

Planning
History
Bulletin

PHB

1984

Volume 6

Number 2



Planning History Group

PLANNING HISTORY GROUP

Centre for Urban & Regional Studies
J.G. Smith Building
University of Birmingham
Birmingham
B15 2TT

Tel. 021-472 1301 ext. 2692

PLANNING HISTORY BULLETIN

Institute of Terrestrial Ecology
Monks Wood Experimental Station
Huntingdon
Cambridgeshire
PE17 2LS

Tel. 048 73 381
Telex 32416

Editor: John Sheail

Editor for the Americas:

Professor Donald A. Krueckeberg
Urban Planning, LSH-Kilmer
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N.J. 08903

The Group as a body is not responsible for
views expressed and statements made by
individuals writing or reporting in the
Bulletin.

No part of this publication may be repro-
duced in any form without the permission
of the Planning History Group.

PLANNING HISTORY BULLETIN

1984 Vol. 6 No. 2

CONTENTS

CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

TREASURER'S REPORT

TEN YEARS OF THE PLANNING HISTORY GROUP

MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

- | | |
|--|---|
| New York City Housing History | 1 |
| Seminar on the City at Columbia University | 1 |
| London, 1919-1950: metropolitan development and planning | 2 |

BOOK REVIEWS

- | | |
|--|---|
| J.W.R. Whitehand (ed.). The urban landscape: historical development and management. Papers by M.R.G. Conzen | 6 |
|--|---|

- | | |
|--|---|
| Jan Marsh. Back to the land: the pastoral impulse in England, 1880-1914 | 8 |
|--|---|

- | | |
|---|---|
| John Langton and Goran Hoppe. Town and country in the development of early modern western Europe | 9 |
|---|---|

- | | |
|--|----|
| John Patten (ed.). The expanding city. Essays in honour of Professor Jean Gottman | 11 |
|--|----|

PUBLICATIONS	14
--------------	----

NOTES AND NEWS	19
----------------	----

NEW MEMBERS	21
-------------	----

WORK IN PROGRESS	22
------------------	----

ARTICLES

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Sir Frederick Gibberd. Lionel Esher | 24 |
|-------------------------------------|----|

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Sir Wilfred Burns. Gordon E. Cherry | 26 |
|-------------------------------------|----|

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| A Plotland Album. Dennis Hardy | 29 |
|--------------------------------|----|

- | | |
|--|----|
| Co-operative Housekeeping. Lynn F. Pearson | 33 |
|--|----|

CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

Ten years into the life of the Planning History Group makes it a very appropriate time to announce a major new development which we hope will advance our many, diverse interests. Under the imprint of Methuen a new international journal is to be launched, the first number appearing at the beginning of 1986: it will be called Planning Perspectives. It will be a high quality, referenced Journal, designed to reflect the interests of all those concerned with the planning of the physical environment. The context will be broad and the emphasis historical, dealing with planning ideas, methods and activities in the framework of social, economic, political and technological change. The editors will be Gordon Cherry and Anthony Sutcliffe; a team of Reviews Editors, Assistant Editors and an Editorial Board is being assembled.

There will, of course, be a relationship with the Planning History Group, members receiving preferential subscription rates. The Bulletin will remain as the official organ of the Group, continuing to provide the domestic link with members that we have come to expect. While it will inevitably change shape somewhat, it will remain as the vehicle for short notes, mini articles, conference reports and personalia.

Typical of the way in which our network might be able to provide contacts for enquirers is a request I have had recently from the London firm of planning consultants, W. R. Davidge and Partners. William Robert Davidge founded the firm in 1921; he was a founder member of the Town Planning Institute in 1914 and the firm is reputed to be the oldest established practice of its nature in the world. (Any rival claims?) It is believed that WRD had connections with the Garden City (and later, the New Towns) movement, but precisely what these amounted to is obscure. The firm is anxious to be better informed on this point: Simon Birnbaum at the firm's address, Livingstone House, 11 Carteret Street, Westminster, London SW1H 9DL, would be glad to hear from anyone who can provide a lead.

I have to make a final call for unpaid subscriptions for the year 1984. As an act of faith I am sending the Bulletin to those on our present list who (through oversight hopefully) have not yet renewed their membership. **If your Bulletin contains a pink renewal form this is the signal for you to reach for your cheque book.** I am afraid that if your membership is not renewed on this second reminder then I shall assume that your interests have moved elsewhere and I will delete your name from our list.

Members come and go. This issue contains the names of new members, and we welcome them to our network. New institutional subscribers continued to be attracted, and this is a healthy sign. A complete membership list is enclosed; please check the details of your entry and let me have any corrections.

You will see from the Treasurer's Report that the financial situation is now giving us some concern. Our production costs have risen significantly, as too have postal charges. Against this our income is virtually static, though supplemented where we can by monies raised through carrying advertisement leaflets. A rise in subscription rates for 1985 is inevitable and the Executive Committee will be considering this.

The term of the present Executive comes to an end in August. The last

Bulletin asked for the names of those who wished to offer themselves for the Executive, 84-86: there were six U.K. and 7 non-U.K. vacancies. As it happens, fewer names have been put forward than might have been expected. There will therefore be no election for the Executive: It will, in fact, be slightly under-manned, though it will be possible to co-opt additional members where appropriate. Elected to the Executive, 84-86, are:

U.K. G.E. Cherry, Helen Meller, J. Sheail, A.R. Sutcliffe

Non-U.K. Eugenie Birch, J.B. Cullingworth, D.A. Krueckberg,
M. Smets, J.B. Smallwood.

GORDON E. CHERRY

TREASURER'S REPORT

I am pleased to be able to report another satisfactory year for the Group in 1983 and the balance carried forward is the same level as at the end of 1982.

Nevertheless disturbing features of last year's accounts must be noted. Expenditure rose last year by over 17%. The increase is partly due to increased administration costs (which included an honorarium to Sue Elias for her hard work for the Group). The more important increase of which I gave warning a year ago has been in printing costs, and I expect these to rise again by a third in 1984.

There has at the same time been a decline in subscription income for the first time.

Two things follow from this. Firstly, we need to continue to expand our membership. Secondly, I fear we shall not be able to hold our subscription rate at £4.00 for much longer.

PHILIP BOOTH

TEN YEARS OF THE PLANNING HISTORY GROUP

One Saturday in October 1974 thirty people responded to an invitation to attend a meeting at the University of Birmingham to consider developments in the field of planning history. A number of initiatives followed. A Planning History Group was inaugurated; on occasional Newsletter blossomed into a regular **Bulletin**, now guided by its second editor; many meetings have been held in Britain and elsewhere, highlighted by two International Conferences; and a world-wide network has unfolded encouraging various developments in loose association with the Group. During this decade a distinctive academic field has emerged with the focus, for a number of reasons, on the history of the regulated and planned environment of the last hundred years or so. A serious question arises: are these achievements a response to self-indulgent romanticism, with little permanent foundation, or are we seeing a major development which offers a firm basis for academic judgement on the activity of planning?

Until recently the history of town planning was seen largely as the unfolding of town building through the ages: town planning, rooted in the drawing board professions, was largely a matter of urban design. It followed that for the town planner the history of built form always represented a significant introduction to his work. Town planning literature in the early 20th century made full reference to art and architectural history and the design of buildings and their associated spaces: the early numbers of **Town Planning Review** are eloquent testimony to this. The early town planners were designers where knowledge of past classical form was so important. For perhaps half a century they continued in this mould, but this general feature held less and less validity as the century progressed.

A major change came with town planning subjected to scrutiny by the social sciences. The design professions lost their primacy over town planning, which was increasingly seen more as a process of environmental change and management, best examined from the perspectives of sociology, political science and history. It was in this context that planning history as we now know it took shape, although its definitive characteristics have not fully emerged. It has revealed starkly to the planner the processes by which planned developments are actually achieved: the political systems, institutional frameworks and the constant response to societal attitudes and preferences. It has placed planning in the context of either a function of government, or as a movement or ideology, or as a set of methodologies.

Another contributory factor in the growth of interest in planning history was the dramatic expansion of planning education during the 1960s. This fed on an increase in demand for planning practitioners, an explosion of knowledge in the social sciences, a widened remit for planning as an activity and a recognition that there was much more to planning practice than the rather unquestioning normative values of the traditional professional stance. By the later 1960s there was a new interest in power relationships in the planning delivery system; case studies flourished and examination of the origins and consequences of town planning held out intellectual promise.

During the time of the Group's existence the growth of interest in planning history has mushroomed. Sutcliffe's annotated bibliography, **The History of Urban and Regional Planning** (Mansell, 1981) listed more than 1400 titles, in eight topic groups, a great proportion of which appeared during the last decade. The number of annual publications continues to grow and the task of updating the bibliography is now probably unmanageable. Higher degree

theses are now appearing to provide a fertile field for a continued flow of publications.

It is timely to see where all this activity, and the existence of the Planning History Group, are taking us. One clear result is the qualitative improvement that has taken place in academic standards. The last ten years have seen works of scholarship, a depth of research and a breadth of understanding that previous decades could not match. Superficial interpretations of past events have now been subject to an altogether more critical examination. This must be a bonus for academics as well as for those in planning practice, if we believe that contemporary planning as an activity is given a greater cutting edge by comparative historical analysis. It is a bonus for history (which after all can and perhaps should be regarded as a social science), for town planning and for all related disciplines: in Britain, at least, geography and historical geography have also benefitted. The planning historian has begun to match the urban historian and the social historian in their overlapping fields.

Another consequence is the fullness of the international recognition: planning history is not the preserve of one country. There are after all global issues to study. This century we have seen the emergence of the world metropolis and various public-sector attempts to control, regulate and shape its growth. We have also witnessed the transfer of important ideas in planning method, in ideologies of planning and in political systems which apply or avoid planning principles.

The breadth of analysis which has shaped our developing field has contributed new insights. Planning historians no longer see their subject matter as an enlightened line of progress from 19th century urban philistinism to some beautifully designed setting for an ideal community (Coketown to Milton Keynes as it were). Neither is it the study of an activity with its boundaries fixed by professional definitions, and its stages marked by legislative dates. Much more, planning history has come to rest in the socio-political realities which form the context in which the planning activity takes place.

We are analysts of the social, economic, cultural and political circumstances which generate a demand for planning in the first place and subsequently operate the delivery system through plans and programmes. An earlier fashion of narrative in planning history which saw developments in chronological sequence, has been replaced by an altogether more analytical approach. The evolution of the various stages in planning were not ordained and so we seek understanding why certain developments took place at certain times and why others were stillborn.

We search for relationships between objectives and outcomes, and we are curious about theoretical groundings in which empirical knowledge can be more surely slotted. There may be structural explanations to offer which might account for planning developments, but one ignores the significance of the uncertain at one's peril. The planning historian is not just the analyst of isolated phenomena (the history of New Towns or National Parks for example) fixed in the past: much more he is the narrator, interpreting a shifting scene, complex and unpredictable, in which certain steps in the planning of the environment take place.

If planning history has been a useful new facet to the study of history, its importance to the study of town planning can scarcely be exaggerated. It

has emphasised planning as a process where both the origins and consequences of any activity have to be explained. It has demonstrated planning as a social science just as much as a design-oriented profession. It has helped the planner as a practitioner, because knowledge of the past provides a guide to the present and future. Above all, a recognition of socio-political fundamentals demonstrates planning as no fixed science. There are no rights or wrongs, only principles shaped by preferences: hence town planning is thrust into the competing power struggle between professionals, bureaucrats and special interest groups in the community.

Where do we go from here? The Planning History Group has never seen itself as a Society with declared goals for its members; rather it offers itself as an enabler, bringing people together so that the subject field can more ably develop. It has not so far seen itself as something which demands separate organisation: economic, social and architectural historians have gone this way, but with planning history it has not yet been seen necessary to do so. Thus far the Planning History Group has been content to stimulate, offer improved access to sources or personnel, raise standards and confer modest status on its practitioners. After a flourish of activity, it may run into the sand or at least into a cul-de-sac of intellectual enquiry. We shall have to see, but experience with meetings, seminars, the **Bulletin** and feedback from members all suggest growth rather than contraction.

But growth in what directions? Planning education still stands at the point when it could benefit substantially from an improved and sustained historical underpinning. Graduate work will take off better from that point. The research field is open, even if the context is confined to the 20th century, a focus which is unlikely to be maintained: empirical knowledge remains to be amassed.

Impatient with the perceived limitations of empiricism, the search for general rules or abstract theory will interest many; indeed thrusts in this direction are overdue. Where they will lead is uncertain. Reality remains very blurred and the nature of power relations in explaining or accounting for particular developments remains rather unprecise. It will be difficult for example to sustain a view which sees town planning as a means whereby manipulative capitalism has imposed a physical form on the city. Nonetheless we shall want to study planning internationally in the context of the social, economic, cultural and political realities which generate it. We shall want to uncover the key determinants of historical change: hence we shall investigate the relationships between demand for change, motives for embracing it, methods of attaining it and the consequences in terms of the environmental product.

Planning history, if not exactly at a cross-roads, is at a point when some conscious drawing together of threads of experience would be desirable. It needs to be surer of the lessons learned, for its bearings for the future to be more accurately determined. The next ten years provides an opportunity for the perceptive analysts to map out precisely where we are and where we are going. It is going to be an interesting intellectual journey.

GORDON E. CHERRY

MEETINGS AND CONFERENCES

New York City Housing History

Preliminary details were given in the previous PHB. Under the title, 'The history of housing for working and poor people in New York City, 1901-1984', the Symposium will be held at the Graduate School of Architecture and Planning, Avery Hall, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, on 12 and 13 October 1984. Details from Professor Peter Marcuse of the Division of Urban Planning at the University. In addition to an overview and discussion of implications for the future, papers will review public housing in the early years, the housing of the working people in the light of European experience, and the issue of Hispanics, Blacks and neighborhood change.

Seminar on the City at Columbia University

David Mont and Kathryn Bordonaro of Teachers College, Columbia University, spoke to the January meeting of the Seminar on the City on the subject, 'The Architecture of Urban Education: the Case of the Sliding Walls.' The point of departure for their study was an old Brooklyn schoolhouse, P.S. 52 (the Bushwick school), built in 1883 and now residing at the state museum at Albany. The upper storey of this school was built as one large room, with sliding walls; why this arrangement? The Bushwick school was constructed as part of a crash program of school building in the late nineteenth century which sought to meet the needs of the expanding immigrant populations: Bushwick in the 1880s was a densely built up, immigrant, working-class neighborhood experiencing huge growth. The unity of form and function in the school design became apparent as the historical background of school design and function was explained.

In the English tradition of school design, large school rooms were used in conjunction with the monitorial system. Instruction was in small groups (8-30 students) under the guidance of an advanced pupil, the monitor, whose average age was 11 in nineteenth-century Britain. A variant of this system developed by Joseph Lancaster for use in Non-conformist schools became the premier system in the United States, including New York City. Recitation took place under this scheme along the sides of the large room. However, there were complaints about the noise level, and about children teaching children.

In 1842, then, Brooklyn schools abandoned this system for a German model of organization: 40-60 students in a room - a grade, with a pyramid of supervisors over classroom teachers. Buildings which had been constructed with the Lancasterian system had their large rooms partitioned. There was an auditorium for the purpose of all-school meetings, in which a sense of community and community responsibility could be developed. The pressures of the expanding population made school construction imperative, with the goal being an inexpensive education for the urban masses.

In 1960, the N.Y.C. Fire Department decided that those sliding walls were a fire hazard: they were replaced with solid walls. But P.S. 52 had been closed in 1943 and sold in 1945. Only recently was it re-

discovered, dismantled, and restored in Albany, where it now serves an educational function again.

London 1919-1950: Metropolitan Development & Planning

A PHG conference with this title was held on 13 January 1984 at Birkbeck College, London. It was intended to bring together a number of people who had been carrying out research on London planning during the first half of the twentieth century. A common feature of the work presented was a concern with outcomes and products rather than the development of policy or planning ideas *per se*. The conference was intended to give researchers and others an opportunity to hear the results of the research and to evaluate the approach. In addition to the papers presented, the conference benefitted hugely from the commentary given by Leslie Lane who served in the LCC Planning Department through the 1930s and 1940s. His vivid account of how London planning felt to those directly involved was a timely reminder of the value of such recollections as a research resource.

The day amply demonstrated that in planning history research, the whole is indeed greater than its parts, and that attempts at synthesis are both vital and stimulating. The richness and potential of planning history research was underlined, particularly when attention is focussed on the interplay between planning policy, planning practice and personalities. One conclusion to be drawn was that these reciprocal relationships might best be explored through groups of researchers working on the development of planning and its outcomes on a regional basis, as the participants presenting the papers had done themselves, albeit unwittingly. Valuable as such studies would be individually, they would also help to answer the crucial question - often left implicit, even begged - how far and for how long was the London planning experience 'sui generis'? This question relates closely to the general issue of the interplay between planners, planning ideas and the fabric of particular conurbations which each of the speakers tackled in different ways. They also sought to establish the process by which planners developed the concepts, assumptions and tools which enabled them to envisage and present a new structure for the metropolis. Pursuing the answers to questions such as these benefits from an interdisciplinary approach and a collaboration between academics and practitioners at all levels which the PHG is undoubtedly well fitted to provide.

Pat Garside (University of Salford) was primarily concerned with the evolution of the concept of 'reconstruction' as applied to London in the period 1919-1950. She argued that reconstruction objectives became increasingly complex. At the same time fundamental disagreement about priorities emerged among the parties involved - central government, the LCC, the metropolitan boroughs, politicians, planners and public, and private developers. Even the unifying experience of the Second World War was insufficient to overcome these divisions which re-emerged in the post-war period, though in a less overt form. The importance of these intergovernmental and intersectoral conflicts was that they, rather than the official and

statutory London plans, set the agenda for reconstruction - determined the scale of metropolitan planning, the location of public redevelopment projects, and the balance struck between political, social and economic objectives. The key actor throughout was the LCC itself whose growing political cohesion enabled it to maintain a small range of simple but powerful reconstruction aims. By this means, the LCC defeated successive attempts by property groups, central government and the planning profession (including Patrick Abercrombie) to superimpose their own alternative definitions of metropolitan reconstruction. The hall-marks of the LCC's ascendancy may be seen in the massive commitment to public housing, especially in the East End and South of the Thames, and the relative neglect of other kinds of reconstruction, most noticeable in London's commercial West End, and in the 'twilight areas' of Paddington, Kensington, Chelsea and St. Marylebone.

Commenting on this paper, Leslie Lane supported the general tenor of the analysis: he recalled the frustration of LCC planners in the inter and post war years as they wrestled with the political and financial ramifications of statutory schemes. In the day-to-day world of planning control and implementation, London's entrenched private and public interests held sway over the loftier ideals of Abercrombie and the Town Planning Institute.

In her contribution, Donatella Calabi (University Institute of Architecture, Venice) was more specifically architectural, but through a detailed study of LCC housing, she also traced the contradictory waverings between professional ideals and local authority pragmatism as both central and local government increasingly involved themselves in London housing after 1919. As late as the 1930s, LCC architects struggled to demonstrate stylistic continuity with past traditions even though slum clearance required them to produce high-rise, high-density schemes. In internal dimensions and service provision, LCC blocks were designed around presumed clients' needs according to progressive standards which were codified through 'models' and 'manuals'. Externally, however, the flats reflected the values of 'domesticity', 'decorum' and 'stability' expected of the Englishman's home. By this means, Professor Calabi concluded, working class housing, and by association the working class itself, was integrated into the existing form of the city. The significance of the architectural form of LCC flats was that it weakened any argument in favour of radical urban reorganisation, and allowed the inherent conflict between planning ideals and prevailing urban structures to remain concealed.

At a deliberately more parochial level, Tanis Hinchcliffe (Polytechnic of North London) presented some interim findings from her on-going study of Islington which is intended to evaluate the effect of local conditions on the objectives of central government housing policy after 1919. In the early 1920s, the Ministry of Health expected an eventual 'withering away' of residential uses in suburbs like Islington, but the borough council spurned the Ministry's attempts at a holding operation of short-term improvement and conversion of existing dwellings. Instead, it committed itself to a policy of 'mansion flat' building for general need, with facilities and rent

structures designed to reflect existing social hierarchies. Access was controlled through fixed term tenancy agreements, which forbade sub-letting and required rent to be paid monthly in advance. After 1923, the Ministry of Health emphasised the role of the private builder in supplying housing for these general needs, but, in Islington, local requirements and political priorities rather than Ministry guidelines shaped borough council interventions in housing. Local political embarrassment over the building of a new Town Hall, for example, was overcome by building high quality mansion flats alongside it even though this meant correspondingly severe reductions in standards on another more distant estate to balance overall costs to the satisfaction of Ministry officials. As Islington involved itself more in slum clearance following the rearrangement of housing subsidies in the 1930s, management problems became a primary concern, especially property maintenance, rent collection, and disputes with and between tenants. A woman housing manager 'trained on Octavia Hill lines' was appointed and the duties of caretakers were redefined and codified to instill a more custodial attitude towards the property and the tenants. Tanis Hinchcliffe concluded that although central government influence was strong especially through subsidy arrangements and cost controls, local authorities developed and defended interests of their own. The more involved local authorities became in housing, the more complex these interests became, and the more distinct from those of central government. Central control and direction therefore became increasingly problematic.

While the first three papers had been concerned with London's built-up core, the final three considered the 'regional' dimension. At this level, intra-governmental relations between local authorities were shown to have had a significant impact on policy outcomes, but only when national and international considerations were absent. In her account of the definition and acquisition of London's Green Belt, Elizabeth Sharp (University College, London) contrasted the development of planning ideas for 'regional open spaces' with the reality of the LCC's Green Belt Scheme, initiated by Herbert Morrison in 1935. Contrary to common belief, this scheme did not enable the LCC to acquire such land itself, but merely permitted the LCC to provide grant-aid to adjoining County Councils and County Boroughs so that **they** could acquire it. Indeed, Elizabeth Sharp showed very clearly that the contradictions apparent between planners' objectives and actual outcomes in London's Green Belt are to be explained by the political processes and conflicts operating in Greater London at the time. Conflict **between** local authorities, and especially hostility to the LCC, was certainly an important factor, as also was County Councils' concern about the scale and form of speculative house-building. Green Belt acquisitions not only reflected existing conflicts, they also in some cases revived and exacerbated them. In Middlesex (the example most closely examined in this paper), one issue of this kind was public access to Green Belt land. While the LCC for its part was seeking land with recreation potential and public access, Middlesex County Council was mainly interested in preventing development of existing open spaces, especially those owned by a number of financially faltering golf-clubs. In addition, conflict arose between Middlesex County Council and the lower tier authorities for whom considerations of rising expenditure and rateable values were

more pressing than some supposed wider need for open space. The London Green Belt represents one of the first attempts at regional planning, and this account of the physical outcomes showed the continuing significance of the conflicting interests involved.

Brandon Howell (Standing Conference London and South East Regional Planning) introduced a new dimension to the day's proceedings as he wrestled with the role of public transport in influencing the location, character and extent of London's residential and industrial expansion. 'Now pioneer, now camp follower' as Abercrombie described it, London's transport services played an ambiguous role in promoting and supporting suburban development. It was the bus, Howell argued, rather than the railway and tube which bound London and its suburbs to the **national** system of transport for passengers and goods. Regional integration of transport, it was suggested, came about not through Sir Charles Bressey's report on London traffic (which contained neither a broad strategy and comprehensive system of routes, nor even priorities for its various proposals). Rather the idea of integration at a regional scale was imposed from above through Parliament and Ministers as they drew on international experience, and especially the German autobahn. Their aim was to create a national traffic system in which London and the Home Counties became one of twelve 'traffic areas'.

The day's final paper concerned that least boundary conscious form of modern transport - the aeroplane and its airports - and showed again that London's regional integration did not come about spontaneously as a result of local physical and political changes, but deliberately as a result of national and international needs. D. Meyrick (Standing Conference London and South East Regional Planning) described how responsibility for co-ordinating policy for London's airports was not accepted by anybody until the late 1930s, and then it was **central** government which intervened. In the 1920s and early '30s, Government had looked to local authorities to provide London with airports, without Exchequer aid, and according to local criteria which proved to be chiefly meteorological and/or topographical. Unwin's successor at the GLRPC attempted to remedy the lack of a regional airport strategy by proposing the now familiar 'ring' concept of their location at intervals of one site per 250,000 people. This brought Robert Hardy-Sims into immediate conflict with London local authorities and not least the LCC when he earmarked the proposed estate at Fairlop for an airport. The outcome was predictable - within weeks, the LCC withdrew its support from the GLRPC thus effectively ending its life.

The continued development of aviation, however, and the military requirements of World War II forced central Government to reconsider its involvement in the planning of London's airports. Eight of the 10 sites named by Abercrombie in the Greater London Plan were identified for him by the Air Ministry. In fact, it was the Greater London Plan (prepared for and at the request of the Ministry of Works) which gave London and the Home Counties for the first time a comprehensive regional land-use and transport strategy.

Though the papers addressed widely differing aspects of planning in and for London, there emerged a common theme - that the concept of a London region for planning purposes did not emerge spontaneously as a

result of physical and political developments at local level. Rather it was the result of conscious efforts at **national** level to forge such an entity to meet national and even international requirements. Small wonder then that London's **sense of itself as a region** has proved so fragile, and that control over London's development has been such a recurrent source of conflict between national and London government bodies right up to the present day.

PATRICIA L. GARSIDE
Environmental Sciences Division,
University of Salford,
Salford M5 4WT.

REVIEWS

J. W. R. Whitehand, editor (1981) **The Urban Landscape: Historical Development and Management. Papers by M. R. G. Conzen.** Institute of British Geographers, Special Publication, No. 13. London, New York, Toronto: Academic Press, 166 pp. Hardback. £16.80, \$34.50. ISBN 0 12 747020 4.

This is an impressive and important volume. While there are a growing number of case studies of the city-building process available - spurred on by a sharp increase in interest in the urban landscape - there are very few interpretative or analytical volumes that attempt to provide a broad perspective on urban landscape evolution. This volume provides a distinct view - a Conzenian view - but it will be of great interest to a wide variety of scholars, including human geographers, town planners, and urban historians. Viewed from an international perspective, **The Urban Landscape** represents an important link in the net of scholarly communication and influence, and a rare entree into a comparatively little known tradition.

In his preface, the volume editor notes that his purpose is to bring to the attention of geographers, historians and town planners (and, I might add, planning historians) four papers published by Professor M. R. G. Conzen between 1962 and 1978. To date, Conzen's articles have been relatively inaccessible because of the limited availability in Great Britain and North America of the publications in which they originally appeared, and because of the fact that one of the papers was published in German. The four papers by Conzen found in this collection provide a link between the generally descriptive works that characterized urban morphology in the English-speaking world in the 1950s and the advent of the more interpretative approaches that were becoming more common by the mid- and late-1970s, partly as a result of the spread of Conzen's influence but chiefly as a consequence of the permeation into the field of social science methodology. The volume editor has provided two exceptionally valuable chapters that place both the individual papers and the Conzenian tradition in context. In the introductory chapter, Dr. Whitehand discusses the 'Background to the urban morphogenetic tradition' and provides details on Conzen's academic and professional career which include academic training at

the Geographical Institute at the University of Berlin in the late 1920s, emigration to Britain in 1933, training in town and country planning at the University of Manchester, work as a practising planner in north-west England, further academic training at Manchester University, and a long and distinguished academic career in the Geography Department at King's College, Newcastle (later to become the University of Newcastle upon Tyne). During these years, Professor Conzen published a number of significant works including his classic 1960 volume, **Alnwick, Northumberland: a study in town-plan analysis**, often cited as 'the major contribution to urban morphology in the English language in the post-war era'. In a concluding chapter, 'Conzenian ideas: extension and development', the editor examines in detail four strands in Conzen's work: town-plan analysis; the fringe-belt concept; new approaches and techniques in urban landscape analysis; and townscape management. This chapter alone makes this relatively short volume worthwhile. Certainly any scholar or teacher concerned with understanding the evolution of urban landscapes will find it stimulating and useful, and the extensive references are extremely valuable.

Notwithstanding Dr. Whitehand's contributions, the heart of this publication is the work of M. R. G. Conzen. The first paper, 'The plan analysis of an English city centre', applies the method previously developed in the English market town of Alnwick to the complex case of an English city centre, central Newcastle upon Tyne. This paper was first presented at the International Geographical Union Symposium on urban geography in Lund in 1960 and in some ways it symbolized a major, new phase in the reassessment of urban morphology. The second paper, 'Historical townscapes in Great Britain: a problem in applied geography', was published in 1966 and provides an overview of the field of urban morphology in three parts: a discussion of cultural landscapes that stress the long-term social importance of historical townscapes; an examination of the general nature of historical townscapes; and a select examination of a few, small historical towns. The third paper, 'Geography and townscape conservation', was first published in 1975 and, like the paper on historical townscapes, it reflects Conzen's professional interest in town planning and his concern that the concepts and methods of townscape analysis should play an integral part in town planning. In this brief but fascinating article, Conzen provides a thoughtful and relevant list of the various facets of townscape conservation, indicating the importance of historical geography in executing planning tasks. The final and most recent paper, 'The morphology of towns in Britain during the industrial era', was published in German in 1978 and is presented here in English for the first time. It is an exceptionally comprehensive article that analyzes the formation and transformation of the British townscape during the era of industrialization.

While it is impossible to convey the richness of Conzen's work in a short review, one aspect of his work is especially noteworthy for planning and urban historians, if only because it confirms from the perspective of the discipline of geography an emphasis that many of us in history have long felt was essential to the study of urban landscapes. Conzen repeatedly emphasizes that townscapes are essentially determined by two criteria: original function and period

of origin. In other words, Conzen stresses that it is axiomatic that it is the social and economic (and, I would add, political) conditions of particular historical periods that are crucial as distinct from the age of landscapes measured in number of years or purely architectural style periods. Period typologies must be grounded in eras that have a degree of historical unity and not be based simply on arithmetic divisions. This view is basic to any unravelling of the complexities of urban morphological structure and it is a view that, fortunately, is rapidly being adopted by planning historians.

In general, then, this publication is essential reading and, as Dr. Whitehand notes, the prospects for building on the Conzenian tradition are brighter than ever before, both in Great Britain and in North America.

ALAN F. J. ARTIBISE
Institute of Urban Studies
University of Winnipeg

Jan Marsh (1982) **Back to the Land: The Pastoral Impulse in England, 1880-1914**. London, Quartet, 264 pp., £12.95, ISBN 0 7043 2276 5.

Almost everyone has heard of 'Back to the Land' and has some notion of its meaning. Yet the assumptions, ideas, and aspirations embodied in the phrase have been neglected by historians. (How often have books been written about 'neglected' subjects!) In this case the neglect is understandable since Back to the Land gave rise to no movement nor formal ideology, and has palpably failed to turn society from its continuing urban orientation.

Why should the call be a fitting subject for the historian? It is important partly because it grew out of some of the central concerns of this period: rural decline, urban crisis, the imminence of social unrest. Each of these concerns can be considered from the vantage-point of Back to the Land. The author's wide range of material substantiates her argument that she is concerned with the 'signposts to a region [of the past], not a narrow path'. The 'region' includes the 'rediscovery' of the countryside, anti-industrialism, open space preservation, the folk-song revival, agrarian communities, the cult of the garden and the rustic hero, farm colonies, the handicraft movement, 'outdoor' educational experiments, vegetarianism, and national dress.

Insofar as these subjects are treated within the confines of one volume Dr. Marsh's work is welcome. It is one of synthesis rather than of interpretation. It is written to appeal to a general readership in addition to professional historians. Planning historians will probably be most interested in the chapter on the Garden City, regarded by the author as the culmination of the back-to-the-land movement. The parallels made between the subject and the vogue for 'alternative' living styles in the 1960s and 1970s give the book some topical relevance. Those who ponder on the demise of utopianism in the 1980s may be wiser after reading the book.

There is no discussion of the origins of Back-to-the-land sentiment, or of the origin of the phrase itself. It seems to have originated with the Chartists to suggest the desire to create the good society in sylvan surroundings. The desire was weakened as confidence in an urban future developed in the years of mid-Victorian prosperity. In the pessimism of the last two decades of the century, the phrase was applied to proposals to unite town and country, agrarian communities, and farm colonies to relieve urban unemployment and revive agriculture. Dr. Marsh treats these and other aspects separately; this is advisable as the subject of the book is intrinsically amorphous. The problem of definition is particularly difficult in this area. The subject may have been better approached by adopting a tighter framework. Some topics may have been treated as manifestations of back to nature sentiment, and others as related to the desire to live the simple life. As it is, the reader is offered vignettes of aspects of the subject. There is little sense of the movement, or the development of Back-to-the-land ideas.

Some of the reasons Back-to-the-land did not herald a mass exodus from the towns are self-evident on examination of the 'movement', but the more general reasons are left unclear. This is partly because the historical context in which Back-to-the-land ideas existed is sketchy. There is an undue emphasis on opinions amongst the radical literati, that probably derives from the author's earlier interests in Georgian poetry and Edward Thomas. The view that 'Back-to-the-land was radical without being revolutionary' needs correction, or at least explanation. The work of Prince Kropotkin and the *Clarion*, and socialist opinion generally, could have been explored more fully in this connection. More could have been made of the link between nature and the past that many Back-to-the-land advocates made. There could have been a deeper analysis of the motives that lay behind the work of the preservers of open spaces so as to point up the conservative implications of Back to the land ideas. Some readers will find several of the sources predictable (*My Days and Dreams* in the case of Edward Carpenter), and some apparently unused (for example, W.H. Hudson, *The Crystal Age* [1885]).

This said, the book serves a useful purpose for social historians. Planning historians may use it as a convenient source for the non-institutional background to the development of the town-planning idea. It helps to provide an insight into the cultural milieu out of which developed the work of, among others, T.C. Horsfall, Raymond Unwin and Ebenezer Howard.

P. C. GOULD
Grimsby College of Technology

John Langton and Goran Hoppe (1983) **Town and Country in the Development of Early Modern Western Europe**. Norwich, Geo Books, Historical Geography Research Series No. 11, 52 pp., £1.75 (\$2.50), ISBN 0 86094 150 7.

This booklet is an examination of the usefulness of the urban/rural

dichotomy as an analytical tool. Whatever position one might hold on the issues debated it is of considerable value as a comprehensive survey of the literature. It ends with a twelve-and-a-half page bibliography and the text explains the position of various authors in the controversies discussed.

The authors begin with the prevalence of the urban/rural distinction as an intellectual tool. Its use is related to the emergence of urban geography and the more recent growth of urban history. While they accept that it has been a fruitful analytical device they suggest that it casts shadows leaving other matters unexamined. Their point is illustrated by reviewing theories on the development of capitalism/industrialisation.

The most common explanation stems from the development of the medieval town with its distinctive money-orientated ethic. In contrast rural areas were unpropitious. Yields were at the mercy of the elements and organic surpluses could not be stored for long. Also communal organisation restricted individual enterprise.

This familiar view has problems. For the Marxist contradictions within an economic form should cause its destruction. Thus feudalism should be destroyed from within, not by non-feudal islands of medieval towns. One internal possibility is the development of agrarian capitalism seen in the British enclosure movement. The resultant structure of landlord, tenant farmer and wage labourer was certainly capitalistic, but its conformist world dominated by parson and squire is an unlikely root of industrial dynamism. The authors therefore turn to less favoured agricultural areas. Here small family-units persisted and survival demanded adaptability in crops. Income was also supplemented by crafts. This was a potential which allowed the early capitalists scope. Also, these areas complemented those of agrarian capitalism in demand, supply and movements of surplus population. These trends can be set against a picture of generally depressed early modern towns, suffering from both the runaway growth of capital cities and the controls of outdated oligarchies and guilds.

That the straightforward problem of the origins of industry can produce totally opposed answers illustrates the difficulties. The authors conclude that the dichotomy is not a sharp intellectual tool but a 'bludgeon or flail battering and shredding historical events into shapes so roughly beaten . . . that they can be fitted together . . . in totally contradictory ways'. Their answer, as befits geographers, is to examine the regional context.

This last is surely the weak link in a stimulating piece. What is needed is debate on methodology. The social sciences have moved rapidly from empirical studies to a series of grand models or hypotheses. Increasingly these prove inadequate in face of the complexity of reality. Probably we have a rather romantic view of scientific method. Certainly it has been applied too uncritically. If we expect total coherence and complete explanation of our models we are surely asking too much. After all physicists explain different aspects of light as wave motions and bombardments by particles

although these are normally incompatible.

A. J. SCRASE
Department of Town and Country Planning
Bristol Polytechnic

John Patten, editor (1983) **The Expanding City. Essays in Honour of Professor Jean Gottmann.** London, Academic Press, 417 pp., \$50.00/£29.50. ISBN 0 12 547250 1.

This collection of thirteen essays deals with a wide variety of subjects which have little in common, except that their themes came under the wide-ranging purview of the great geographer whom they honour. Their sequence simply follows the alphabetical order of the contributors' names. The essays are preceded by the editor's 'appreciation' of Gottmann's life and work and by an exhaustive bibliography of his publications, spanning fifty years and covering eighteen pages.

The essay by David Hooson, entitled 'National Cultures and Geography in an urbanizing age', first presents the author's own development which led him to study the geography of the Soviet Union and then deals with Gottmann's unique role. Hooson emphasizes that in his cosmopolitan life Gottmann synthesized the inheritance of four national schools of geography, Russian, French, English and American - turning their methods to the study of the urban field which all of them had tended to neglect. By reassessing the regional, ecological, economic, and political context, Gottmann developed a comprehensive understanding of the urban phenomenon and of the worldwide urban network.

Philippe Pinchemel deals with the national school most influential in Gottmann's development, the French. He recalls that at the twelve International Congresses up to 1951 only four papers on urban geography were presented. The emphasis of Vidal de la Blache and Blanchard on the natural environment, specifically at the site, led to a certain neglect of population and tended toward environmental determinism. Pinchemel notes the contributions of non-geographers: as early as 1875 the engineer Lalande developed 'Laws' which largely anticipated Christaller's Central Place Theory. French geographers have tended to ignore Christaller. This aversion of the presumably Cartesian French to 'abstractions of this sort' is obviously the reverse of their strength, their understanding of the unique and specific, which makes Gottmann's work so much richer than most studies of urban systems.

Peter Hall tackles this large subject under the title: 'Decentralization without End? A Re-evaluation'. He attempts to 'construct a tentative descriptive model of urban evolution' in six stages, encompassing the 'developing' as well as the 'developed' world. While the description of these stages is fairly adequate, this reviewer believes that a deeper understanding of the process can be derived by studying the impact of two continuing basic trends -

centripetal towards large agglomerations, and centrifugal within agglomerations - as modified by changes in productive forces, in particular reduction of the friction of distance. Hall presents a wealth of statistics and provides some illuminating interpretations. His statement that in the developed world people 'are flooding out into the country' is true; but it may be more meaningful to say that 'cities are flooding out into the country'.

Other contributors deal with more limited aspects of this phenomenon. Michael Chisholm asks, 'City, Region, and - What Kind of Problem?'. The paper is policy-oriented: its concern is with the shrinking population of the big cities. Until recent years public policy had tried to direct employment away from these cities. This has indeed happened but, as Chisholm shows, it can be attributed only to a minor extent to British public policy. Similar policies would not produce a reverse flow. The two main obstacles to be overcome are 'failure of the work force to adapt' and 'land market rigidity'. No doubt increased productivity of the labour force gives a region a competitive advantage, but if all regions of the globe succeeded in doing this the net result (other things being equal) would be increased unemployment. As for the 'rigidity' (land prices unattractive to industrial development) the author proposes a site-value tax on vacant urban land. Such a desirable tax exists in the U.S.A. and in Canada. In the former it has produced widespread abandonment. In Canada central city land is being developed for residential and commercial purposes, but not for manufacturing, despite strenuous efforts to plan and zone it for industry.

A related but different theme, 'Urbanization and Population Change in Nineteenth-Century England' is explored by Richard Lawton. He emphasizes the high level as well as the wide regional variations of the urban birth-rate in 19th century England, with a wealth of interesting detail. David Ward's paper on the 'Place of Victorian Cities in Developmental Approaches to Urbanization' deals somewhat surprisingly with residential segregation.

The future rather than the past is explored by J.B. Goddard's essay on 'The Geographical Impact of Technological Change'. Using micro-electronics as a starting point, he draws attention to the space-scientific content in which changes occur, and presents evidence of wide local variations. Not surprisingly, research and development employment is found to be concentrated in the South East and in multi-plant rather than single-plant firms. David Lowenthal's paper 'Conserving the Heritage: Anglo-American Comparisons' relates past and future. He notes that both countries have done little to preserve the landscape (such as the hedgerows of England). He compares how the English concentrate on preservation with the American emphasis on re-use. Observing that in the U.S. 'modern revulsion against earlier rejection of the past generates exuberant support for preservation', he contrasts the dedication of the 1876 Exhibition to technical progress with the loss of faith in progress exhibited in 1976, which 'looked back with nostalgia'. There is an interesting discussion of the complex legal, financial, and professional aspects of conservation.

Discussing 'The Dissolution and Growth of Ethnic Areas in American Cities', Ceri Peach finds that it is the mental attitude rather than the real situation that has changed. The ghettoization of blacks has increased throughout this century. It is only in the last twenty years that the optimistic assumption that blacks would follow the pattern of absorption of other less visible ethnic minorities has been seriously questioned. This has led finally to 'a reassessment of the apparent melting of European ethnic groups'. The thesis is impressively documented.

The remaining four papers deal with countries other than the U.K. and the U.S.A. D.I. Scargill investigates 'The Ville Moyenne: A French Strategy for Town Expansion'. The French Government has attempted to limit the growth of Paris by promoting the largest provincial cities as 'metropoles d'équilibre'. Some have achieved significant growth but, as in other countries attempting 'decentralization', the primate metropolis has continued to grow. The 'metropoles d'équilibre' have grown at the expense of the smaller towns. To remedy this, the government decided to promote the 'villes moyennes' with populations from 20,000 to 200,000, in addition to promoting growth in smaller towns and the countryside. One wonders whether the result is very different from what would have occurred without the benefit of these various elaborate programs. Scargill does not ask this question. Instead he describes how emphasis has shifted from cosmetics to social and cultural amenities, and how it is the routine low-wage type of manufacturing plant which is attracted to these medium-sized cities. The most rapid growth occurred in towns within the orbit of the three great metropolises, namely Paris, Marseilles and Lyon.

J. Wreford Watson's piece, entitled 'Centre and Periphery: the Transfer of Urban Ideas from Britain to Canada', deals with Edinburgh and Halifax. This reviewer was not convinced by the author's obsessive emphasis on the 'mental map'. Decisions are, of course, made by the mind, but this does not prove that 'it was the mental attitude rather than the real situation that counted'. The changes which led people to relocate were real enough in all of the interesting cases which he relates. It is also curious that he insists on calling any inbound movement a 'drive' and any outbound one a 'flight'. Both push and pull are obviously at work in both directions. Not surprisingly, he concludes with calling for 'a future . . . when the flight from problems must end, and the day for solution begin'.

Y. Ben-Arieh's contribution 'Urban Development in the Holy Land', is restricted to the period 1799-1914 and is of limited interest. W.B. Fisher's on 'Urban Evolution in Islamic Areas' deals with a far more important subject. The Islamic City presents the only living example of an urban way of life and urban form radically different from the Western model. Fisher raises 'the question of how far this pattern could be said to amount to something distinctively and explicitly Muslim'. He finds that 'the idea of rapid growth of towns due directly to strong Islamic impulses cannot be fully sustained'. This may be true, but it does not affect the very distinctive characteristics common to all Islamic cities. In fact, the author discusses some of them, such as the predominant role of the quarter and the significance of the 'Concept of a Holy City of Islam'. As for contemporary

problems, the predominance of informal activities and of informal (squatter) housing is also found in non-Islamic cities of the Third World, which can also, in all probability, expect further rapid growth.

Evaluating the volume as a whole, probably few readers will be equally interested in all contributions. But everyone interested in cities will find a good deal of new and stimulating ideas and insights.

HANS BLUMENFELD
66 Isabella Street, Apt. 2602
Toronto
Canada M4Y 1N3

PUBLICATIONS

Robert Freestone (1983). The development of urban planning in Australia 1888-1948: a bibliography and review, in: Peter Williams, ed., **Social Process and the City**. (Urban Studies Yearbook 1). George Allen and Unwin, 175-204.

The volume represents the most comprehensive treatment published on Australia, it is a timely contribution to a world-wide upsurge of interest in planning history. The review essay looks at general characteristics, coverage, and themes of the literature. Several areas for future research are suggested. The discussion is supported by a chronology of planning 'events' providing some historical background and documentation additional to the 'select bibliography'. This comprises nearly 200 items arranged into General and National (Emergence of planning in the nineteenth century, Developments since 1900, and Planners, planning ideas and planned communities) and State and City (ACT, NSW, Qld, SA, Vic, WA).

Robert Freestone (1983). **Denis Winston: An annotated bibliography 1949-1976**. University of Sydney, Planning Research Centre, Monograph No. 15, 41 pp. Copies available from The Director, Planning Research Centre, Sydney University, NSW, 2006, Australia (\$A7 + postage).

An annotated and chronological bibliography of over 130 published monographs, articles, addresses, and comment by Denis Winston (1908-1980) during his Australian years. Winston was the first Professor of Town and Country Planning in Australia. Before appointment to the Chair at Sydney, Winston lectured in Architecture at the Universities of Durham and Liverpool (1936-1942), served as Chief Architect for the Northern Ireland Ministry of Health and Local Government (1942-1945) then as Borough Architect and Chief Planning Officer for the City of Southampton (1945-1948). The bibliography provides not only one record of Winston's ideas and ideals over more than two decades, but represents a significant stream of Australian planning thought during a critical period of professionalization.

L. Caffyn (1983). Housing in an industrial landscape: a study of workers' housing in West Yorkshire. **World Archaeology**, 15 (2), 173-83.

In an attempt to save land and building materials, the two-storeyed cottage, as opposed to the single-storey cottage, became the predominant type of workers' dwelling the late eighteenth century. Where builders were philanthropically motivated, a model village might result. Building in hilly areas might lead to some characteristically ingenious plans.

Michael Cassell (1984). **Inside Nationwide. One hundred years of co-operation**. Nationwide Building Society, London, 151 pp., ISBN 0 9508382 0 9 (hardback), ISBN 0 9508382 1 7 (softback).

A history of the first hundred years of the Nationwide Building Society (previously known as the Co-operative Permanent), is interwoven with an illustrated history of housing in Britain over the same period, and of building societies in general.

Gwyn Rowley (1984). **British Fire Insurance Plans**. Chas. E. Goad, Old Hatfield, Hertfordshire AL9 5BE, England, 129 pp. (available from P. Morley, Dept. of Geography, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2TN, price £2.00/\$4.00, inc. p.&p., money/cheque with order), ISBN 0 947 54700 2.

Between about 1880 and 1970, volumes of fire insurance plans covering 126 areas throughout the British Isles, including the central portions of all important towns and cities, were produced by the Goad company. By means of colour and symbol, information was given on land use, internal and external building construction, height, street width, and property numbers and lines. The plans were usually updated every few years. The guide draws attention to the way in which this immensely important, yet under-used source, may pinpoint the evolving structural and functional mosaics of city centres during a period of considerable change. No other published set of plans shows such detailed and complete land use information for British urban centres in past times; it may be compared to the Sanborn urban maps of North America. A postscript describes how further sets of plans were discovered during the removal of material from Sutton in Ashfield to Old Hatfield in 1983. It is hoped that further publicity for this historical source will lead to further FIPs being found.

S.V. Noe (1982). Old Lahore and old Delhi: variations on a Mughal theme. **Eklistics**, 49 (295), 306-19.

Compares the differences that arose between old Delhi, in India, and old Lahore (Pakistan), as a result of their original planning.

John Sheail (1983), 'Deserts of the moon'. The Mineral Workings Act and the restoration of ironstone workings in Northamptonshire, England, 1936-1951. **Town Planning Review**, 54 (4), 405-24.

Illustrates how the problems of ironstone restoration in Northamptonshire were first perceived in the inter-war period, and how they became so pressing in the public mind as a result of experiences during the wartime years that ministers and their officials concluded that there was no alternative to legislation. The attention paid to the example of the Northamptonshire ironfield may provide important insights into the development of the planning and conservation movements more generally.

T. Wild (ed.) (1983). **Urban and rural change in West Germany**. Croom Helm, London; Barnes & Noble, Totowa, N.J., 259 pp., price £16.95, ISBN 0 7099 2715 0 (CH); 0 389 20392 0 (B & N).

The contributions not only explore the various changes evident in West Germany's mosaic of cities, towns, villages and countryside, but focus upon the problems which have arisen, and the planning strategies which have been implemented for their solution. Sudden and very marked directional changes in the course of post-war development have in turn produced severe tests to the nation's evolving system of town and country planning.

Robin Best (1984), Are we really losing the land? **Town and Country Planning**, 53 (1), 10-1.

Based on his paper given to the Agricultural Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, an abstract of the paper has appeared in **Planning History Bulletin**, 5 (3), 5-6.

Brian Chalkley, John Goodridge and Mark Brayshaw (1984), Celebrating the city that was born again. **Town and Country Planning**, 53 (1), 6-7.

It is 40 years since Abercrombie's Plan for Plymouth, Devon, was put forward as a means of rebuilding the war-shattered city. The article reviews Abercrombie's achievement in the context of the very different circumstances that now confront the planner.

M. Bannon and J. Hendry (1983), Planning in Ireland: an overview. **Department of Town and Country Planning, Occasional Papers in Planning**, 1, price £2.00 from Science Library, Queen's University, Chlorine Gardens, Belfast BT9 5EQ.

A critical history of planning, north and south of the border, is provided by 'Urban and regional planning in the Republic of Ireland 1911-1976', and 'The development of planning in Northern Ireland'.

Both highlight a similar cyclic interest in planning, and the need to develop planning systems more directly relevant to local needs, together with suitable structures for their administration.

Gordon E. Cherry (1983), The influence of location policies on metropolitan areas. **Habitat International**, 7 (3-4), pp.19-30.

Originally presented to the First International Congress of Planning of Major Cities in 1981, the paper focuses on metropolitan experiences in Britain since the second world war, and their relationship to American and west-central European experience and implications for developments in other parts of the world. It traces changes in the British metropolitan city, assesses the reasons for economic, social and technological change, and comments on the achievements of location policies to date.

Andrew H. Dawson (1983), Poland: 30-year rural-urban transition. **Cities**, 1 (2), 175-84.

Analyses urban policy in Poland between the end of the plan for post-war reconstruction and the onset of the crisis of 1980. Demographic, economic, political and other circumstances affecting urban development are described.

John Sheail (1983), Planning, water supplies and ministerial power in inter-war Britain. **Public Administration**, 61 (4), pp.386-95.

Despite several attempts to reform the structure of the water industry, little was achieved in the inter-war period. Three phases in the perception of water-use planning can be discerned, namely the period of post-First World War reconstruction, the years 1929-34, and those of 1935-39. The allocation of water resources affected property rights so closely that Parliament was particularly reluctant to delegate its regulatory powers over the industry to ministers and their officials.

Gordon E. Cherry (1984), Leisure and the home: a review of changing relationships. **Leisure Studies**, 3, pp.35-52.

A research agenda in respect of leisure and the home requires an historical perspective and the setting of a socio-cultural context. Changing relationships in the twentieth century are reviewed. The physical attributes of the housing stock are set against the context of demographic, social and cultural change. Having assessed past and present patterns in leisure activities, future trends are considered.

F. Gray (ed.) (1983). *Crawley: old town, new town*. University of Sussex. Centre for Continuing Education. Occasional Paper. 18. 108 pp., price £1.90. ISBN 0 904242 21 8.

Compiled by members of an adult education class. Part I examines the more important recent events and processes that have shaped the area, in particular the making of Crawley as a new town after the second world war. Part II contains edited accounts of seven local people, as they remember various features of their lives in the Crawley area.

Gerard C. Mooney (1983). *The State, housing and the reserve army of labour: Glasgow 1850-1939*. Centre for Urban and Regional Research. Glasgow University. Discussion Paper 11. 42 pp., ISSN 0263 1075.

The massive influx of people into the towns and cities of Britain during the industrial revolution brought a potential threat to the ruling class. Where were these people going to be accommodated? Housing provision plays a fundamental part in the maintenance and reproduction of bourgeois social and economic relations. The case study illustrates how State intervention was designed to sustain, despite shifts in the relative positions of capital and labour, the conditions most conducive to capitalist production and accumulation.

Gordon E. Cherry (1984). Britain and the metropolis. Urban change and planning in perspective. *Town Planning Review*. 55 (1). 5-33.

In a synoptic review of the period since the late nineteenth century, the author illustrates how changing urban patterns have been influenced by developments in public policy embracing reform movements and welfare programmes, advances in planning method and forms of environmental control, and the application of social science research.

Urian Wannop (1984). Clydeside in transition. Three questions on the significance of metropolitan strategic planning. *Town Planning Review*. 55 (1). 34-54.

This is an edited and revised version of the Inaugural Address given at the University of Strathclyde and abstracted in *PHB*. 6 (1). 1983.

T.R. Nicholson. *Wheels on the road. Maps of Britain for the cyclist and motorist, 1870-1940*. Geo Books, Norwich. 1983. 102 pp., price £7.50. ISBN 0 86094 125 6.

The 50 illustrations and text draw attention to the many types of map, road book and guide published from the early 19th century onwards as more people travelled for work and leisure purposes.

NOTES AND NEWS

Public Record Office Publications

The Public Record Office Advisory Council Publications Committee is reviewing its publications policy (lists, guides, & c). It is approaching various constituencies for suggestions for new initiatives which it might incorporate in its programme over the next five years. Members of PHG are encouraged to send proposals and comments to Tony Sutcliffe (Dept. of Economic and Social History, University, Sheffield S10 2TN), who is a member of the Publications Committee.

Land Use Policy

The first number of this new journal was published in January 1984 by Betterworth Science Ltd., Journals Division, P.O. Box 63, Westbury House, Bury Street, Guildford GU2 5BH, U.K. To be published four times a year, the International Journal is edited by Dr. M.R. Brett-Crowther. In a leader, 'Shaping the policy that shapes the policy', the editor writes of how policy is a product of the value of leaders. 'Whilst there is much to distress the intelligent critic, problems can become definable, apprehensible and solvable where advantage is taken of good cartography, photogrammetry, and range of communications systems, and a rising number of ecologically educated people.'

Land Development Studies

Published by E. and F.N. Spon, the first issue of this international journal appeared in January 1984 (ISSN 0265 0821), edited by Dr. A.J. Dobson, Planning Department, Essex County Council, Globe House, New Street, Chelmsford. Intended for professional practitioners in planning and development, as well as researchers in academic institutions, papers will be published on any area of real estate development, from research into single aspects of the development process to studies of complete schemes. Development is considered in terms of finance, investment, economics and the environment, as well as in relation to public policy and private enterprise.

French Towns

An interesting series on French towns and cities has been published under the general direction of Philippe Wolff, published by Editions Privat, 14 rue des Arts, 31000 Toulouse. In 350 pages, Gabriel Desert's *Histoire de Caen* (1981) proceeds from Caen and its origins to Caen as a regional capital. To date 18 volumes have been produced including those for Marseilles, Bruxelles, Lille, Nancy, Geneve, Lausanne, Bordeaux and Rennes. The prices range from F. 180 to about F. 300.

PROFESSOR ROBIN BEST

Robin Best died at his home on 20 April 1984. He was Professor of Land Use at Wye College, London University. An obituary in **The Times** of 4 May 1984 drew attention to the way he had spent his whole working life at Wye College, and had been the originator of one of the earliest degree courses in Environmental Studies.

Over a period of 30 years, he had developed a reputation for careful and meticulous scholarship, which led to his being recognised as a leading authority on land use structure and competition in Britain. His recent paper to the British Association (extracts of which were reproduced in **PHB**) was one of many publications that reviewed the character and significance of planning in the British rural and urban context over the last half century.

NEW MEMBERS

U. K.

Mr. Stephen A. Cropper
Mr. A. D. Johnson
Professor Ian Masser
Mr. Richard A. Mordey

Bournville Village Trust
The British Library

Non-U. K.

Mr. Seymour Adler
Professor Laurence C. Gerckens
Mr. Howell S. Baum
Professor Galen Cranz
Mr. Jeffrey Diefendorf
Professor Robert B. Fairbanks
Mr. Oddvin Horneland
Professor David A. Johnson
Mr. Roger Montgomery
Mr. Jim Richardson
Mr. Javier Salazar Ruckauer
Mr. Morris L. Sweet
Mr. Pieter Uyttenhove
Mr. Marc Weiss

Biblioteca della Commercio, Bellinzona
State University of New York at Buffalo
University of Pennsylvania
Perth: Town Planning Department
Tennessee Valley Authority

WORK IN PROGRESS

Supplement 4

In this fourth supplement to 'Work in Progress (PHB 4(3)) a distinction is again drawn between recent publications and activities (A), and work in progress (B).

Mr. Stephen A. Cropper, Operational Research Group, Maths and Physics Building, University of Sussex, Falmer, Brighton BN1 9RF.

- A1 Theory and strategy in the study of planning processes - the uses of the case study. **Environment and Planning, B**, 9, 341-57.
- A2 'Do I know what you mean?' On the methodology of cross-cultural comparison. **Town and Regional Planning Series, University of Sheffield**, Department of Town and Regional Planning (forthcoming).
- B1 The intellectual and political history of an employment planning programme, 1976-84 - as part of an award (SERC) for the development of 'Aids for strategic decision-making in complex conflicts'.

Professor Jefery M. Diefendorf, Department of History, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03801, USA.

- A1 **Businessmen and Politics in the Rhineland, 1789-1834**, (Princeton University Press, 1980).
- A2 Konstanty Gutschow and the Reconstruction of Hamburg, (paper presented at Western Association of German Studies, October 1983, and being currently considered for publication by Central European History).
- B1 **The Rebuilding of Germany's Cities after 1945** (book, work underway since 1980).

Professor Robert B. Fairbanks, Department of History, University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas 76019, USA.

- A1 My most recent publication is an article co-authored with Zane L. Miller, Housing, Planning and Race in Cincinnati, 1920-1955, in **The Martial Metropolis: American Cities in War and peace, 1919-1961**, edited by Roger Lotchin (Praeger Press).
- B1 I am completing a book manuscript entitled 'Housing in the City: Reformers and the Problem of Low-Cost Housing in Cincinnati, 1890-1960'. It explores the changing definition of and response to the low-cost housing problem and treats early public housing as an experiment in community building. Special attention is given to the city's planning movement and its contributions to housing reform.

- B2 I have also just initiated a study on housing, planning and boosterism in Dallas during the 1940s.

Dr. David A. Johnson, Graduate School of Planning, 1618 Cumberland Avenue, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916.

- A1 Norris, Tennessee, on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary. **Planning History Bulletin**, 1984, 6(1), 32-42.
- B1 Co-editor (with Daniel Schaffer) of forthcoming Symposium issue of **Planning History**, Journal of the American Planning Association (scheduled for spring 1985).

Professor Roger Montgomery, Department of City Planning, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

- A1 For 7 years, Undergraduate Dean of College of Environmental Design, University of California, Berkeley.
- B1 The role of architecture and architects in the California homebuilding industry.
- B2 History of urban renewal during the Eisenhower administration.

SIR FREDERICK GIBBERD

Sir Frederick Gibberd, CBE RA etc., who died last January, was a distinguished English architect planner. One needs to use all four words to characterise his contribution to planning history. Born in 1908 in the heart of red brick Warwickshire, he was never intellectually or emotionally brainwashed (though he was beguiled) by continental influences. Pullman Court in Streatham, his first big job, may seem a textbook example of gleaming white Thirties' modernism, but the war softened him, as it did others. The elegant BISF prefabs and terrace houses of the late Forties have pretty, almost Regency, porches, and Lansbury market place in east London, built for 1951 and now so wretchedly vandalised, is an epitome of what we now call the Festival style. Even when Britain's first tower block and London's new airport came his way he notably rejected these obvious invitations to modernist drama in favour of red brick. Liverpool R.C. Cathedral, bravely won in anonymous competition at the peak of his career, if you compare it with its prototype at Brasilia, is both prettier and fussier in a very English way.

So it is no surprise to find him, as a planner, firmly in the Unwin tradition. His book Town Design of 1953 is an update of Unwin's Town Planning in Practice of 1909, and he must have seen it as such. He wrote:

It is now generally agreed that the large city leads only to social evil. It monopolizes the cultural life of the region, and often of the nation. Apart from its inherent evils of creating high death and low birth rates, and of breeding mal-adjusted social types, such as gangsters and 'wide boys', it makes a full life impossible for the ordinary decent citizen.

He would have qualified this later. He could not resist photographing those congested, depraved cities (Washington, Rome, Florence, Amsterdam, Prague, Stockholm), and quoting their streets and spaces and silhouettes as exemplars, as did Unwin. But whereas Unwin's generation still saw the street and square as the visual raw material

of urban design, and did their best at Hampstead and later at Welwyn to reconcile it with contemporary demands for sunlight and greenery, Gibberd's generation had to take on board the Corbusian aesthetic of 'objects in space' and specifically the beautiful but unreal and unexecuted acropolis for St. Die. So Gibberd writes of the town centre as 'a composition in which landscape design will play its part and in which the buildings of the central area will appear as freely disposed masses rather than as continuous street frontages'. This 'stradophobia', as Colin Rowe was later to describe it, is now seen as the dynamite which literally exploded our historic towns until the conservationists got themselves organised and put a stop to it. Gibberd's scheme for Nuneaton, only partly executed, involved no such destruction, but is still an unhappy example of this dependence on 'landscape' to tie together odd buildings that have no discernible relation with one another. For Harlow, under the influence of St. Die and of Bruno Taut's concept of the Stradtkrone, Gibberd designed a 'freely disposed' civic group which should have dominated the town but was so scaled down and anglicized that it was easily crowded out by later commercial developers.

If the Stradtkrone failed to orient you, all the more important was it that the town plan should read clearly and vividly on the ground. Two characteristically English failings prevented this. First, the flight from the right angle and the fashion for 'organic' planning, with roads following the contours, ensured that the visitor lost all sense of direction - a fatal Victorian application of Romantic landscape notions to city planning, which even the Milton Keynes grid has yielded to. English planners praised Bath, but they followed Bournemouth. Secondly, the swathes of 'natural' landscape that penetrated the town failed to register visually because the neighbourhoods they embraced had no firm edge. As early as 1949 Gibberd had shown, in the firmly orthogonal layout of the Somerford Estate in Hackney, how you could build at traditional London densities without going above three storeys, but did not persuade his Corporation to house their ex-Londoners in the style they were used to. Perhaps, as in his own beautiful garden at Harlow, his love for the great oaks and elms of the Home Counties distracted him. The

landscape swallowed the town.

Experience has inevitably taught us the failings of the conventional wisdom of the Fifties as so comprehensively and clearly set out in Town Design. But on the whole, and within its scale of reference, it stands up better than the harder attitudes that supplanted it. It certainly has a consistency and common sense that were notably lacking among the 'stradophile' aesthetes who led the reaction against it in the Seventies. In the more serious succession that starts with Camillo Sitte, and ends (so far) with Christopher Alexander, it has a central place.

Lionel Esher.

Christmas Common Tower.

Watlington, Oxford OX9 5HL.

SIR WILFRED BURNS

Sir Wilfred Burns, who died on 4 January, 1984, at the age of 60, was a key figure in British post-war planning. A natural leader, first in local and then in central government, he was associated with many important developments in planning practice over the last thirty years; indeed, such were his personal contributions that we have to assess him as a major figure in his profession. [1].

The chronology and pattern of his career may be briefly stated. Born in Farnworth, near Bolton, Lancashire, he moved to Ulverston at the age of six, and was educated at the Grammar School there. He trained in civil engineering at Liverpool University. After war service in the Admiralty, he embarked on a local government career in Leeds. An influential period at Coventry from 1949, however, proved to be the formative years when he became a senior member of a formidably strong multi-professional team concerned with city reconstruction. A move to Surrey for a short period as Deputy County Planning Officer was

followed in 1960 by eight years as City Planning Officer at Newcastle upon Tyne, in charge of a newly created Department. In 1968, he joined the Ministry of Housing and Local Government as Chief Planner, becoming (uniquely) Chief Planner and Deputy Secretary in the Department of the Environment in 1971, with a leading role in integrating planning and transport. He left government service in 1982 only to embark on a series of further commitments in his retirement. Having satisfactorily recuperated from serious heart surgery, he joined the Local Government Boundary Commission, becoming its Deputy Chairman and maintained a network of professional contacts in many quarters.

At Coventry, Burns was first an assistant planning officer, serving under Donald Gibson as City Architect and Planning Officer. When Arthur Ling succeeded Gibson in 1955, Burns was appointed in charge of the Planning Division. In this capacity he contributed substantially to the planning and reconstruction of the City.

In retrospect, Burns' move to Surrey was a career aberration, but professional advancement in urban authorities was then restricted by virtue of the seniority of the municipal engineer over town planning in Departmental organisation (though not in Coventry). But the 1960s were to see a significant shift in this respect, the first breach in professional domination occurring in Newcastle. Political change of control in 1958 helped to break the mould and a new Labour leader, T. Dan Smith, proclaimed the sort of city he wanted to see. These Newcastle years were exciting ones. Politically-provided opportunities for change met with a worthy professional response and Burns extracted the best from an innovative team, setting trends in thinking, method and practice which influenced urban planning nationally throughout the decade and beyond.

The last 14 years of Burns' career were in Whitehall as a successor to J.R. James. During that time he was involved with, and had an influence on, all the major issues and developments in planning, in a period when so much was undergoing change. He was Director of the South East Joint Planning Team which published the Strategic Plan for

the South East in 1970. His involvement with transport was manifest in his chairmanship of the Urban Motorways Committee which published its report New Roads in Towns in 1972. In 1974, he took a leading role in arrangements to set up the School for Advanced Urban Studies at the University of Bristol. In 1975 he was instrumental in developing the Community Land Act scheme in the legislation of that year; ironically he worked on the repeal of the Act in 1980. He took responsibility for policy proposals contained in the White Paper Policy for the Inner Cities (Cmd. 6845), 1977. In the same year he reported as chairman of a group concerned with planning and transportation problems in Bath; a group including Avon County Council, Bath District Council and Bath Preservation Trust had been set up by the Secretary of State in 1973 and the Bath Steering Group Report was published in 1977. In 1980, his work as Chairman of a Joint Group of Officials of Local Authority Associations and Government Departments came to fruition with his Committee's Report which reviewed local authority assistance to industry and commerce.

Burns' professional career coincided with the years of the rise and fall of British town planning. His work was undertaken against the background of the more distinctive phases: the high water mark of the later 1940s when idealism, commitment and confidence held out so much promise for planned reconstruction, the potential of civic design and the possibilities giving rational order to land use; the years of relative quiescence in the 1950s; the resurgent boom years of the 1960s; the disappointments and reappraisal of the 1970s; and the changed political attitudes of the 1980s. From shining star to fading vision; from certainty to doubt; from purpose to drift; from radicalism to incrementalism; from centralism to popular participation: these have been our experiences of the last 35-40 years. During this time bureaucracy, the professions, the machinery of government and political will have all been challenged and variously called into question as the community (the clients of planning) have alleged failure, waste, excessive cost and overzealous regulation. Professional planners have been buffeted by the demands of a fickle public and the challenge of a response to a rapidly changing set of social, economic and technological conditions.

Most professional planners develop their careers within the system which is set for them, ducking and weaving through the circumstances of their time. Just occasionally truly great men, pioneers in their field, break through and succeed in getting the system to work for them, rather than be led by it. Wilfred Burns was such a person. He was a man with a vision for what might be: not for design or for the visual appearance of cities, but for making cities work in such a way that brings benefit to people. He was a man who could use opportunities, Newcastle being his personal creative showpiece, but his adaptiveness and pragmatism served him in good stead later in Whitehall when planning had to trim its sails in troubled waters.

Essentially, Burns was a child of the war-time hopes and dreams for a better Britain. In Coventry and Newcastle he did so much to show how the vision might be translated into new environments. In later years he faced the reality of seeing the idealism blunted by a combination of statutory procedures, a collapse of professional confidence and a shift in political values. But throughout he was a committed professional. He had a total view of things, his message being 'that planning means more than civic design, or traffic, or statistics or regional design . . . and that its scope will continually widen.' He was an expansionist, not for professional aggrandisement in any competitive sense, but to share the planning method and process with related professions and disciplines for the creation of finer cities and liveable environments. He staked out a claim in the totality of local authority enterprise, contributing massively to a powerful resurgence of authority and conviction about planning, throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s, building on post-war idealism but in the knowledge that given the right conditions planning had so much to give to social well-being. This vision was to be thwarted in the later 1970s and beyond but his commitment to an ideal raised his profession to new heights in the conduct of urban, rural and regional affairs.

GORDON E. CHERRY

[1] PHB is grateful to the Editor of Town Planning Review for permission to publish this extract from an appreciation of Sir Wilfred

Burns by Gordon Cherry, which will appear in Vol. 55 (4), 1984. PHB hopes to publish a bibliography of Wilfred Burns at a later date.

A PLOTLAND ALBUM

If you find the exotic ruins of Tenochtitlan, Pompeii or Delos a little beyond reach, then why not settle for a somewhat easier trip to Dunton in Essex to see remnants of what was known even in its heyday as 'the forgotten city'.

In the 1940s there were as many as 27,500 people living in that part of south Essex between Laindon and Pitsea. The majority of these were in homes of light construction, without main services, and fronting onto a 75-mile network of grass track roads. It was 'par excellence' a plotland settlement, the first plots dating from the end of the last century when East Enders started to take advantage of a combination of cheap land and easy access to buy their own place in the sun. The little plots (selling in 1924 for about £6 for a 20-foot frontage) offered temporary retreats for weekends and holidays in the first instance, only becoming permanent homes in the Second World War, when primitive facilities seemed a small price to pay for an escape from enemy bombing in East London.

Confronted with what was widely regarded in official circles as a 'rural slum', and armed at last with effective planning powers the question was not one of whether to remove this unwanted legacy but rather of how. The answer was to designate the whole area as Basildon New Town, replacing all that was unplanned with a brand new settlement.

'Slowly the anarchic sprawl will be tidied into a new order, and the character of the district will be entirely changed', predicted an article in the Manchester Guardian in 1950. It was a fair prediction, and for more than 30 years the Development Corporation has engaged in the complex and volatile task of clearing the plots, one by one, as a prelude to rebuilding. It has been a fraught exercise, with many a plotholder resisting to the last this assault on his much-prized

property.

There is, then, a gentle irony in the decision of the Corporation to hold back the bulldozers from the few remaining plot and to reserve the whole of what used to be known as the Dunton Hills Estate as a reminder of Basildon's origins. With financial aid from the Countryside Commission, the Landscape Section of the Corporation has devised a plotland trail, and has produced an excellent booklet packed with photos, estate plans and other illustrations.

What the visitor to Dunton will find is the original estate layout, with a handful of buildings dotted around. One of these, 'The Haven', is being renovated and will be used as a plotland museum. The family who built it in the mid-1930s has been contacted to advise on furnishings, amazed but delighted that their ordinary existence should be of interest to anyone else.

Most of the bungalows that were once here have been demolished, but visitors are free to wander through the various plots, stepping over loose building materials and foundations buried in the long grass and noting the tell-tale signs of garden plants and hedge lines that give it all away. Those who like their history in the form of cottages and workshops rather than palaces and castles will take delight in Dunton.

The scheme has already aroused local interest and, significantly, new sources of family photos, property deeds and so on have been dug out of attics and cluttered cupboards. Planning historians will be amongst the first to appreciate the value of this type of material. All in all, full credit to the Corporation for taking an initiative which could so easily have been seen to be against the general grain of their work. Authors are not acknowledged in the booklet, but it was Pat Hayes who started the research and Lindsey Evers and colleagues in the Landscape Section who have seen it through.

Dunton is an evocative reminder of Basildon's past but, as the only trail of its type, it can also serve as a museum for plotlands generally. Essex had more than its fair share of plotland development

in the early twentieth-century but (as many a planner who has spent long hours dealing with a legacy of makeshift settlements will testify) there are few parts of the country that missed it altogether. Humble, self-made homes, passionately defended by their inhabitants, have proved remarkably resilient to the efforts of planners to remove them. They have also called into question the goals of planning itself. In the face of individual claims, is the public good better served by their removal or not?

Planning historians should make the pilgrimage to Dunton and decide for themselves. Go in the winter and trudge through the sticky mud along the unmade tracks (without the advantage of a house at the bottom of the hill which once served as a collecting point for wellington boots before boarding 'Old Tom's' bus into Laindon). Or go in summer and enjoy the view back towards East London, feeling, as the early settlers described it, 'as if you are on top of the world'.

A plotland album: the story of the Dunton Hills Community is published by Basildon Development Corporation (1983), and copies are obtainable free of charge from the Landscape Section, Basildon Development Corporation, Gifford House, Basildon, Essex.

DENNIS HARDY
Middlesex Polytechnic.

COOPERATIVE HOUSEKEEPING

The cooperative housekeeping movement is a forgotten element in the history of English planning. Cooperative housekeeping was a nineteenth-century variation on communal living whereby families lived separately but shared responsibility for domestic duties. Houses and flats in these cooperative housekeeping schemes were often built in quadrangles. Their ability to combine privacy and community still makes them popular places to live in today. Many schemes were initiated by women, showing that women have been involved with the design of good, practical housing for at least a century.

Several articles appeared in the literary journals on associated homes in the mid-nineteenth century (1). Early writing in the cooperative movement publicised the debate in socialist circles. Edward Vansittart Neale was a champion of associated homes (2) and *The Co-Operator* published a series of articles on the subject (3). Opposition from cooperators more interested in using their capital to build individual homes meant that no associated homes were built.

It took an American, Melusina Fay Peirce, to bring cooperative housekeeping to the attention of the middle classes as a means of solving their domestic problems without any overtones of socialism. Ironically, her articles in *Atlantic Monthly* (4) included a description of the constitution of a cooperative housekeeping association, based on that of the European co-operative societies. The outcome was a rush of enthusiasm for the idea, reflected in numerous articles (5) and papers to learned societies (6). This open discussion culminated in the production of two plans for cooperative homes.

The first was designed by E. W. Godwin and commissioned by Mrs. E. M. King (7), and was a large house comprising accommodation for about 20 households with school, play room, kitchen and common dining room. One of the most important advantages of this limited amount of communal living was that it actually increased family privacy, as servants were able to live off the premises and not be almost permanently on duty. The second cooperative home was a design by Marie C. C. Morfit (8). This rather extravagant house included flats for 6 households, servants' rooms, laundry, kitchen, sick rooms and a bowling alley. Neither of these houses was built, but contemporary discussion now accepted the basic idea as an economic proposition rather than a socialist utopia (9).

Single working women could also benefit from this new form of housing. In the early 1900s, several homes for 'gentlewomen' were built, some with shared facilities. They were often intended to make a small profit, and provided independence for the women along with the physical and moral security required at the time (10). A forerunner was the Ladies' Residential Chambers in Chenies Street, Bloomsbury (11), opened in 1889. Each was provided a small kitchen and scullery. Residents could eat in their own rooms or use the communal dining room and kitchen. The opening of the Chambers was attended by Lydia Becker, a supporter of cooperative housekeeping since the early 1870s and secretary of the Manchester Society for Women's Suffrage.

Until the early 1900s, all designs for cooperative housekeeping establishments had been variations on the ordinary house form, usually larger versions with additional communal rooms. The coming of the garden city movement, presented opportunities for houses and flats with a more outwardly-communal appearance. This change in form stemmed partly from the publicity given to Parker and Unwin's design for cooperative housing, included in 'The Art of Building a Home' in 1901. Unwin's chapter 'Of Co-operation in Building', argued that tenements grouped round quadrangles or gardens would give character and dignity to towns (12). He cited old college buildings as an example of satisfactory town building, showing the influence of his early years in Oxford. Another influence on Unwin was William Morris (13) who suggested communal kitchens, laundries and dining rooms for workers' housing, although still emphasising the differentiation of public and private space. Ebenezer Howard's 'Tomorrow: A peaceful path to real reform' was first published in 1898, and also contained a reference to groups of houses, some with common gardens and cooperative kitchen (14).

In 1899, the American socialist and feminist, Charlotte Perkins Gilman made her second visit to England: her book, 'Women and Economics' (15) was then issued. In her book and lectures she advocated the socialisation of domestic work, which she defined as the professionalisation of housekeeping and the freeing of women from the ties of cooking, cleaning and child care. Her suggestions for apartment living for women with families received wide publicity but little support in England. Gilman had joined the Fabian Society during her earlier visit in 1896, being proposed by Beatrice Webb. The Fabian News carried an advertisement in 1899 seeking residents for a cooperative home in Canning Town (16).

The formation of the Garden City Association in 1899 stimulated discussion on

possible new forms of housing. Speakers gained a wide audience for their views on cooperative housing. One such speaker was Harold Clapham Lander, a Fabian who was a council member and later secretary of the Association. He was particularly active, writing part of a Fabian Tract on housing (17) as well as being honorary architect to the Co-operative Garden City Committee, and speaking on cooperative dwellings to the first Garden City Conference in 1901 (18). Between 1901 and the start of building at the first garden city of Letchworth, a series of cooperative housekeeping schemes came to fruition in London and the surrounding area. Raymond Unwin's Fabian Tract was published (19), giving more details of his ideas on cooperative housing. The revised version of Howard's 'Tomorrow' was published in 1902 as 'Garden Cities of Tomorrow', while the *Englishwoman's Review* published an article on cooperative cooking in 1903 (20). In 1904 a pamphlet was issued from Hampstead suggesting an experiment in 'common kitchen arrangements' at Letchworth (21). In 1904/5 H. G. Wells's 'A modern utopia' was serialised, showing a future where private autonomy was decreasing and life was mainly lived in hotels, clubs and cooperative homes (22). Later in 1905 Wells published two articles in the *Daily Mail* commending cooperative housekeeping as a solution to the housing problem (23). Walter Crane first wrote to 'The Garden City' magazine urging that collective dwellings be built in Letchworth, and then published his son's design for a collective dwelling containing 16 cottages and a common room, in the form of a quadrangle (24). Finally in 1906, Ebenezer Howard and H. Clapham Lander produced their plan for a group of 24 homes and a common kitchen, and by 1907 a site in Letchworth had been found and a company formed to carry out the plan (25).

Homesgarth, as Howard called the group of homes, was the first family venture in cooperative housekeeping to open in November 1910 (26). Sixteen houses, designed by H. Clapham Lander, were built in the first stage of the plan. (the other 16 were never completed), which comprised two and three storey houses and a communal dining and kitchen, built around two sides of a quadrangle. The houses were joined by a covered walk around the inside of the quadrangle. Howard, who lived there from 1911-20 (27), wrote eulogies to the freedom it gave women from domestic cares and suggested a similar system for working class families (28). Homesgarth was intended for comfortably off childless couples, and received criticism because of this, although it was Howard's intention to extend the cooperative housekeeping system to include other social groups.

Homesgarth was the second of the new group of cooperative homes, the first being Waterlow Court, a home for 50 single working ladies in Hampstead Garden Suburb.

This was suggested by Henrietta Barnett and originally planned by Raymond Unwin (29) although M. H. Baillie Scott designed the final version for the Improved Industrial Dwellings Company. Baillie Scott had already published a plan for a group of 16 cooperative houses with central dining hall (30), and the Waterlow Court design appears to be an extension of this (31). The Court is still a beautiful cloistered quadrangle. Henrietta Barnett made great efforts to start a group of houses with a communal kitchen for families, but this came to naught (32).

After the two well publicised developments of Homegarth and Waterlow Court came four schemes all initiated by the same woman. Alice Melvin, a Finchley resident who had earlier been involved with the provision of women's hostels (33). Her first venture was Brent Garden Village, an almost exact interpretation of Gilman's plan for cooperative homes, with suburban houses connected by a covered way to a central building. Melvin first suggested this in a lecture to the Finchley Women's Guild in October 1909 (34), following which a friendly society was established to raise money for the purchase of Brent Lodge, the prospective central building. The architect P. Woollatt Home designed the kitchenless houses, supervised by Melvin, and the first residents moved in during November 1911, to the amusement of the press (35).

By this time Melvin had begun another scheme called Melvin Park at Ruislip (36). Intended as a forerunner of a completely cooperative garden city, a serviced block of flats, was eventually opened in November 1912. Situated in Golders Green Road, North London, it was a 'Victorian warren of a place' with a central kitchen and dining room looking out on to large gardens. Residents could take their 'excellent' meals either in their own flats or the dining room, until the flats were sold in 1964 (37). Alice Melvin's last idea was to buy Frogna Priory, a large mansion built in 1892 and situated close to West Hampstead underground station, and use it as a cooperative home (38).

Meanwhile in Letchworth, two young women had been inspired by the communal ventures they had seen on a visit to Austria and Germany. Miss Ruth Pym, (later to become warden of Letchworth Settlement), and Miss S. E. Dew, a teacher, were friends of Ebenezer Howard. The Howard Cottage Society finally agreed to back their scheme for a half quadrangle of cottages and flats with a common dining room (39). Built between 1914 and 1916, Meadow Way Green conforms most closely to the original idea of cooperative housekeeping, in that residents took it in turns of a fortnight each to supervise the cooking. The second half of the quadrangle of cottages was added in 1925. Communal dining flourished until 1976.

The architect was Courtenay Crickmer.

One further attempt was made by Mrs. E. B. Pearsall of Letchworth to initiate a scheme which would include families with children. Plans for the houses were drawn up by Bennett and Bidwell, (who had both worked for Parker and Unwin), and published in August 1920 (40). Nothing came of this scheme, nor of a plan to build a block of cooperative flats at Onslow Village near Guildford (41). Although the village was begun with fanfares of publicity - Ebenezer Howard had helped to choose the site - it soon ran short of funds (42).

The second garden city of Welwyn had begun building in 1920, its early publicity stating that cooperative housekeeping schemes were to be encouraged (43). In 1922 Guessens Court, a quadrangle of kitchenless flats with a communal block on the fourth side, was opened. They were designed by H. Clapham Lander and run by the New Town Trust which built various housing developments in Welwyn (44). The quadrangle and its idiosyncratic towered archway still exist, although the communal block is now a hotel.

One final development harking back to Waterlow Court was that of St George's Court in Bournville, Birmingham. This was initiated by Dame Elizabeth Cadbury in 1925, and was a three sided block of flats for single business and professional women (45). It was designed by the Bournville Village Trust architect, S. A. Wilmot, and included a communal lounge, kitchen and dining room. The Court originally had a warden, and women who became unemployed could be asked to leave their accommodation. The last of the communal activities finished in the late 1960s, and it has now been modernised so that all flats are self contained (46).

The cooperative housekeeping movement went into gradual decline in the mid 1920s, with few schemes being started while others did not expand as originally envisaged. Apart from possibly one in Liverpool, all the schemes were concentrated on London and the two garden cities. The scheme retaining its communal functions longest was Meadow Way Green, the development in which residents helped with the domestic work and one of the minority into which children were allowed. The six cooperative housekeeping developments still remaining have retained their popularity as places to live, although in every case the communal functions have dwindled away. Indeed, interviews with residents who remember the communal activities suggest that although they were welcomed, they were not the main reason for residents wanting to live in those developments. The houses or flats themselves,

It was, however, an ideal form of accommodation for certain groups of people. A small network of well known figures became involved. Howard had read Gilman. Howard's architect Lander spoke at Melvin's meetings. Howard knew Pym. Unwin drew the first plan for Waterlow Court. The formation of the Garden City Association provided an opportunity for the building of new types of housing. Both the garden city and cooperative housekeeping movements reflected a feeling that a better way of life had to be found. Cooperative housekeeping was seen as a means to improve the working conditions of servants (but not to dispense with them) and as an economic form of housing for the working classes. It was a protest against the Victorian image of the home whilst still emphasising the need for privacy. It did not challenge the structure of the family in any way. It reflected progress towards women's emancipation, providing accommodation for women workers and reducing the domestic workload for married women.

The movement withered away, particularly after the First World War. It became even harder to keep servants; they were replaced by a new generation of household appliances, intended for individual households rather than community groups. The suburban building boom increased the availability of houses, and fewer moral restrictions were placed on women. Council-house building began in earnest and, in spite of much advice on the need to include communal facilities (47), it was rare to find even communal washhouses. The peak of interest in communal living had passed, although communal outdoor activities (such as rambling) enjoyed an upsurge in the 1930s.

The fact that these developments, intended for cooperative housekeeping, have become popular places to live says much for the values implicit in their design. The combination of privacy and community, the human scale, comfortable materials and illusion of rural life could be criticised as being elitist, but their survival and popularity is a challenge to architects today in producing designs that are equally acceptable for a wider public. It is also an indication of how design input by non-architects can result in liveable housing. Cooperative housekeeping was a women's housing initiative with lessons for all those involved in house design today (48).

LYNN F. PEARSON
Centre for Urban and Regional Studies,
University of Birmingham.

References

1. For example Mary Gillies, Associated Homes for the Middle Class, *Howitt's Journal* (1847), 1 (20), pp. 270-273 and 2 (29), pp. 38-41; Helix, Human Progress, *Westminster Review* (1849), 52 (1), pp. 1-39. I am indebted to Allison Ravetz for the latter references.
2. Philip N. Backstrom, *Christian socialism and co-operation in Victorian England* (1974), London: Croom Helm, pp. 136-146.
3. For example Co-operative Housekeeping, *The Co-Operator* (1896), 28 August, p. 619.
4. Melusina Fay Peirce, Co-operative Housekeeping, *Atlantic Monthly*, (1868-9), 22 (133-4) and 23 (135-7), pp. 513-524, 682-697, 29-39, 161-171, 286-299.
5. Co-operative housekeeping, *Chamber's Journal* (1869), 20 March, (273), pp. 177-9; E. W. Domestic co-operation, *Co-Operative News* (1872), 2 (1), p. 1; Mary C. Hume-Rothery, Cooperative housekeeping, *The Cooperator and Anti-vaccinator* (1871), 11, pp. 262-3 and 289-90; Elizabeth P. Ramsay, Co-operative housekeeping, *Englishwoman's Review*, (1875) 6 (30), pp. 435-443.
6. E. M. King, Confederated homes and cooperative house-keeping, *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* (1873) Communications to the sections, pp. 195-6.
7. E. M. King, Cooperative housekeeping, *Building news* (1874), 26 (24 April), pp. 452-3 and 459-60.
8. Marie C. C. Morfit, On cooperative housekeeping, *Trans. of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*, (1876), pp. 618-9.
9. Roswell Fisher, The practical side of cooperative housekeeping, *The nineteenth century* (1877), Sept. pp. 283-291.
10. Lady Brabazon's Home for Gentlewomen, *The Architect* (1904), 71 (19 Feb), p. 128; Home for educated women workers, Nutford House, *Building News* (1915), 109 (8 Sept), pp. 260, 264-5, 275.
11. Ladies' Residential Chambers, *Englishwoman's Review* (1889), 20 (193), pp. 271-3.
12. Raymond Unwin, Of co-operation in building, pp. 91-108 in Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin, *The art of building a home* (1901), London: Longmans, Green.
13. William Morris, The housing of the poor, *Justice* (1884), 1 (27), pp. 4-5.

14. Ebenezer Howard, **Garden cities of To-morrow** (1946 edition, ed. F. J. Osborn), London : Faber and Faber.
15. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, **Women and Economics** (1908), London : G. P. Putnam's Sons, pp. 241-256.
16. **Fabian News** (1899), 9 (3), p. 12. The house, at 87 Barking Road, has disappeared and shops now occupy the site.
17. H. Clapham Lander, Consideration of practical difficulties as regards building, **Fabian Tract No 101** (1900), pp. 27-31.
18. H. Clapham Lander, The advantages of cooperative dwellings, **The Garden City Conference at Bournville, Report of Proceedings** (1901), pp. 61-68.
19. Raymond Unwin, Cottage plans and common sense, **Fabian Tract No 109** (1902), pp. 14-15.
20. Co-operative cooking, **Englishwoman's Review** (1903), 34 (259), pp. 267-8.
21. Proposed experiment in House Grouping for the purpose of common kitchen arrangements, to be tried in "Garden City" (1904), Hampstead : pamphlet in collection of First Garden City Museum, Letchworth.
22. H. G. Wells, A modern utopia, **Fortnightly Review** (1905) 77 (458), pp. 366-380.
23. H. G. Wells, Joint households, **Daily Mail** (1905) 25 May, p. 6 ; A woman's day in utopia, **Daily Mail** (1905), 7 June, p. 4.
24. Walter Crane, Cooperative housekeeping, **The Garden City** (1905), 1 (4), p. 59 ; **Ideals in Art** (1905), London : George Bell, pp. 115-117.
25. Ebenezer Howard, Co-operative housekeeping, **Daily Mail** (1906), 18 Aug. p. 7 ; Letchworth co-operative houses, **The Garden City** (1907), 2 (20), pp. 436-8.
26. Reports of opening of Homesgarth in **Pall Mall Gazette**, 24 Nov 1910 ; **Westminster Gazette**, 28 Nov 1910 ; **County Gentleman**, 3 Dec 1910 ; and many others.
27. North Hertfordshire District Council (M.K. Miller), **Letchworth Conservation Area Broadsheet** (1977), Letchworth : NHDC.
28. Ebenezer Howard, A new way of housekeeping, **Daily Mail** (1913), 27 March, p. 4 ; A new outlet for women's energy, **Garden cities and town planning magazine** (1913), 3 (June), pp. 152-9.
29. Dame Henrietta Barnett **The story of the growth of the Hampstead Garden Suburb 1907-1928** (1928), London : Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust, pp. 20-21.
30. M. H. Baillie Scott, **Houses and Gardens** (1906) London : George Newnes, pp. 116-8.
31. James D. Kornwolf, **M. H. Baillie Scott and the Arts and Crafts Movement** (1972), Baltimore : John Hopkins, p. 312.
32. Barnett, *op.cit.*, 1928, pp. 73-4.
33. Domestic drudgery, **The Standard** (1911), 15 Nov.
34. The co-operative kitchen, **Daily Mail** (1910), 24 Aug.
35. For example : First houses without kitchens, **Daily Sketch** (1911), 16 Nov. p. 16 ; A Kitchenless Kitchen, **The Times**, (1911), 14 Nov. p. 7.
36. No housework, **The Standard** (1911), 16 Nov. p. 4.
37. Information from records at the Registry of Friendly Societies and private communication, Mr. J. H. Rogers, 27 July 1983.
41. Onslow Village Limited, **Prospectus and descriptive booklet** (1920), Guildford : Onslow Village Ltd., Onslow Garden Village, **Garden Cities and Town Planning Magazine** (1920), 10 (12), pp. 243-5.
42. Information from records of Onslow Village Limited, Guildford.
43. Second Garden City, **A scheme for a second garden city** (1919), pamphlet in collection of First Garden City Museum, Letchworth.
44. Information from records of Welwyn Garden City in collection of First Garden City Museum, Letchworth.
45. Bournville Village Trust, **Bournville Housing** (1928), Birmingham : BVT, P. 37 ; Bournville Village Trust, **The Bournville Village Trust 1900-1955** (1955), Birmingham : BVT, p. 31.
46. Information from records of Bournville Village Trust and conversation with Mr. A. J. Kelly of BVT, 6 May 1983.
47. Ministry of Reconstruction Advisory Council, Women's Housing Sub-Committee, **Final Report** (1919), Cd. 9232, London : HMSO, Paras. 66-73 ; Marion Phillips (ed), **Women and the Labour Party** (1919), London : Headley Brothers, p. 71.
48. The paper is based on research supported by the Social Science Research Council.

