The IPHS was inaugurated in 1993 as a successor body to the Planning History Group, founded in 1974 at London. The Society is aimed at promoting open, interdisciplinary, internationally-flavoured, ‘town-and-down’ dialogue between all interested in past, present and future of urban and regional planning. Its membership is drawn from several disciplines: Planning, architecture, economic and social history, geography, sociology, environment, politics and allied fields. Being a society to promote both multidisciplinary and practice oriented studies and research, its membership is open to all who have a working interest in planning history. Thus it welcomes members from both academic disciplines and professions of the built environment. The Society for American City and Regional Planning History (SACPH) and the Urban History Association (UHA) are American affiliates of IPHS.

Thus, the broad goals of the society are:

- To foster the study of planning history in advance scholarship in the fields of history, planning and the environment, particularly focusing on industrial and post-industrial cities.
- To encourage and give support to networks, which may be interest-based, region-based, or nation-based, working in the fields of planning history.
- To provide services for numbers, publishing a journal, promoting conferences, and providing an international framework for informal individual member contact.

To invite national organizations, whose work is relevant to IPHS, to affiliate status in pursuit of these aims the interests of IPHS are world-wide.

The members of IPHS elect a governing council every two years which is headed by the President of the society. In turn the Council elects an executive Board of Management complemented by representatives of SACPH and UHA. The President chairs the Board and Council. Since 1994, it organizes a bi-annual conference for academic interactions among the scholars and planners. The various conferences organized by the IPHS are given below.

The 12th International Conference of the International Planning History Society (IPHS) will be held at New Delhi between December 11-14, 2006. Delhi has witnessed the rise and fall of several empires as their seat of Government; hence, it was often compared to a phoenix that resurrects itself from its ashes. 3450 years of history have made it one of the greatest capitals of the world. Delhi has been the Indian city that has been the changing face of India over the last century in terms of political, economic, cultural and industrial activities. It has been the epicenter of India’s political life with more than 13.5 million inhabitants. A rich culture and heritage on one side as also the evils of industrialization associated with rapid urbanization make it one of the most unique capitols in the world. It is also unique among all the capital cities of the world in the sense that other than New Delhi there are seven-seventeen locations within Delhi (i.e. comprising of seven cities), which were the seats of different governments. However, the scope of this study is limited to the planning and development aspects of Delhi in the 20th century in terms of political and administrative developments, population growth trends, industrial and commercial activities, overall planning aspects, infrastructure development and financial aspects (the resource generation as well as spending). The administrative steps introduced from time to time to ensure proper and sustained development of Delhi are also examined. These growth trends are examined in relation to different phases during the twentieth century.
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Papers should be sent direct to Dr Clapson at mjciphs@aol.com.

Further information about the prize can be obtained from Mark Clapson on mjciphs@aol.com.

Planning Perspectives Paper Prize
The New Delhi Conference will also mark the second occasion on which a prize will be awarded for the best article on planning history published in the journal Planning Perspectives. The eligible date range is 2004-2005.

The prize - a two-year subscription to the journal and £150 worth of Routledge books - is provided by Taylor and Francis, publishers of Planning Perspectives.

For more information about Taylor and Francis and Planning Perspectives visit: http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/02665433.html

Book Prizes
The most innovative book in planning history written in English and based on original new research. Books must have been published in the previous two calendar years (2004-05).

The best book addressing planning history of South Asia and related to the region where the conference takes place, written in English. Books must have been published in the previous two calendar years (2004-05). Books may be individually or joint-authored. Anthologies and edited works are also welcome, but reprints and 'readers' are ineligible. The prize for each award is £250. The deadline for receipt of submissions was 1st May 2006.

Further information about the prize can be obtained from Chair of the Book Prize Committee Dirk Schuhert.

Tel: +49-40-42878-3661,
Fax: +49-42878-2472,
E-mail: d.schuhert@tu-harburg.de
TU Hamburg-Harburg, Schwarzenbergstrasse 95 Wd, 20133 Hamburg, Germany.
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Canvas to corrugated iron: Improving fremantle worker’s living conditions, following self government

Barrie Melotte
Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Western Australia
B.Melotte@curtin.edu.au

Introduction
A torrent of people poured into Fremantle, Western Australia, following the discovery of gold all in the Eastern Goldfields, firstly at Southern Cross in 1888, then Coolgardie, 1892 and Hannan’s Kalgoorlie, 1893. These new immigrants experienced similar difficulties to those of the original Colony of Western Australia settlers, over sixty years earlier.

Initially, the Colony lacked prepared and surveyed land, as well as finished materials, services and facilities. However, human capacity to "make do for now", a desirable survival characteristic of settlers, overcame these adversities. Aside from the convicts and their Chelsea Pensioner guards between 1850 and 1864, the immigrants, in following the early settlers, may well have been attracted by the emergence and maturation, of representative and responsible government in the Colony, adding crediting to Edward Wakefield's 1829 thesis.

There is no doubt however, about the attraction for participation later, in the gold rush. Even after the Federation of Australia, early in the Twentieth century, the number of newcomers continued to grow beyond the formal capacity of the new State of Western Australia. People from different stations in life may have arrived in Fremantle for different reasons initially, however, everyone had equally, to 'make do for now'. However, as this saga unfolded, we see some of the newcomers were more equal than others.

The Beginnings
Fremantle has had more than one beginning. The outstanding milestones on this incredible journey influenced new phases of land subdivision, settlement, or governance. These phases included:

a) Free settlers establishing the Colony of Western Australia in 1829.
b) Convicts and their Pensioner Guards arriving in 1850,c) Colonial Representative Legislative Council, in 1870,d) Colonial Responsible Government, elected in 1890, and

e) Statehood in the Commonwealth of Australia 1901.

Another significant achievement, the Workers Homes Act 1912, contributed to the integration of orderly land settlement and good governance.

Free settlers establish the Swan River Colony
Earnest, self-interest by Captain James Stirling was finally rewarded when he convinced the British government to agree to the new Colony. Captain Fremantle, commanding the warship HMS Challenger, arrived at the Swan River, on May 2, 1829. He claimed possession of New Holland, with the exception of the Colonies of New South Wales and Van Dieman's Land. Captain Stirling arrived later, commanding the HMS Parnelia, a store-ship, bringing his family, a number of officials and supplies.

Stirling's arrival was dramatic, with his ship almost sinking after hitting a sand bank off Carnac Island, a few kilometers short of the limestone reef then protecting the Swan River entrance. Consequently, the Parnelia's cargo had to be transferred, along with some passengers, to the Challenger. Captain Fremantle was thought to be unsettled, because of his superstition about women on board ship; and another 30 intending new settlers were put ashore on Carnac Island, a few kilometres off the coast. A two-day winter gale was understandably ominous, perhaps justifying Fremantle's concern. On June 7, 1829, Stirling set up more permanently, on Garden Island, where the newcomers had to endure the cold winds and rain, huddled in temporary brushwood and canvas shelters.

Mary Ann Friend left Portsmouth, on August 14, 1829, on the Wanshead, a merchant ship commanded by her husband, bringing emigrants to the fledging Colony. Anchored in Gage Roads, between Garden Island and Fremantle, on January 30, 1830, only six months after the establishment of the Colony, Mary Friend wrote:

"It is very true that the country is beautifully undulating and thinly wooded but also the soil is
The servant tents were pitched each side with tree trunks as seats. The lack of suitable finished building materials in the Colony and the Jack of money, did not stimulate the servants' preference for anything ornate, or structurally complicated, until after the arrival of the convicts in 1830. At times, there was even a lack of essentials, including food. See Figure 2.

Later Mrs. Friend noted, "On 2 February 1830, a 'horse house' was taken ashore to serve as a 'cottage once'...

The servants' tents were pitched each side with tree trunks as seats. See Figure 1.

After six months in the colony, Richard Morrell wrote in 1832, complaining of the scarcity of provisions, high prices and troublesome natives. He wrote on the back of a painting sent to England aboard HMS Sulphur. Lieutenant Governor Stirling was by coincidence, also aboard, going home to England, to plead for better support for the settlers. Stirling returned to Fremantle 2 years later, promoted to Governor, but without significant additional support for the settlers.

Freemantle's early buildings were makeshift and construction was basic, being hindered by the slow progress. Hence, a distinguishing feature of early West Australian buildings was their lack of pretension of grand architectural scale. Purpose and function, with four walls and a roof, were priority considerations; light and fresh air, were secondary. However, Freemantle did become a small town.

The lack of suitable finished building materials in the Colony and the lack of money, did not stimulate demand, nor encourage more than basic responses.

There was little attempt to do anything ornate, or structurally complicated, until after the arrival of the convicts in 1830. At times, there was even a lack of essentials, including food. See Figure 2.

Similarly, local government occurred as a result of a desire for more local autonomy, rather than encouragement of new institutions for settlers. The financial difficulties of the new Local Roads Boards and Municipal Trusts had prompted the appointment of a Central Board of Works, to deal with major functions, such as Roads. However, there was strong, and ultimately successful, opposition from Local Councils. Even when the Freemantle Town Trust was in difficulties, in the mid-1850s, a contemporary observed "the value of local participation in government had not entirely been overlooked".

Chadwick's Health of Towns Association influenced national legislation including the Public Health Act 1848, which offered extensive local powers to improve water supply and sewerage disposal in England. However, these powers were not extended to the Colony of Western Australia.

Colonial Representative Government
Representative government was not achieved for the Colony until 1870; and this was not superseded by Responsible government until 1890, thus taking sixty-one years to achieve two of Edward Wakefield's ideals for new colonial government.

Further distress, open conflict and subsequent agitation, led to serious attempts to improve living conditions. Local government, hindered by a lack of funds, was only marginally successful. State government, shrewdly led by John Forrest, succeeded using public works policy and finance, sometimes in concert with Local government and the people.

This busy period of self-government of the Colony within the framework of the British Empire, enabled several growing families to move from a canvas sheet or tent, pitched wherever possible, to a tent, set up on a officially surveyed and regulated block in the "Free Residence Area", which became known as "The Blocks". There were also a few lucky families, whose living conditions improved dramatically, when they relocated to a house in this area, built with whatever materials they could buy, or salvage.

Canvas Town
"Canvas Town" is a generic description of a large collection of temporary accommodation, frequently found throughout Australian history, in the various gold fields. In Western Australia however, Canvas Town was also the description of more permanent living areas around Fremantle, during the 1890s. The Census of Western Australia 1901 recorded "... no fewer than 19,628 of the habitations enumerated, or about thirty seven percent of the total specified were built of 'colico, canvas, or hessian' constituting the usual "Canvas Town" of a
Mr. and Mrs. Burford recall that the wallpaper was..."...stuck on the hessian wall with a paste like containing alum, because the mice did not like the taste, and would not chew the wallpaper." 12

Another personal recollection was of "Tents anywhere, tents everywhere." These canvas camps appeared in Fremantle, as the State's population expanded from 46,920 in 1890, to 179,780 in 1900, and then to 184,124, recorded in the 1901 Census. See Figure 3. Smaller camp areas appeared overnight, whilst the earlier, larger areas, with one camp area of three hundred tents, flaked at a slower rate. On the southern Swan Riverbank at Willis Pont, one hundred tents, occupied by 175 men, women and children, without sanitary arrangements were removed, when the area was needed for the Fremantle Harbour construction. A second two hundred tents, averaging three people for each tent, were on the Fremantle Common, near the Rifle Range. Tents also were located at Beaconsfield (South) and Fremantle Recreation Ground (central, later Railway station area). A Rocky Bay camp on the Swan River, North Fremantle, was home to an estimated 400 men employed nearby by Public Works Department quarrying limestone for the Port construction and the State Engineering Works. Several failed attempts to relocate the tent people resulted in a damming comment published in the local "Fremantle Times":

"First, they plant themselves on land belonging to anyone but themselves; next they turn the locality into a species of Pandemonium, particularly at night, utterly disregarding such minor details as cleanliness and ordinary morality; finally, after rendering their surroundings an eyesore to passers-by and a menace to their own health, they have the audacity to ask the Board of Health to clear away the mire in which they have wallowed." 13

A formally recognized, "Canvas Town at Fremantle, with a population of 250 people," was located east of Fremantle Town, beyond Monument Hill, on the elevated ground, south of Plympton Hill. The Board of Health dealt with a broken pump at the Canvas Town Well in April 1898, noting some people were drawing water with their own unclean receptacles, thus increasing the risk of contamination and disease. Some Health Board members were in favour of giving more official support for Canvas Town by not "closing the well but it was resolved to clean the well out and insulate a new pump." 14

This support had also come after a deputation to the Fremantle Council, from the East Fremantle Councilors, Owen and Evans, had asked for; "...the removal of tents, two miles out to the commonage, as the inhabitants were a nuisance in many ways, and many of them could well afford to occupy some of the houses now empty." 15

The Fremantle Mayor advised the deputation in January 1898: "...that the Health Board had already taken steps in that direction and notices were being served for the removal before 1st. Jan. 1898." 16

The Council By-laws had earlier given formal recognition, and the Canvas Town camp was now properly conducted. The Council had introduced a licence fee of five shillings per year, and a fortnightly Council sanitary fee, of two shillings and sixpence per month; which many did not pay. 17

The desperate Fremantle Council petitioned the Minister for Lands, reporting: "Canvas Town was a refuge for criminals, and some other residents were of very loose character; a) some residents would not pay their licence and sanitary collection fees; b) the Building Act forbade tents in the Municipality and; c) Fremantle Council would give the four weeks notice of an order to vacate the area...." 18

Both the Fremantle Council and the Minister realised Canvas Town and its people, having some formal recognition, deserved consideration. However, the authorities believed the families should be moved to more permanent circumstances, or at least to the public land of Fremantle Common, further to the east. In December 1898, Fremantle Council gave orders to vacate Canvas Town within one month. "The Canvas Town population was, at this time,...one hundred and eight married couples, forty-six single men, and two hundred and ninety-six children." A frightened deputation drew the Minister's attention to their hardship, including, a wife with nine children, who earned only seven shillings per day; and a husband supporting his wife and four children, on thirty-five shillings per week. Another man, earning one hundred and seventy-five pounds per year, had a wife and ten children to support. 19 Resolutely, the Canvas Town relocation was partially complete by January 20, 1899. Only thirty-five people remained when, lacking Fremantle Council services, the area was noted as reasonably clean. The squatters however, persisted for some time. 20

"The Blocks" In August 1899, the Forrest Government released to the east, a "Free Residence Area", on twenty-one year leases. This area was located to the south of Marmion Street and the later Richmond Raceway (now residential) and the East Fremantle Football Grounds. The application fee was ten shillings, and the lease rent was ten shillings per year. Four weeks later, forty-two of the seventy-four allotments payable had been selected. The lots in the "free residence area" later became known as the "Worker's Blocks", or "Tent Blocks". "The more common description of the area eventually became "The Blocks." A small house one room house, built on one of the seven metre wide "tent blocks", still stands at 78 Forrest Street. See Figure 4. Mr. Burford lived with his parents at 49 Forrest Street, in a house built on one of The Blocks.
The houses on The Blocks were built as self help. You had to pay for the materials from your own pocket... when homes were scarce people had to build their own homes with whatever materials they could get.[1]

The Blocks’ area, was soon accommodating small, skillion, or pitched roofed, houses, often constructed one room at a time by their proud owners, who now included Western Australian Government railway employees. Settlement conditions were changed, thus enabling freehold selection and purchase of the land. However, the lack of a piped water supply continued to be a problem. One well located in Montreal Street, midway between Forrest and Holland Streets.[2] Another well was located further along Forrest Street, in the Raglan Jarvis property, near the present Gibson Park. Water storage was a problem as conventional rainwater tanks were replaced through expediency with square metal containers, ‘unconventional but effective tanks’.[3]

The tent areas had largely gone from Canvas Town by 1902, because the residents, had either returned to the Eastern states [56], left for the Eastern goldfields of Western Australia, or settled elsewhere; including the Blocks further east and other locations, such as North Fremantle. The Council Health Officers began to consider the buildings in Fremantle, which in the

"... hurry of construction... had not attempted... to consider health and comfort."[4]

The 1911 Census showed that, in Western Australia, that calico, canvas or hessian, dwellings had been reduced to approximately 20% of all dwellings. However, just over 25% of all dwellings, were of one room only.[5] The State Land Administration correspondence files between March 1899 and August 1912, were concerned with the sale of blocks of land in Fremantle; and the subdivision of these into smaller blocks to be sold as residential lots for ‘Working Men’, under the “Land’s Act”.[6] These smaller residential lots were initially sold for £25. However, some of these lots, were shown as reserved in 1912. The official correspondence recommended their release for leasehold at £37/10/- and £40 each, reflecting the increased popularity of The Blocks area. See Figure 5.

The relocation of the Western Australian Government Railways workshops from Fremantle to Midland, in 1904, had a major impact on these local economies. This impact may have relieved some pressure on the availability of land, in The Blocks area. However, this relatively isolated community still agitated for better services. Subsequently, in August 1905, the Fremantle Council provided a piped water supply.

The East Fremantle Council ‘ruralized’ some of the white limestone tracks.[7] Prior to this

"... white roads used to glare and make your eyes sore in Summer. The dust used to be whipped up into the air".[8]

The government was still holding a number of allotments in reserve. These reserve allotments were to become more important with the passing of Workers Homes Act, in 1912.[9] The Blocks

The first Fremantle Workers Home, built of freestone and brick, with a corrugated iron roof, was identified by Mr. Burford, as No.41 Forrest Street. The West Australian photograph and report of the opening day noted:

"The house is built on a stone foundation and has a "dado," of sawn wood free from up to the window level. Above are brickwork and cement facings, with a pitched iron roof and verandah. The villa-fronted house typically contained two bedrooms, a kitchen, and a wash-house equipped with troughs and tippers. There is no provision for drainage or sewerage, in this neighbourhood; so a well-soil was sunk in the yard at the rear of the building."[10]

These other Workers Homes were reported in various stages of construction, on adjacent lots facing Forrest Street. It is believed, the Opening Day photograph, shows the houses reported in various stages of construction, to be 41, 39, 37, & 35 Forrest Street. See Figure 6. The house reported as "... to be built," appears to be No.41 Forrest Street, because of the bricks stacked on the left of that property, mid-ground in the photograph.

Mr. Burford said he

"...can remember as a seven year old, the wintry day of the opening day of the first Workers House at 41 Forrest Street. Trestles with tablecloths had been set up in Midland Street. I kept riding past on my three-wheeler bicycle, hoping something would fall off."[11] From the table.

According to the Workers Homes Act, 1912 Part Three, the government not only built the home, they also provided the land, and leased it to the owner. Thus, anyone whose income was less than the amount fixed under the Act may be provided a home, without having much cash in the beginning. The State provided these homes under conditions, which meant that a poor family may be housed, clothed, and fed. It was better than paying rent to a landlord.[12]

Thus, Part 3 enabled the Workers Homes Board to erect dwellings and give successful applicants a perpetual lease of the land; and a period of up to thirty years, to pay for the cost of the home. At the outset, the worker had to repay the Board two shillings and sixpence per hundred dollars of the construction cost of the house and eleven pence, per allotment for the ground rent.[13]

Part 4 of the Act, which operated throughout the State, enabled workers, who possessed land freehold or leasehold, to obtain money from the Workers Homes Board, with the approval of the Minister, to construct dwellings, release mortgages, purchase sites, and carry out improvements. Premier Scaddan also said the Workers Homes were... built under conditions which were ideal. It was splendid opportunity to show the people what collective action could do. The ceremony was really in the nature of a demonstration of what socialism really meant. Socialism was collective action by the people in order to assist each other. Here was the State combining to place its citizens in comfortable homes in order that they might rear families which should produce good citizens of the future."[14]

According to the Workers Homes Act, 1912 Part Three, the government not only built the home, they also provided the land, and leased it to the owner. Thus, anyone whose income was less than the amount fixed under the Act may be provided a home, without having much cash in the beginning. The State provided these homes under conditions, which meant that a poor family may be housed, clothed, and fed. It was better than paying rent to a landlord.[15]

Thus, Part 3 enabled the Workers Homes Board to erect dwellings and give successful applicants a perpetual lease of the land; and a period of up to thirty years, to pay for the cost of the home. At the outset, the worker had to repay the Board two shillings and sixpence per hundred dollars of the construction cost of the house and eleven pence, per allotment for the ground rent.[16]

Part 4 of the Act, which operated throughout the State, enabled workers, who possessed land freehold or leasehold, to obtain money from the Workers Homes Board, with the approval of the Minister, to construct dwellings, release mortgages, purchase sites, and carry out improvements. Premier Scaddan also said the Workers Homes were... built under conditions which were ideal. It was splendid opportunity to show the people what collective action could do. The ceremony was really in the nature of a demonstration of what socialism really meant. Socialism was collective action by the people in order to assist each other. Here was the State combining to place its citizens in comfortable homes in order that they might rear families which should produce good citizens of the future."[17]
The Vice-President of the Town Planning Association of Western Australia, W.A. Saw advised the Royal Society of Western Australia, on some aspects of Town Planning, in 1918. Saw reported:

“The Workers' Homes Board have done good work with the funds that are available, and the proposed housing of soldiers will assist. [Up] to £700 will be advanced to each approved applicant and the interest will only be 5 per cent. Thirty-seven years will be allowed for repayments when a stone house is created, and a shorter time if of less enabling material, viz., 20 years for a wooden house.”

Saw also made contemporary comments noting a Western Australia Worker's Home of three rooms and kitchen, cost £110. 5d. per week. “246 such houses have been built.”

Saw also noted in 1918:

“There are about 1,100 freestall estates on which houses have been erected. The Board has advanced over £500,000 for building houses. (The freestall system has proved more popular than the leasehold system).”

The total expenditure up to February 28, 1929, was £1,104.539, with the sum of £81,261 under freestall conditions and £1,123,278 under leasehold conditions. The average cost of the Workers' Homes before World War I (1914) was £400 to £450. The average cost steadily increased, with the average cost of homes erected in 1928 being about £750.

Conclusions

The introduction of the early colonist's experience and observations identified the difficulties experienced, in the establishment of the Territory of “Western Australia”. No accommodation other than their ship, a horse ‘house’ or a tent was available, when they arrived. In addition, there was a lack of prepared and surveyed land, finished building materials, services and facilities in Fremantle. A desirable human capacity to “make do for now”, overcame these adversities.

This survival characteristic was desirable, not only for these early colonists. The gold seekers who arrived in Fremantle in the early eighteen nineties, immediately following the discovery of gold in the Eastern Gold Fields of Western Australia, faced similar adversity.

The serious lack of land, accommodation and services also forced the gold seekers to make do with temporary arrangements. State and Local authorities, which had been recently established, adopted various semi official regulations, which gave temporary relief, so only the worst infringements were presented by these authorities. Similarly, temporary arrangements were made to encourage the tent dwellers to relocate to new residence areas, which initially offered assistance, by access to land and materials. Later this situation was improved, by legislation for workers’ homes.

The Governors had to Civil authorities, awkwardly searched their way from 1829, affected by, and giving effect to British and Colonial, legislative reform and new ways of public government, conflict versus local tensions. Representative government for the Territory of “Western Australia” was belatedly achieved, in 1870. Responsible government, which followed in 1880, gave the colonist’s even more authority to determine their destiny. Federation of the former Colonies in the 1901 Commonwealth of States, required and saw, this franchise used as an experiment, by the State of Western Australia, to find some more permanent solutions for public housing.
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Modelling the urban future: planning, slums and the seduction of growth in St Louis, 1940–1950

JOSEPH HEATHCOTT

This paper considers the attempts by planners during and after World War II to forecast population change for the purposes of long-range planning. St Louis is used as a case study to examine the social, economic and political contexts within which decisions about how to map the city’s future were made. At the heart of the problem is the adoption by the city of a growth model to justify a large-scale slum clearance agenda at a very moment when the city was poised for catastrophic population loss. It is argued that planners allowed themselves to be caught up in the momentary crisis of a wartime population spike, ultimately ignoring their own frequent warnings about underlying trends toward population decline. Within this post-war crisis of temporary overcrowding, planners made the critical decision to move ahead with slum clearance projects of unprecedented scale. Unfortunately, by the time their projects were complete, the city for which they had been undertaken no longer existed.

Planning Perspectives, Vol. 20 No. 4 2005

‘Oh, the planners did their best’: the planning films of John Betjeman

MARK TEWDWR-JONES

The development of British town planning in much of the twentieth century was situated within the modern movement and characterized by the ascendency of a professional elite who possessed vision, rationality and the desire to bring about change for the good of society. These ‘planning wizards’ championed planning’s cause, promoted the professional basis of the discipline and were central to debates and projects about the physical restructuring of British cities. At the same time, the introduction of early television in Britain enabled the arts and factual programmes to be communicated to a wider audience. Broadcasters found such subjects as planning difficult to convey to a mass audience and various approaches and innovative programming were attempted. One artist who played a pivotal role in developing broadcasts on planning and development was the poet John Betjeman (1906–1984). Betjeman possessed a background in architecture, had been a regular performer on broadcasts on the radio and utilized the new medium of television to campaign for subjects that interested him personally: Georgian and Victorian architecture, old railway stations and the last vestiges of Edwardian Britain. As a skilled player of television and someone who was totally at ease in front of the camera, Betjeman turned many of his television broadcasts into personal statements containing passion and intense irony on those issues he perceived as threatening Britain, and against those in charge of restructuring the state. He may, therefore, be viewed as some sort of alternative planning expert. Attention is paid to two of his television series from the 1960s as brief case studies and the debate is broadened to assess implications for planning and the use of film to convey emotions about planning and places.

Planning Perspectives, Vol. 29 No. 4 2005

The rise of modernism and the decline of place: the case of Surrey City Centre, Canada

SHAWN M. NATRASONY AND DON ALEXANDER

This paper reviews the ideology of modernism in a North American context and discusses how its various attributes are embodied in the Surrey City Centre development in the Greater Vancouver area of British Columbia, Canada. In doing so, it makes use of Calhoun and Fuston’s tripartite framework of specialization, mass production and standardization as being characteristic of the ethos of the age. After analysing the various interventions that design professionals and civic agencies have made in the Surrey City Centre area, it concludes that modernist ideology has a tendency to foster placeless settings lacking in vitality, security and comfort and appeal for pedestrians.
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Press Release 18 May 2006

Headline: New Planning Agenda to combine 3 Great Themes

Copy:

A new planning agenda for the 21st Century combining Sustainability, New Urbanism and the Garden City is the challenge being taken up in the second International Garden City Research Fellowship.

Judges reviewing an international field of entries from practitioners and academics selected the bid by Professor Dennis Hardy, one of the UK’s leading experts on international town planning and development, as the competition winner.

“We were hugely attracted by the aims of the Dennis’ study,” said Chairman of the Judges, Professor Stephen Ward, speaking after the panel had completed its deliberations. “There is clearly some strong commonality between these three great themes - sustainable development, urbanism and the Garden City movement - yet so far no-one has attempted to combine them in a single coherent agenda.”

Professor Hardy, who retired as Pro Vice-Chancellor and Professor of Urban Planning at Middlesex University in December 2005, has written and lectured widely on urban planning history and contemporary policy.

His book credits include “Poundbury: The town that Charles built" and a two volume history of the Town and Country Planning Association. Indeed TCPA Director Gordon Amiss and leading luminary Sir Peter Hall backed Hardy’s bid to win the 2006 Fellowship.

Hardy collaborated with Hall and Colin Ward on “Tomorrow: A peaceful path to reform”, a facsimile edition of Ebenezer Howard’s original text, published by Routledge to mark the Centenary of Letchworth Garden City, where Hardy contributed a concluding chapter outlining the continuing relevance of the Garden City solution to modern day problems.

Welcoming Professor Hardy’s appointment, Stuart Kenny, Director General of Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation said, “His proposals recognised that Howard’s Garden City was more than a physical solution, it also offered an ingenious way to share wealth within a community. We continue to implement and promote this aspect of Howard’s way and encourage its adoption elsewhere.”

Work now begins on the Fellowship study and is likely to result in the publication of a book, hopefully next year.

In the meantime, the University of Westminster and Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation, joint backers of the Fellowship, have started the search for the 2007 Fellow. Interested parties are invited to visit www.glcftfellow.org for further information. The closing date for entries is 30 November 2006.

Notes:
1. “Garden Cities, New Urbanism and Sustainability: Towards a new Planning Agenda” by Professor Dennis Hardy
2. The winner of the first GC Research Fellowship was by Dr Doreen Waddington, researcher and lecturer at The Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm, School of Architecture and the Built Environment [for further info on Dr Waddington visit www.infra.kth.se/edu/Civ/doranges.htm] Her research for 2005 Fellowship was entitled “Garden Cities of Tomorrow - towards more sustainable communities”

For further information contact:
For GCRI - please contact Alan Howard 01462 476956 alanhoward@letchworth.com
For University of Westminster - please contact Dr Martin van Rooijen 020 7911 5819
For further info on Dr Waddington visit www.infra.kth.se/edu/Civ/doranges.htm

Fax - 44 20 7911 5871
Email - mvanrooij@westminster.ac.uk
For the Judges - please contact
Prof Stephen Ward
Oxford Brookes University
OX4 3JG
OX3 9PH
01865 483421
Fax 01865 483559
sward@brookes.ac.uk
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