustainability was integrated into planning at the Earth Summit at Rio through its Agenda 21 (United Nations, 1993) that nominated local cultural awareness as the foundation for the practical implementation of sustainability strategies for cultures and their environments. In the 1990s a number of the strands of earlier thinking coalesced in the 1995 findings of the World Commission on Culture and Development and its report, Our Creative Diversity (WCC, 1995). The independent World Commission on Culture (WCC) was established in 1992 by the United Nations and its document represents the full flowering of culturalism at the level of international governance. It argues that cultural policy when considered as the basis of development must be understood in the broadest of terms. It should not only be sensitive to culture but inspired by it. This inspiration includes making better use of pluralism as a source of cohesion in multi-ethnic societies (WCC, 1995).

Conclusion
The history of cultural concepts and planning is an interesting one. In the broad pattern of its history, up until the period after the Second World War, planning in Australia and Britain tended to reflect a socially dominant concept of culture. Following the bridge to postmodernity that was laid down in the 1970s, planning slowly began to reflect the onset of new cultural ideas, although it manifested a form of conceptual schizophrenia, including these ideas unevenly. More up to date ideas about culture were influential on planning's perceived margins in the sectors of social and 'cultural' planning and the like. A dominant or declining idea of culture was uppermost in planning's 'mainstream', that related directly to land and statutory processes and had a strong nexus with power and capital.

Nevertheless, a cultural sea-change for society was represented by the introduction of the concepts of culture as a way of life and the allied anthropological concept of culture that emphasised the need to interpret cultural variation and meaning. The concepts of 'ways of life' and the anthropological 'interceptive' view of culture are both now important normative tools in the development of culture and planning.

At the global level, the United Nations continued from its inception to resource intellectual, conceptual and empirical work related to culture to the point where it can now be used to assist in defining the opportunities for planning. However, a gap remains in the area of creating supporting and enabling methodologies to realise the conceptual vision and the outstanding opportunities. Yet, the deeper implications of culturalism for planning continue to be realised as the de-culturalised approach to planning modernism is still failing the test of relevance in the face of the ongoing expansion of the cultural economy (Scott, 2000) and the accelerating diversity of postmodern communities. Perhaps, as in the 1970s, societies now stand on the cusp of significant changes that may lead to a more thoroughgoing integration of culture in all social technologies, including the key beneficiary of planning.
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Introduction
A rapidly-growing body of publications attests to the historical significance of the brief period of c. 1941-1952 to the development of concepts and techniques in UK town planning (for example, Hasegawa, 1999; Tiratsoo, 2000; Larkham, 2002; Pendlebury, 2005).

During this period of "reconstruction planning" there were in the region of 250 examples of formal reconstruction plans, unpublished reports, third-party comments and so on (Larkham and Lilley, 2001, as updated), and at least 93 place-specific reconstruction planning exhibitions.

Recent estimates suggest that some 45% of plans were produced by consultants; indeed much of the literature has focused on key plans by well-known consultants (Jones, 1998; Lambert, 2000, and Larkham, 2004 on Patrick Abercrombie alone, for example). It is often suggested that the consultants were expensive to engage; but there has been no comparative work on this and other costs of producing the reconstruction plans. This short paper attempts to do so, together with exploring the related costs of using in-house local authority staff to prepare plans, which prove not to be surprising high, during a wartime and immediate post-war period dominated by rationing, austerity, and national financial crises.

The sources of information are very diverse. Much has been gleaned from news items in various contemporary journals, principally the Architect and Building News and The Builder. Such news items are very patchy in their coverage, and may be incomplete in their detail, since their source was the relevant consultant (who might wish to maximise the sum apparently paid, as a bargaining tool for future commissions) and local authorities (who equally might wish to minimise the sum paid out). In a few cases, other archival sources for individual architects or planners have produced greater details, including contracts, correspondence, or office notebooks.

The cost of consultants
It is sometimes suggested, explicitly or implicitly, that consultants were expensive for local authorities to employ (Larkham and Lilley, 2001, p. 3) and, therefore, that their employment could be a result of other processes, for example place-promotion and competition (Larkham and Lilley, 2003). Their expense is shown in Table 1. For better comparison, consultants' fees have been converted to 2003 equivalents using the formula developed for the UK Office of National Statistics by O'Donoghue et al. (2004). This not only aids our contemporary comprehension, but also avoids the considerable problem of inflation during the 1940s, when the great majority of these plans were commissioned. The data provided by O'Donoghue et al. show that the purchasing power of the pound in 1950 compared to 1940 was only 0.61. In comparison, the purchasing power of the pound in 2003 was more 0.028.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Date of contract</th>
<th>Fee (£)</th>
<th>Cost as at 2003 prices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Abercrombie</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>28,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Davidge</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>46,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Valley</td>
<td>Abercrombie</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>147,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>Lock</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>27,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Thompson, James, Pierce</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>59,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>Reilly, Asian</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>29,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>Minoprio, Spencerly</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>18,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>29,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>Abercrombie, Nickson</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>14,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Abercrombie, Nickson</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>28,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todmorden</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>14,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthing</td>
<td>Cowles-Vossey</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>68,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bank area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Holden</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>148,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>61,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch</td>
<td>Abercrombie, William-Ellis, Brett</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>24,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>18,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>26,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minehead</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>24,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>23,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>29,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockport</td>
<td>Sharp</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>59,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedford</td>
<td>Lock</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>21,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: from announcements in various contemporary professional journals; Sharp papers, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Notes
1. For this calculation see O'Donoghue et al., 2004, p. 18.
2. Payment for a 2-year contract.
3. The first figure represents Abercrombie's first estimate, in 1945; the second is his final bill in 1947.
4. Date of report publication, not of contract.
5. The total fee agreed by Bedford Council was £5,000; of this, Lock's own fee was £1,000.

For these plans, there seems little incremental increase in fees charged through the period commensurate with his increasing professional standing. Oddly, the little-known (in replanning terms at least) Cowles-Vossey was offered the same sum for replacing the centre of Worthing in 1946 that Sharp received for Stockport in 1949; although, such was inflation, that corrected to 2003 prices, Sharp received rather less in spending terms.

Thirdly, some consultants worked very closely with the Borough Surveyor, Engineer or equivalent; and it may be thought that the fee offered to the consultant might be smaller in recognition of the input from the authority's own staff. Certainly, Abercrombie's fee from Plymouth was low relative to many other plans; yet the Dover fee was, at £1,000 guineas, around the standard (although, with inflation, worth little more than Plymouth). In both cases Abercrombie worked...
closely with the local officers; indeed the Dover report was presented to the Council in the sole name of the Borough Engineer and Surveyor, P.V. Marchant.

It is known from some correspondence that the Town Planning Institute had a set of standard fees, to which many consultants adhered (for example Minoprio and Spencer for Worcester; Abercrombie for Warwick). Unfortunately, the RTPI has been unable to provide any details of this scheme. It may, however, explain the dominance of fees of £1,000 or 1,000 guineas (7 of the 22 examples in Table 1).

A further possibility is that the fee, whether in the TPI scheme or not, was linked to the size of the town. Table 2 compares fees with various features including population and area; and with the town’s rateable value (which may indicate ability to pay). For convenience, these data were extracted from the Municipal Year Book for 1945, which was the year when the largest number of reconstruction plans appeared. However, there is no discernible relationship between these variables (Figure 1). Large towns have offered small fees (Plymouth), while much smaller towns have offered higher fees (Chichester).

Table 2 also shows a “plan cost index”, aiming to show a relationship between rateable value income and consultants’ fees. The bombed towns on this list were offering fees at the low end of the cost plan index (note that some plans may have been contracted early in the war, immediately following bombing, when their rateable income was substantially reduced). Unbombed Worcester, however, shows a very similar index figure to bombed Exeter. The similar figures for Chichester and King’s Lynn are exceptionally high, suggesting a high fee in connection to the limited resources of these small towns; yet they were purchasing the services of one of the most prolific plan-makers, Thomas Sharp, who seemed to specialise in these smaller historic towns. Paying the same fee to the same person, Salisbury found him much more affordable; while wealthy Oxford was easily able to pay two-and-a-half times more. York is an exception here, as the known fee covers only one of the two consultants (and was funded by a local charity rather than directly by the Council). Portsmouth is shown here for comparison, as the data refer to a specific local authority employee (see below).

Simply producing the plan was often not the end of the consultant’s duties, nor of the fees charged. Sharp acted as an expert witness in the public inquiry over compulsory purchase orders immediately following his Exeter plan, for which his additional fee was £11810/10/0 (Minutes of the Special Committee on re-planning and re-construction of the city, 17/7/46, 20/8/46; County Record Office). Likewise, Max Lock’s fee for appearing as an expert witness at the public inquiry for the West Hartlepool Development Plan in 1950 was £13010/10/0; the Town Clerk wrote to Lock on 11/10/50 confirming his fee as 17 guineas per day inclusive of hotel and out-of-pocket expenses, for the duration of the inquiry plus not more than two days of preparation (correspondence in the Max Lock Archive, University of Westminster). At Dover, following approval of the report presented by Marchant, Abercrombie and Nicolson were engaged as consultant architects for the reconstruction of factory buildings, including preparation of an outline plan for the industrial area of the central precinct at a fee of 200 guineas (and other advisory duties at a fee of 1% of the cost of any factory erected). On 16/1/51 it was agreed to pay them £10615/0 expenses in connection with this sketch master plan (Dover Planning Committee Minutes, East Kent Archive Centre).

The cost of in-house staff

It is much more difficult to demonstrate the costs of using in-house staff for the purpose of producing reconstruction plans, since that was often only a small portion of their duties.

Occasionally, special staff were appointed. F.H.C. Maunder ARIBA was appointed as City Planning Officer and Reconstruction Architect to Portsmouth City Council at an annual salary of £1,250 (The Builder, 1944, p. 42). Manchester Corporation appointed 29 temporary planning assistants, at a cost of at least £7,000 per year, to work on both the city-wide and sub-regional plans produced by the City Surveyor and Engineer, R. Nicholas (Architect &

### Table 2: Comparison of plan costs with size and financial resources of towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area (acres)</th>
<th>Rates/</th>
<th>Rateable Value (£)</th>
<th>Cost of plan (£)</th>
<th>Plan cost index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>68,801</td>
<td>5,152</td>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>626,115</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>147,946</td>
<td>8,508</td>
<td>13/6</td>
<td>1,000,684</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chichester</td>
<td>14,912</td>
<td>2,869</td>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>159,102</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>66,629</td>
<td>9,127</td>
<td>12/6</td>
<td>671,209</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Lynn</td>
<td>23,528</td>
<td>6,687</td>
<td>16/16</td>
<td>126,194</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>8.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>139,900</td>
<td>7,205</td>
<td>14/14</td>
<td>757,564</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>126,236</td>
<td>7,923</td>
<td>18/16</td>
<td>762,115</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>80,530</td>
<td>8,438</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>900,677</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>208,182</td>
<td>9,515</td>
<td>10/4</td>
<td>1,569,158</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>252,421</td>
<td>9,223</td>
<td>13/6</td>
<td>1,678,067</td>
<td>2,188</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury</td>
<td>26,456</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>262,754</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>31,640</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>11/6</td>
<td>236,937</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torquay</td>
<td>22,222</td>
<td>12,790</td>
<td>14/3</td>
<td>113,834</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>13,483</td>
<td>5,057</td>
<td>11/4</td>
<td>106,060</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>50,497</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>12/12</td>
<td>407,278</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>676,912</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal Year Book, 1945 for columns 2-5.

Notes:
1. Mostly from 1931 Census, as there was no 1941 Census.
2. General rates, or excluding special levies.
3. Staffing costs only. Although some publishing costs are known, this is for so few towns that their inclusion would skew these results.
4. The “plan cost index” is calculated as Plan cost/Rateable value x 1000.
5. First figure is Lock’s fee; the second is the total cost inclusive of office and report printing costs.
6. Annual salary of F.H.C. Maunder, the Council’s City Planning Office & Reconstruction Architect, was £1,250; employed 7/4 - 4/46, so multiplied by 20 months.
7. Abercrombie’s fee estimate, in 1945, was “about £529”; his final bill, in February 1947, including additional work agreed by the Council, was £2,000.
8. Sum paid to Adshead; funded by Joseph Rowntree Village Trust, who also paid an unknown sum for FWC. Needham to work on this plan.
9. If Needham was paid the same as Adshead (in fact he worked on the plan for longer, after Adshead’s death) the final index would be 1.26.

Building News, 1943, p. 139. In the following year, an advertisement was published seeking temporary senior assistants in the planning section of Manchester City Surveyor’s Department, at an annual salary of £800 - £1,000 per year plus cost-of-living adjustment of £49 - £540; specifically to deal with proposals for the construction of built-up areas (Architect & Building News, 1944, p. 48).

Even where a consultant was engaged, as has been suggested, direct and indirect costs could fall upon the authority. In Bath, for example, “While Abercrombie laid down the framework of the plan, it is likely that most of the detailed work was done by Mealand and Owens, with a team of about 40 employees of the City Council and other consultants” (Lambert, 2000, p. 182). In many cases, correspondence and contracts make it clear that the authority was to provide maps, plans, surveys, and sometimes even junior staff to assist the consultant.

A ‘third party’ plan

A small number of plans were prepared by ‘third party’ plans, usually either individuals, or via local newspaper campaigns. However there is one example of a plan, published professionally in a format similar to Sharp’s plans, for which some financial information survives. In the Introduction to the survey and plan for...
“There was at first no clear idea about how much the enterprise would cost, or how long it would take to carry out. It was the first time such a thing had been done; but a guess of ‘one thousand pounds and one year’ was thought to be as good as any other. As events proved, these cost and time factors were much underestimated; the project, which included an exhibition in addition to the original programme, actually took nearly two years and expenditure was over £2,000” (Jeremiah, 1949, p.14).

Although Jeremiah’s salary would not have approached £1,000 a year, variable, but for the Public Control people at last and they, the brutes, have been silenced, we could actually see people raise an object to us and force us to a different conclusion, although firms were invited to subscribe £1.25 for colour copies and £1 for 'de luxe' copies at £2,500. The Dover solution also for an Abercrombie report – the first in the project, which included an exhibition in September 1946 – was accepted, and the price fixed at £2,000.

The Dover solution – also for an Abercrombie report – was to publish a very limited edition of 100 copies. Even this cost a surprising amount. On 17/2/47 Dover Planning Committee heard that costs of colour copies of plans for the report would be £105 for 100 copies; of the text £50 for 100 copies; and a royalty charge of approximately £9 per 100 copies for the maps. Four months later, on 17/4/47, the cost of printing was amended: the report, including card cover and folder for maps, would be £35/13/6; the maps would cost £173. This was accepted, and the price fixed at four guineas. These were out of stock by 10/5/48, when a reprint of amended maps was ordered at £102/10/ (Dover Planning Committee Minutes, East Kent Architectural Centre).

Overall, therefore, publication costs were not insignificant. A report on the Birkenhead plan in the Liverpool Daily Post (1945) suggested that the cost would be the equivalent of a 1d or 2d rate. Although, if all copies were sold, the authority would usually recoup some or all of its costs, few were profitable, especially when substantial numbers were given away for review or publicity purposes.

Some of the other costs associated with the replanning. However, these are rarely found in any detail. They can be very variable; as for Lock’s work on Hartlepool, where the incidental costs of the plan exhibition was at least £816, comprising a town centre model, £500; a contour model of the district, £100; detail models of 2 areas, £100 each; and consultant’s fees “for the design of buildings and the direction of the models”, £210 (Northern Daily Mail, 1947). Many plans were associated with public exhibitions of this type. Fees also usually included expenses, which commonly included travel but could also include many other items. Charles Reilly’s 1944 contract with Birkenhead provided for expenses including first-class travel for Reilly and third-class for his assistant Nam Aslan (contract in Reilly papers, University of Liverpool). Other incidental costs included, for example, replacing outdated Ordnance Survey sheets: on 15/9/50 Dover’s planning committee agreed to commission an aerial survey at £66, and prepare detailed plan sheets for 10 acres of the central reconstruction area at £13/12/- per acre, as the war damage had rendered the OS sheets out of date (Dover Planning Committee Minutes, East Kent Architectural Centre).

Lock’s archive records in substantial detail the estimated and actual costs of the Middlesbrough plan (Table 4). The final expenditure on the plan production (excluding most publication and any exhibition costs) was £6,689 (£129,543 at 2003 prices). This was about 14% higher than Lock’s original estimate. Including printing costs the total was £9,035, giving a substantially higher plan cost index (Table 2).
Articles

For Abercrombie’s plan for Warwick, the costs were even higher (Larkham, 2004). Although his original estimate in mid-1945 was £520, this rose within months to £1,000, and the final bill in early 1947 was for £3,200. This did include additional photography and an architectural survey, all agreed with the relevant Committee. Even so, given the small size of the town and its limited financial resources, this leads to a staggering plan cost index figure (Table 2). Publication costs were a further £3,000.

Conclusions

This paper uses admittedly fragmentary evidence from archives and contemporary publications to examine the costs of reconstruction planning, a feature little mentioned in earlier coverage of reconstruction. These costs were, clearly, high, especially if consultants were employed; although the variations in costs do not seem to be associated with the size and complexity of the job, nor with the eminence or experience of the consultant. The influence of the Town Planning Institute’s scale of fees on this variation is unknown; and not all consultant planners were TPI members. However, costs were also considerable even if in-house staff were used. The scale of costs can be more readily appreciated if they are represented in 2003 prices, and if they are compared to the town’s ability to pay as measured by its rateable value income. The index thus derived shows significant variation, with Warwick outstanding in the scale of its payment in fees and expenses, and in publication costs, relative to its size and wealth.

This clearer understanding of the nature and scale of the costs involved in producing reconstruction plans allows us to reconsider the motives for the production of so many plans by so many towns, damaged and undamaged.

Note

1 Although the surviving minutes (in the National Archives files) suggest that Pitman withdraws, the published result bears their name.
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Planning History 2005

Book Review


Murray Fraser, University of Westminster

This is an excellent book. It manages to avoid the usual problems of ‘primer’ collections – especially the feeling induced in the reader that they have heard it all before – and instead offers a lively and wide-ranging account of American architectural and urban history over the last 200 years.

The editor, Keith Eggener of the University of Missouri-Columbia, outlines his case in an admirably direct introduction. He wants to trace the evolution of architectural history in the USA from one of anecdotes, connoisseurship and jingoistic nationalism, to a new condition shaped by interdisciplinarity. As he shows, the very definition of architecture has changed from rarefied, ‘high art’ monuments created by individual geniuses, to something that is better understood by multivalent and deeper readings – heavily influenced by Michel Foucault and discourse analysis – of our cultural landscape as a whole. Diversity of topic and historical method is now the name of the game, and the 24 essays in this volume, all written since 1981, provide a vivid slice of current preoccupations within American academia.

Eggener adopts a literal starting point, defining his subject area as anything relating to the built environment within the present-day boundaries of the USA. He then organises the material into 6 chronological sections with their own broad-brush themes: indigenous and colonial peoples; post-colonial developments in the era up to the Civil War; post-bellum expansion; the emergence of the USA as a major cultural force after the First World War; the importation of European modernism in the mid-20th century, and subsequent postmodernist reaction; and, finally, the contemporary American city.

While most of the selected material focuses on buildings, often on interiors and ideas about domesticity, there is enough on urbanism and planning history to make it a fascinating read for those in related disciplines. Two standout and less well known essays, both written in 1993, are by John Michael Vlach on the morphology of Southern slave plantations, and Robert Rydell on the racist, sexist and culturally patronising undercurrents of the celebrated World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago.

Vlach deals rapidly with the issue of the ‘Big House’ so that he can move on to the real stuff of his text: the village layouts and everyday life of African-American slaves. He notes that only a tiny percentage of plantations were anything like the Gone with the Wind stereotype; the majority being smaller units with ‘only’ about 20-30 slaves working the land. Quite something, given an estimate of 2.5 million plantation slaves in the USA in 1860. There were noticeable differences in types of settlements between the main regional bases (Virginia, the Carolinas and Louisiana), and their landscapes were largely shaped by whichever was the main cash crop (tobacco, cotton, rice or sugar). He is fascinated by the ways in which African-American culture was created and nurtured on these estates, and notes the relative autonomy allowed to slaves in terms of sitting, designing and managing the villages that they lived in, just as long as it happened out of sight of the White slave-owners.

A similar concern with power imbalances in 19th-century America emerges in Rydell’s sustained and angry account of how Black and Coloured Americans were denied a voice in the ‘White City’ (sic) exhibition of 1893. Equally lamented in his dissection of the Chicago exhibition was the gender segregation represented by The Woman’s Building, designed by America’s first female architect of note, Sophia Hayden. And he barely keeps his cool over the subjugation of Eskimos, Native Americans, African tribesmen and Middle-Eastern peoples in the show. The presumption of ‘Western’ superiority ran through all of the 19th-century industrial showcases, it took on a more explicit spatial arrangement in Chicago in 1893 than it had previously.

Elsewhere in the book, a piece by John Stilgoe from the early-1980s analyses how the non-hierarchical and conceptually endless rectangular grid-plan conceived by William Penn for Philadelphia – heavily influenced by course of by others – created a rationalised urban model that was later to be used to organise two-thirds of the rural area of the USA during the era of westwards expansion. Dell Upton’s (1986) is fascinating on the social and spatial configuration of churches, courthouses and plantation mansions in eighteenth-century Virginia, whereas Daniel Bluestone’s (1991) offers an anti-nationalist reading of the profuse
While these figures clearly wrote about the built landscape of the USA from their own perspective, they all enriched the debate in many ways. In this book, the reader can expect to find a wealth of information on the architectural and cultural context of specific buildings, including the Pruitt-Igoe housing project in St. Louis. This investigation is not only of historical interest, but also reveals much about the contemporary American city, its culture of congestion and hidden desires of New York.

As to the post-war era, Katharine Bristol (1992) does a solid job in dismantling the myths of the Pruitt-Igoe slab block estate in St Louis, built in 1954 and famously demolished between 1972-76. Demonstrated in the press, and by Oscar Newman (because it showed the need for 'defensible space'), it eerily shows that during the Pruitt-Igoe era, architects could not have made too much happen, but alarmism about the decline of American cities is certainly abated. Even so, it is the bland admonishments of 'New Urbanism' that seem to be held greater sway, for reasons that cannot be gone into here.

These points, however, are not to diminish the achievement by Eggerner in this 'primer'. It is well worth reading, and the level of care and thought that has gone into the selection of texts, excepting the final section, is to be praised. With the trend towards wider and more culturally complex readings of American architecture and urbanism set to continue, the book acts as a valuable staging post in charting the fascinating developments.
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