



DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. NI:1p3:N42 H2

Ac. No. 40790

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of one anna will be levied for each day the book is kept beyond the date.

[illegible]

Industry and Rural Life

INDUSTRY AND RURAL LIFE

*being a summarized report of the
Cambridge Conference
of the
Town and Country Planning Association
Spring, 1942*

edited by

H. BRYANT NEWBOLD

F.R.I.B.A.



FABER AND FABER LIMITED
24 Russell Square
London

FIRST PUBLISHED IN OCTOBER MCMXLII
BY FABER AND FABER LIMITED
24 RUSSELL SQUARE LONDON W.C.1
PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
LATIMER TREND AND CO LTD PLYMOUTH
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED



THE TYPOGRAPHY AND BINDING
OF THIS BOOK CONFORM TO THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS

FOREWORD

The last Conference of the Association, which was held at Oxford in March 1941, gave general support to the policy of the Barlow Royal Commission's Report, for decentralization from overgrown and congested cities. Much concern was then expressed lest, in carrying out that policy, the vital interests of food-growing and the amenities of the countryside, should be overlooked. Whilst movements of industry and population if well directed will bring new life to rural areas, yet without proper guidance there is danger that they will occupy and waste precious land of high fertility. The purpose of the Cambridge Conference was to define the principles and the methods by which the needs of industry and business, and of the workers, could be reconciled to the needs of agriculture and rural life.

It will be recalled that it was recommended at the Oxford Conference, in acceptance of the proposals of the Barlow Report, that a Central Authority, national in scope and character should be set up. This has since been adopted by the Government and embodied in their policy for reconstruction.¹ In consequence, as it may be justly assumed that the deliberations of the Town and Country Planning Association were helpful in the formulation of the Government's post-war policy on that occasion, so now it is a reasonable expectation that their recommendations at Cambridge will be noted in quarters where they will do most good. The list of delegates affords confirmation of this view. For in it will be found not only the leading planners but also eminent authorities on the land and its proper usage. And as all projects for post-war social regeneration centre round the most economic employment of the land it will be agreed that the Cambridge Conference afforded very valuable service to that end.

H. BRYANT NEWBOLD

¹ Hansard, 11th February, 1942.

Hullo, hullo, hullo, hullo, you Coal Black Smith!

O what is your silly song?

You never shall change my maiden name,

That I have kept so long.

I'd rather die a maid

(Yes but then, she said, I'd be buried all in my grave)

Than I'd have such a nasty, rusty, dusty, fusty, musty, Coal Black
Smith!

A maiden I will die!

Country Song (Traditional)

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	<i>page</i> 5
INTRODUCTION by F. J. Osborn	9
GOOD WISHES FOR THE CONFERENCE: The Rt. Hon. Lord Portal, Minister of Works and Planning	16

SESSION I

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT, by the Chairman, Professor G. M. Trevelyan, O.M., C.B.E.	17
STATEMENT I, by Sir A. Daniel Hall, K.C.B., F.R.S.	18
STATEMENT II, by L. F. Easterbrook	27
DISCUSSION	38

SESSION II

REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

OPENING REMARKS, by the Chairman, Sir P. Malcolm Stewart, Bt., O.B.E.	41
STATEMENT, by Professor Sargant Florence, M.A., PH.D.	42
DISCUSSION	48

SESSION III

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

OPENING REMARKS, by the Chairman, Major John A. Rosevear, F.S.I., D.T.P.(LOND.)	52
STATEMENT I, by Professor A. W. Ashby	53
STATEMENT II, by Dr. W. K. Slater	72
DISCUSSION	81

CONTENTS
SESSION IV

ARCHITECTURE AND AMENITIES

Chairman, The Rt. Hon. Sir Montague Barlow, Bt., K.B.E.	<i>page</i>
STATEMENT, by Professor Patrick Abercrombie, F.R.I.B.A.	83
DISCUSSION	89

SESSION V

RURAL LAND-OWNERSHIP AND PLANNING

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS, by the Chairman, Major W. Harding Thompson, F.R.I.B.A., P.P.T.P.I.	93
STATEMENT I, by C. S. Orwin, M.A., D.LITT.	94
STATEMENT II, by Lord Brocket	102
COMMENT, by E. P. Weller, M.A.	109

SESSION VI

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TOWNS

Chairman, Eric Macfadyen, M.A., J.P.	
STATEMENT I, by Thomas Sharp, M.A., M.T.P.I.	113
STATEMENT II, by F. J. Osborn	120
DISCUSSION	132

SESSION VII

INFORMAL DISCUSSION	135
---------------------	-----

APPENDIXES

I. Memorandum to Lord Justice Scott's Committee on Land Utilization in Rural Areas	144
II. National Planning Basis	172
III. Biographical Notes	174
IV. List of Delegates attending the Conference	176
V. Book List	181

INTRODUCTION

This Cambridge Conference was a stage in the effort of the Town and Country Planning Association to evolve an effective consensus of opinion and action among people concerned for the best use of land in the national interest.

I think it is a fair judgement on the Conference to say that, like the Oxford Conference of 1941, it did a great deal to elucidate some of the problems facing us in Reconstruction, and made appreciable progress towards an agreed town and country development policy. A detached critic (if there is such a being) would probably concur with my own impression that some of the speakers at the Conference had made less effort than might have been hoped to integrate their own special interests with others of equal importance to the nation. But that very fact, which makes the result of any such Conference indecisive, is precisely the justification for holding it. Sectional views must be stated with full authority and weight, and an expert would not be an expert if his mind had gone in the direction of philosophical synthesis or political balancing and compromise.

It is for the statesmen or politicians, as representing the millions of plain ordinary townsfolk and countrymen, to come to decisions after all the experts and interests have been heard. But they cannot do this if the only material they have before them is a multitude of apparently unrelated facts and claims. Some lead must arise somewhere, some synthesis be attempted, some outline of a practicable policy be prepared for discussion both by the experts and the interested strata of public opinion. A broad outline of policy, submitted by the Town and Country Planning Association to Lord Justice Scott's Committee, after prolonged study and discussion of all the issues, was therefore sent to all the speakers before the Conference, and printed for the use of the delegates. It appears as the Appendix to this Report.¹ Moreover, the invitation to the Conference stated

¹ Memorandum of the Town and Country Planning Association to Lord Justice Scott's Committee on Land Utilization in Rural Areas. Appendix: page 144.

INTRODUCTION

that general acceptance of the Nine Agreed Points of the Report of the Barlow Commission would be assumed.¹

Very little that was said at the Conference tended to invalidate the policy implicit in the latter document and expanded in the former. That there were substantial differences of accent was to be expected. If complete unanimity had already existed on the policy, the Conference would have been unnecessary. On the other hand, if the possibility of agreement were not latent in the situation, any Conference whatever would be futile. In war-time, it is very difficult for persons of weight and standing (all of whom necessarily have heavy responsibilities in connection with the national effort) to attend a Conference, and even more difficult for a voluntary society (whose members are in the same position) to organize it. However, the value and imperative necessity of such Conferences was shown by the extent of agreement underlying the addresses, and by the variety and importance of the outstanding points of disagreement—on which agreement must be reached soon if a period of chaos at the end of the war is to be avoided.

The special tasks at Cambridge were: first, to ascertain the views of authorities on agriculture as to the probable trends of after-war agricultural policy in so far as they are likely to influence town and country planning; and, second, to study the methods by which the decentralization of industry from overcrowded cities, recommended by the Barlow Report, could be effected with the greatest advantage and least injury to the rural countryside. We felt that it was desirable at the same time to obtain authoritative views on both sides of the vexed question as to whether rural planning, new urban developments in the countryside, and good agricultural development were considered to necessitate changes in the system of land-ownership—an issue on which town and country planners are, like other sections of public opinion, divided.

Putting it still more pointedly, the main theses of the Conference were these. The 'planners' wanted to know from the agriculturists the future line of agricultural development. They also wanted to inform the agriculturists of the claims of industry and the townsfolk to further land for factories, business and living-space, and to be

¹ Report of Royal Commission on Distribution of Industrial Population of Great Britain, 1940 (H.M. Stationery Office).

INTRODUCTION

advised as to how to adjust these claims to the interests of agriculture and the life of villages and country towns.

The personnel of the Conference was not, and was not intended to be, a balanced cross-section of the nation. There were a good many delegates from the cities, but fewer than at the Oxford Conference, while rural areas and interests were more strongly represented. The majority of the speeches were made by people with special knowledge of countryside problems, and the 'planners', for once, did most of the listening.

One of the few quick generalizations that might be ventured is that the agriculturists seemed more in agreement about town and country planning policy than about agricultural policy. Most of them were, very naturally in the light of inter-war spoliation, distinctly jealous of any further urban extensions in the countryside, though the majority took the sensible view that the practical policy is to guide and canalize such developments rather than to ban them entirely—an outlook on which a balanced national plan can be founded, reconciling rural interests with the needs of industry and of the overcrowded populations of the cities. But the tendency to consolidate on the defence from development of as much farm land as possible, and particularly of the better-quality lands, was as unmistakable as it was welcome to advanced planners. There is no difficulty in principle (though plenty in practice) in the way of an agreed policy on this point. The problem resolves itself into the constituent problems of a sufficiently strong machinery for use-zoning, and of providing an adequate compensation fund for displaced values—or the more radical alternative of the public ownership of land or of development rights.

Here I must defend town planners on a charge made by more than one speaker at the Conference—that of not having cared for the safeguarding of agricultural land. This is the reverse of the historical truth. From the start of the modern planning movement the conception that towns ought to be designed as restricted units on a 'background' of permanently-reserved farm land has been present. Long before the birth of the specialized countryside preservationist societies this conception was consistently advocated by planners, and especially by those identified with the garden city movement. Outstanding instances are Ebenezer Howard's *Garden Cities of To-morrow* (1898), and Raymond Unwin's *First Greater London Regional Report*

INTRODUCTION

(1929). Statutory planners struggled for years with compensation and betterment provisions that forced them to zone vast areas of rural land for building—while agriculturists were publicly silent on the subject. Planners may well find some irony in the accusations now made against them. The patient, reaching out for the long-neglected medicine, refuses the doctor credit for the prescription and even blames him for the progress of the disease.

On the question of ownership an intractable division of opinion revealed itself at the Conference. Three extremely powerful statements were made by responsible agricultural experts in favour of the complete public ownership of rural land, the surprising and new claim being made that this was of greater urgency than the public ownership of urban land. The opposite view was vigorously stated by the Chairman of the Land Union, Lord Brocket. It must be said, however, that the dominant opinion of the agriculturists at the Conference seemed to favour either complete nationalization of rural land, or a piecemeal and opportunist progress in that direction, beginning with 'problem' areas and land not at present satisfactorily managed.

On the vital question as to whether national agricultural policy is going to favour larger and more mechanized farms, or small family farms and the maximum number of persons on the land, the curiosity of planners was rewarded by several different answers. Sir Daniel Hall based his case for nationalization largely on the necessity of a positive policy of rearranging farms, properly equipping them, and increasing their average size; he viewed agriculture primarily as a competitive industry which must adapt itself to world prices. Mr. Easterbrook and most of the other speakers put more emphasis on farming as a 'way of life' and as a social-political element needed in the national balance, and while not disregarding economic necessities, gave a very high place to non-economic satisfactions. This outlook is of course finding strong expression at the moment in Continental and American economic and sociological literature, and unconventional as it seems to those trained in economics, is politically realistic in principle, though not always stated in language which impresses realists.

The gulf in principle seemed deep; Sir Daniel Hall was no less critical of the 'retail structure' of present-day farming than Mr. Easterbrook was of the 'factory-farm' conception. The view of some

INTRODUCTION

experts that every square yard of agricultural land should be cultivated was opposed by the view of others that it is better to concentrate on intensive cultivation of a smaller area of the best land. Each party to the controversy, however, made substantial concessions to the others, and the lay planner perhaps came away with the assessment that, the enthusiasms and arguments on all sides being obviously strong, national statesmanship might be expected to follow the hallowed British practice of pursuing all the policies together—encouraging larger farms in some areas and increasing smallholdings and family farms in others, reclaiming waste lands here and downgrading cultivation there. A number of speakers in fact advocated a wide range of sizes of holdings as ideally suited to the diversity of soils and circumstances in this country.

It should not be assumed, however, because this is the way of compromise and the easy way, that it is in the ultimate interests of the countryside as a whole. The arguments adduced by the various speakers, and the books in which they have amplified these arguments, should be very carefully studied, for the issues are vital, and in agriculture, as in town development, the direction in which we make our first moves after this war is likely profoundly to affect national prosperity and happiness for a century or more.

Professor Sargant Florence gave a quantitative and factual basis to the long-held view of planners (again I can cite Ebenezer Howard and Raymond Unwin) that many industries have a considerable elasticity of location. Full understanding both of the extent and the limitations of that elasticity is basic to a policy of guidance of industrial siting. It is important to realize that a decision as to what is the 'best' location for any particular undertaking depends very much on the factors that are regarded as relevant, including 'incommensurable' economic factors such as the contentment and enthusiasm of industrial personnel, non-economic factors, and factors transcending the economics of a particular undertaking. Among the latter are those under the heading of defence, susceptibility to trade fluctuations, and considerations of social and political structure.

National policies and habits have had arbitrary effects on industrial location. For example, the 'company town' or 'mill village'—not an ideal type of settlement, but important as illustrating in an extreme form the practicability of dispersal—is commoner in America than here, and the industries most favouring such developments include

textiles, steel, pulp and paper, rubber, and others not commonly regarded as 'footloose'. The high capitalization of American industry, coupled with the custom for workers to own their own homes, has financially facilitated this form of development. In this country the prevalence of the tenancy system has made housing their own workers in factory villages too costly for most firms, while our publicly-financed housing has, in practice, supported metropolitan concentration rather than decentralization or dispersal. The fact that urban development is becoming more and more a partnership between socially-provided housing and privately-promoted business makes the case for public guidance of industrial location unanswerable even on 'economic' grounds. Professor Florence's analysis is a valuable tool in applying that guidance. The discussion pointed rather to the grouping of diversified industries in smallish towns than to the settling of single industries in villages, though there was fairly general agreement that many villages would gain by small industries related to agriculture.

On the question of the social facilities and community equipment of villages and small towns, the recorded addresses and discussions are of great practical value. An extremely penetrating study was made by Professor Abercrombie of the problem of securing better design of individual buildings and greater harmony in civic architecture and landscape. Mr. Thomas Sharp's restatement of his idealism in urban design was very well received by the Conference. Planners who approach the subject sociologically do not all agree with him that civic design must stress the unity of the communal life rather than the individuality of the home; but there is no difference of opinion as to the desirability of visual beauty, and Mr. Sharp's specialization on this component of planning is a useful one in an age still fundamentally philistine in matters of architectural appearance.

A very encouraging feature of this Conference was the presence of many young students. Those of them who spoke were refreshingly arrogant in public and disarmingly polite in private, so it was rather difficult to tell whether their general accusation that everyone over thirty had a '1939 mentality' was a manifesto of the solidarity of youth or a real conviction. But it does no one any harm to be told such things, true or not. The difficulty about town and country planning is that only those with a considerable range of knowledge and

INTRODUCTION

experience can attain the necessary synthesis of all the issues, while maturity always tends to damp off into inertia and lack of originality. Possibly the best advice to the young is to take over the world as quickly as they can get hold of it, but to learn to *use* their elders, who are more necessary to them than they think, especially in this sort of subject.

F. J. OSBORN

Postscript.

Reports of Lord Justice Scott's Committee on Land Utilization, and of Mr. Justice Uthwatt's Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment, are published just as I am correcting the final proofs of this Introduction. Both are important official contributions to the study of the group of subjects dealt with at the Cambridge Conference, and may with advantage be read in conjunction with this volume.

F.J.O.

GOOD WISHES FOR THE CONFERENCE

The Chairman of the first session read the following telegram from the Rt. Hon. Lord Portal of Ravelstoke, Minister of Works and Planning:

All good wishes for a very successful conference.

PORTAL

SESSION I

Agricultural Planning and Policy

CHAIRMAN: PROFESSOR G. M. TREVELYAN, O.M., C.B.E.

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

by PROFESSOR G. M. TREVELYAN, O.M., C.B.E.

Professor G. M. Trevelyan was Chairman at the first session, held on Friday evening, March 27th. In his introductory remarks he said that the problem before them was one of a most pressing and difficult character because the land was strictly limited in size; the population was numerous and the number of things people quite legitimately wanted to do was extensive. Was the land to be left any longer to *laissez-faire*, chance and chaos? Or was the State to have a plan in regard to the use to which the land could be put?

It was a very hard task because they had to make allowances for the proper needs of industry, residence, amenity and—above all—agriculture.

The time had gone by when the land could be left to chance and private enterprise. Although it was generally agreed that no power except the State could really solve the problem, the question arose—the State in what capacity and through what instrument? There was a danger of conflict between different departments, and of the wrong land being taken for departmental purposes.

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY

STATEMENT I

by SIR A. DANIEL HALL, K.C.B., F.R.S.
(Chairman of Economic Advisory Council)

While recognizing the need of the cities and the towns, Sir Daniel Hall calls for respect for agriculture and agreement that its claims on the land may, on occasion, be paramount. British agriculture is of real importance to the nation and is far from being an outworn industry.

He recommends the state ownership of agricultural land, through a new Department of State, as the one method for making it fully available for its proper purposes—urban as well as agricultural. Further, if our farming is to become capable of cheap production and holding its own in the world's markets, the land must be redistributed into generally larger units; and farming must be assimilated to the methods of modern industries. At the same time, he does not deny altogether the necessity for smaller farms and smallholdings. These are appropriate to certain types of land and imperative for social reasons.

* * * * *

Sir A. Daniel Hall said he came before his audience with perhaps a different reference from that which most of them represented. Theirs was to plan the future growth of the towns and their offshoots upon the land, his was to reduce the abstraction of agricultural land to a minimum. Perhaps indeed he was a hostage within the invaders' camp, for as he had read some of the propaganda about town planning it seemed to be assumed that the countryside had no purpose of its own but was a bare sheet upon which the towns might inscribe what they would.

He continued: So I will say at once that I am jealous of the land for its prime purpose of producing food, and that I become angry at the waste and destruction that I see going on. It may be a building estate on the south coast that is ripping up the good corn land into villa plots and leaving half of it a prey to thistles and ragwort, it may be the bungaloid growths that I see wherever a building speculator

has been able to buy a few fields cheaply, it may be the raw brick and galvanized slum which follows the acquisition of a camp or training ground by the War Office (for in the last fifty years no one has done more to uglify southern England than the Services), it may be a brickfield or gravel exploitation that has left a no-man's-land of mounds and swamps, but in all cases our birthright—the Land—is being defiled and destroyed.

Sir Daniel realized that this waste was as evil in the sight of his audience as in his. So he wanted to come to terms; he recognized that the need of the cities and towns had to be met and that their expansion could not be checked, but he wanted their respect for agriculture and their agreement that its claims might on occasion be paramount. He noted evidence of their kindly feelings. It was agreed that there should be round each town a nice green belt where the children could come to see the cows that gave them milk and where the nurserymen and market gardeners could produce fresh flowers and fruit; but in the grim time that was coming the production of our food demanded something fiercer and harder than that sort of picture-book England.

Farming Does Matter

Sir Daniel continued: But before I can make my claim I must persuade you that farming in this country matters and that British agriculture is still worth while. Most townsfolk don't think it does, that is if they think about it at all. What is there to remind them of farming; the milk arrives on the breakfast table every morning, a telephone call conjures up the meat and vegetables, even if these, when they do come to hand, have been purged of all their gross earthly origin, and compressed into a tin or the more hygienic glass jar. The war has shaken people up a bit to a realization that these things have to be grown somewhere and that life has not become wholly reduced to pressing a button. Still the ordinary man of business—industrialist, lawyer, banker—does on the whole regard farming as an out-of-date and primitive business that may better be left to other countries who will pay in foodstuffs for the manufactured goods we can so well supply and for the loans we have made, if these are not already liquidated. We have for a couple of generations been developing the food production powers of countries—the Dominions, Argentina and Denmark—in return for our manufactures and our capital; and it is only common sense to hope that with returning sanity the old prin-

ciples of international trade will prevail. Nevertheless I will not allow that this is a valid argument against the development of British agriculture, but since a discussion of that thesis can hardly be pursued here, I will only assert again that our farming is far from being an outworn industry. We have in the agricultural land of the country an estate that is still far from being developed and when this war is over we shall have no lack of men ready to supply the labour it will require; and we shall need every form of production from our own resources.

By some strange irony the most vocal supporters of the conception that our farming is no longer able to stand up to world competition are to be found among the farmers themselves; but then they have been spoilt by the system of doles and subsidies that was set up during the inter-war years. When the opportunities of war are over farmers are hoping to sail into a protected haven of guaranteed prices, which is something to expect in a world whose whole economic basis will have crashed.

Will there be a Place for Farming?

But to return to the land, will there be a place for farming? Even some thirty years ago Sidney Webb once said to me, 'You know, there is going to be no room for this agricultural development of yours. The towns must swallow up the countryside; they need land for the rentiers and retired men, they need land for sanatoriums, convalescent homes and lunatic asylums, with a ring of part-time smallholdings for misfits, neurasthenics and tuberculous subjects. Land again will be wanted for waterworks, public parks, golf courses and sports grounds: there must be nature reserves and freedom of access to great open spaces.' He might have added the claims of hunting and shooting, for England was even then developing into the most comfortable home for wealthy men of all nationalities, with its society of easy access graced by an aristocracy and a court.

But have not the foundations of that society upon which Lord Passfield based his forecast already been destroyed? Must we not prepare for a community few of whose members can live without working, and which will have to turn to account all its assets of knowledge, manpower and material? Of these material assets our land is the chief.

State Ownership

As the first necessary step in this reconstruction of the countryside the State will have to take over the ownership of the agricultural land, for only by doing so can the State make it fully available for its proper purpose—urban as well as agricultural. Again only the State as owner can protect this limited area of ours from the waste and misuse that comes from pursuing one end without regard to other vital interests that are involved.

I realize the distrust with which every Englishman views the intervention of the State in affairs, especially when property is threatened, and property in land is the most exclusive of all possessions. But the land of this country is severely limited and insufficient for all the purposes for which it is needed; it will have to be rationed like other necessities have had to be rationed in the times of stress through which we have been passing. The possession of land confers a monopoly, the owner of which can hold up all the activities of a community, and such a monopoly should reside only in the Nation itself. As I have said before, I am jealous for the land, apprehensive of further depredations. Instances abound of its reckless misuse and that not merely for private profit since Government Departments have been among the worst offenders. I may remind you that between 1918 and 1941 about 350,000 acres of agricultural land were acquired by the War Office and the Air Ministry, and a good deal more has been taken since. Between 1928 and 1934 the withdrawal for roads, building and sport averaged 8,500 acres per year. Of course the Services must acquire land for their purposes, but due consideration has not always been given to the other requirements of the people; above all no authority exists whose duty is to protect the land and put the case for possible alternatives. It is all too well known that the Services are autocratic and when they have fixed upon a site they make it a matter of *amour propre* to carry their point and over-ride all opposition. Mistakes are made because they lack information about what they insist upon having and they often pay excessively, but there is no one of weight enough to stand up against them.

Nor is it only the Services who are thus arbitrary. It may be any of the Municipalities and Corporations to whom powers of compulsory acquisition are given. Let me give you an instance. A year or two before the war, the Metropolitan Water Board selected, as a

site for a reservoir, some land near Walton-on-Thames that was being farmed as a market garden. This land was commonly recognized as the most intensively cultivated area of its size (198 acres) in England. It afforded an example of advanced scientific methods, on which, incidentally, men were being trained to carry on similar progressive farming elsewhere. Now it is easy to assume that a farm can be restarted and that the owner can be compensated for disturbance. But an enterprise of this kind cannot be transferred to any piece of land as a factory can. Its soil had been matured by years of intensive cultivation; its peculiarities had been learned by long experience from which had been derived fine points of management of great value. The particular combination of soil, water supply and situation with regard to labour and transport can be found but rarely; in this case, I know personally, how prolonged a search had to be made in order to find a substitute. Yet it is difficult to believe that this was the only spot in the Lower Thames Valley suitable for a reservoir! But the Water Company had only to say, 'We are responsible for London's water supply and we must have this site'; and they had their way. There was no one to argue with them or to make them produce their evidence. Now the Water Company may have been entirely justified, none the less I suspect that all organizations possessed of arbitrary power prefer to bully rather than to argue. Hence it is that I am looking for a great Department of State to own the land and to protect it.

Purchase by Land Stock

It is impracticable here to discuss the details of the process by which the land should be acquired; and I am not suggesting confiscation, but purchase, on the basis of giving the owner Land Stock which would bring him the same annual income as he was deriving from the land, the valuation for Income Tax under Schedule A being taken as a datum line, with equitable adjustments to meet special cases. The title should be vested in the Commissioners of Crown Lands who would manage the land just as they do their present great estate of something more than a quarter of a million acres of agricultural land. As far as my purpose goes this compulsory acquisition should apply to all land outside the jurisdiction of City and Borough Corporations and of the Urban District Councils, exception being made of properties now in public ownership, such as Church and School premises.

Now a transfer of ownership of this description, while it would ensure that the importance for agriculture of particular areas would be duly considered before they were handed over to the Services, to Town Planning Authorities, or to industrial and commercial uses, yet it would, of itself, do little for the reconstruction of agriculture. State ownership is indeed necessary before the opportunities of reconditioning the land can be utilized. For example, at the present time the County War Agricultural Committees are restoring to cultivation considerable areas of neglected land that has been allowed to fall into waste. This is excellent work, sometimes involving considerable operations of clearing, drainage and the restoration of water courses. But the whole cost is being borne by the State; there is no provision for repayment, though the Ministry of Agriculture may eventually acquire the land, when doubtless its initial capacity for reclamation will be reckoned in the price to be paid. Before the war some of the operations necessary for bringing the land into better cultivation, such as drainage and treatment with lime or basic slag, were being urged on by an undertaking from the Ministry of Agriculture to bear half the cost of the treatment, without any liability for repayment by owner or occupier. On many of such improvements the return is deferred, in any case the benefit ultimately accrues to the owner of the land. It is inevitable that the State can only secure a return for improvements it carries out, whether temporary or permanent, if it is the owner of the land. Many forms of reclamation which would add to the extent of cultivable land in the country and so make up for the necessary urban drafts upon agricultural area, are only practicable if the Government is the general owner of the land. For example, the reclamation of foreshores and slob lands—still a feasible operation in many districts—is governed by the fact that the ownership of the strip down to low water mark resides in the frontager, who may also control the only access to it. In any case the land that can be won from the sea will be a relatively narrow strip which can only be worked profitably if it can be merged in the adjoining farming land. The frontager is in a position to exact all the prospective profit from the reclamation without taking any of the risk; and, since in most cases several frontagers are likely to be concerned, the prospects of an agreement to carry out any large scheme are remote. One cannot here go into detail of the many ways in which our land is capable of amelioration, often by processes which have only become

practicable through recent advances in science and engineering; but since the returns can only accrue slowly in the shape of agricultural rents, landowners have shown themselves unable or unwilling to undertake such work. Only the State can find the required capital and the State will be repaid only if it is the owner.

Larger Units Advised

One must, however, go further; the mere acquisition of the agricultural land would have but a small effect upon the general run of farming in this country. In itself it would amount to little more than a change of landlords. A more drastic reform is needed before the full capacity of the land for production can be realized and farming can become generally prosperous.

While one must admit that the great falls in price that have marked the last sixty years are not peculiar to agriculture, but are part of certain world movements that have affected all primary commodities, none the less farming, in comparison with other industries, has shown a special inability to recover from them. If we look for a reason we cannot but be struck by the fact that agriculture in this, as in most countries, still retains a very primitive retail structure.

During the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries we have moved out of the system of peasant farming into one of farming for sale by cultivators who are small capitalists employing labour for wages. Yet in England, in 1938, of 253 thousand holdings larger than 5 acres no less than 132 thousand, or 52 per cent, were less than 50 acres, and 210 thousand or 82 per cent were less than 150 acres. Only between 11 and 12 thousand, or 12 per cent, were 300 acres or upwards, though they account for nearly half of the cultivated area. Now this mere factor of size renders their occupiers unable to utilize to the full the extraordinary advances of science and engineering, and the capacity to increase production and handle the soil economically that has been attained in the last sixty years. From every point of view the small farmer, even the man of 300 acres, is working at an economic disadvantage; his fields are too small for the power machines now available just as their total acreage does not provide a profitable load for their prime cost, his command of capital is weak as is his buying and selling, the scale of his business is too small to command the expert knowledge that can be turned to profitable use. To put it in another way; it is not a man's full time job to manage

five or six men on a couple of hundred acres. The argument is too technical for exposition here. I can only assert that if our farming is to become capable of cheap production and of holding its own in the world's markets the land must be redistributed into generally larger units, and farming must be assimilated to the methods of other modern industries. I am not denying the necessity of smaller farms and of smallholdings themselves, for they are appropriate to certain types of land and imperative for social reasons. Indeed one of the special benefits from turning farming into large scale enterprises with a fringe of individual businesses lies in the fact that it will provide a more satisfactory recruitment of the agricultural personnel. There will be opportunities for advancement in the management staff both for young men with education but no capital and for the workers who show initiative and technical capacity. In this way one of the chief social grievances against our agricultural system will be removed. To this end the State purchase of the land must be followed by its division into suitable economic holdings. This is a reform that is only practicable under public ownership, because the reallocation will often ignore existing boundaries, both of farms and estates, which have so largely been determined by accidents of ownership in the past. This great work can be carried out only by degrees. To begin with a natural area, perhaps not a county but a river basin, would be handed over to a new special department, first for survey and then for replanning with the accompanying works of soil amelioration, drainage and reclamation. When replanned in new holdings it would be handed back to the Crown Commissioners to be let to tenants, as actual farming is unlikely to be successful under direct State management.

A New Technical Department

Indeed the new department that is to do this work of replanning must be neither the Ministry of Agriculture nor the Commissioners of Crown Lands, but must be a purely technical organization staffed by engineers, scientific men and men of experience in large scale farming. To a large extent it will have to grow and to build up its expert staff in so doing. The Forestry Commission affords an example of such a department. It must, above all, be kept as free as possible from political influence and that alternation of cajolement and intimidation which the farmers' organizations now exercise with regard to the Ministry of Agriculture.

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY

It will be to this technical body that the Crown Commissioners will turn for advice whenever municipalities want land for town planning or the Services for camps and training grounds. The knowledge that its experts possess of the soil, of drainage and water supply, will go far to ensure that urban requirements will be met with a minimum of disturbance to our great and, as I trust, revived industry of agriculture.

I have said nothing of finance. But it is obvious that the designs, that are being made for the better housing of our population, for communications and for public services, can thereby be saved from the exploitation by private ownership of the only terrain on which they can be carried out. If the land belongs to the State there need be no 'unearned increments' created only by the needs of the community. Had public ownership of the land been put into operation at the close of the last war the cost of the roads and the building developments of the last twenty years would have been recovered many times over.

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY

STATEMENT II

by L. F. Easterbrook

(Public Relations Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, 1940-1)

Mr. Easterbrook opens with a warning against excessive science and economics in dealing with the land. The problem is how best it can be developed, ensuring full lives for our citizens under humane influences. He sees in the Central Planning Authority a definite step in preventing misuse of the land, the best of which should, in his opinion, be permanently earmarked for agriculture.

Regarding nationalization of the land, he confesses an open mind. In some cases it may be good, in others bad. The vital point is that the State should be able to exercise proper control of its use, while allowing scope for individual responsibility. On practical as well as sentimental grounds, he is against a national change-over to larger farms. Of greater importance than size is the availability of adequate services.

In conclusion he outlines a plan for international agriculture, 'the most practical contribution to world peace that any single group of persons can make.'

* * * * *

Mr. Easterbrook said that when we had won the war we were going to be given what was seldom granted to anyone—a second chance. It would be an opportunity planners had never had in the history of any nation. An opportunity, and a tremendous responsibility. For we should set our stamp on the face of Britain for a century and more ahead. Five generations hence they would judge what sort of men we were, know how we thought, what were our ideals and character, what were our values.

A Spiritual Revival

Mr. Easterbrook continued: We must plan for efficiency, certainly. And yet if we think only of efficiency I believe we may make ghastly mistakes and we shall be looked upon by history as a race of money-

grubbing materialists of only third-rate calibre. Let us face the fact that most of us have grown up and lived our lives in a materialistic age when the flame of faith and the spirit has burnt low. It will not always be so. Mankind cannot live by concentrating upon this side of his nature so unduly and the pendulum will surely swing the other way. Already one sees signs of a spiritual revival. But it is of the very first importance to us planners that we should face this fact and all that it implies, for then it will be a guiding post to us and we shall the more readily beware of the perils of over-accentuating the undoubted benefits that scientists and economists can bring to us. They are invaluable servants, but treacherous masters. I think there is a real danger that we may plan a wonderfully organized country, with the laboratories for its cathedrals and a chain of accounting centres for its shrines, only to find that we have produced a beautifully tidy land, swept and garnished, but quite uninhabitable by human beings, a land where seven other devils, each worse than inefficiency, have entered in. Let us, therefore, encourage our scientists and our economists, let us make full use of them. But do not let us forget the poets, the prophets and the philosophers, the educationists, and people like those great landscape gardeners of the eighteenth century whose work lives in the countryside to-day long after the results of the economic activities of those times have passed away.

The problem can be stated in simple terms. We have been given one of the fairest inheritances on this earth. Now we have to develop it. How can we use it to the best advantage while making it a happy place for our citizens to live out their full lives under humane influences?

A Central Planning Authority

One definite step has already been taken, and that is a good one. A Central Planning Authority is to be established that will be responsible for all matters relating to the physical reconstruction of the countryside. Agriculture will then take its place along with other national interests and no longer will there be half-hearted local schemes that were hopeless when looked at from a broad, national point of view. The wasteful, insane, unmoral system of taking the best agricultural land and imprisoning it for ever beneath bricks and mortar and macadam will come to an end. This land is irreplaceable and, as Dr. Dudley Stamp has so ably shown, we cannot afford to

lose another acre of it. I was delighted a little time ago, when I was in the West Country, to hear that, after the future expansion of a famous western city had been decided upon, the first body consulted was the County Agricultural Committee. They went and asked them what land could be taken for urban development without harming agriculture. What a revolution! What a change from a system that has sterilized the productive acres while leaving the unproductive; that has lopped bits off farms so that they are no longer workable units; that has faced farmers with the problem of having to plan six and seven years ahead with an unknown but continuous shrinking in acreage; that has encouraged them to give up farming and take to land speculation instead! And we have given this system the queer title of 'land development'!

But now, I hope, we shall see some land—the best—earmarked for agriculture for ever, and other land only surrendered for other purposes if it really is vital to the national interest and unavoidable to do so. I am particularly hopeful of this as there is now the Committee sitting with Lord Justice Scott to consider how we can use our countryside to the best advantage. The setting up of this Committee is a happy augury that in future not only will the claims of Agriculture for our limited acres be considered at least equal to those of other industries, but that care will be taken to preserve the beauties and improve the amenities of the countryside. I hope that the Committee's report will be a document which in the post-war era will serve as a guide to town and country planners, and a testament that we regard our land and the use to which it is put as a national trust.

If we are able to estimate how much land we mean to use for agriculture, we shall all know where we are, and the remainder can be used for Green Belts, National Parks, recreation grounds, and other purposes that will bring a better balance into our top-heavy urban civilization. As an agriculturist, I would far rather see a limited quantity of land earmarked for farming and farmed to the full than have some quite vague system by which large expanses of our country are only half-farmed and are not really used wholeheartedly for any purpose.

County War Agricultural Committees

Having earmarked the Agricultural land, the next matter will be to see that it is properly used. In the days, not so long ago, when

landowning was a profession, the owner, or his agent, took good care that the tenant managed his land well and some of the old leases showed a degree of control that would turn the most optimistic of bureaucrats to-day green with envy. The tenant farmer, anyhow in peace-time, must have scope, flexibility in cropping and be encouraged to use his initiative and brains; but complete freedom of cropping, we have seen, has led too often to bad farming, to over-cropping of the land; or, more often, to neglecting it and letting it degenerate into third rate grass. On the other hand our soil and our local conditions are so diversified that too much centralized management would lead straight to disaster. We cannot administer our farms from Whitehall, or even from the county town, and farm management necessitates quick decisions, extemporization and individual responsibility that are quite foreign to the outlook of the ordinary civil servant. It is no good blaming them for this; the Civil Service was never designed for such a purpose. I believe we have hit on the best solution for this in the County War Agricultural Committees, that I hope will continue after the war. We can, if we like, think of their chairmen as broadminded landowners responsible for the agricultural welfare of their part of Britain, and the Executive Officers as their estate agents, well-trained technically. They should have power to make decisions and administer agriculture in the counties on the general lines of a national plan. They should be responsible only to the Minister of Agriculture, and the Minister would be responsible for them through Parliament to the people. But the farmers, farm workers and others who now serve on the county committees would still have an important job to do. For their practical knowledge of local matters would be invaluable and we do not want to run any risks of creating a series of little dictatorships, a hierarchy of gauleiters and jacks-in-office who get altogether too big for their boots. We must look to democratic principles to keep this in check, and do not let us forget that other aspect of democracy—the sense of individual responsibility. The more people we can make feel they have a personal job to do in the general work of the community, that this is *their* Britain, and they have a part to play in looking after it, the more will our race develop character and intelligence and rise to fresh heights in this waxing of public spirit. I hope this work will continue to be voluntary and unpaid, so that we can build up through it an added tradition of service to the land.

Nationalization of the Land?

Does this pre-suppose nationalization of the land? I am always rather suspicious of long, vague words like that. Nationalization may be good or bad. But one thing is certain. It does not of itself produce anything. As the poet has told us, you do not change the nature of roses by giving them high-sounding names. Where the landlord-tenant system still functions, say in parts of the north of England, there is nothing to beat it. On the other hand it has obviously broken down in a very large number of instances—it would be true to say in the majority of instances. I should have said that if a man is able and willing to manage his estate well, it would be more sensible to leave him in the job, probably making only about 1 per cent on his money, than to take it away from him and give it to the State at a cost of 3 per cent or more to the taxpayer. On the other hand where land is being hopelessly neglected and owners will not mend their ways, or where the State has had to step in and undertake expenses that are really the owners' responsibility, or where the State has reclaimed land, that land might well pass into national ownership. I must confess to rather an open mind on nationalization, for I don't think it so terribly important—provided—and this really is important—that the State can exercise proper control of its use. Let us ensure that first, at any rate. The other is not nearly so urgent.

Larger Farms?

All this is tied up rather closely with what we have heard a lot about lately—the replanning of our farms. We are told that most of them are not big enough, that the fields are too small, even that we should think about those 'collective' farms, associated with Russia. Now there is not the slightest doubt that some of our farms are too small, and that a great many of our fields, especially those of awkward shape and under eight acres or so in size, want enlarging a bit and straightening out. But just at the moment there seems to be a movement for going much further than this and changing the whole nature of our farming, from a nation of small farmers to a nation of large farms with more managers and more employees but fewer farmers.

I suggest that there is room for farms of all sizes in this country, that in the plains of East Anglia the large, mechanized farms, that already exist there, may increase in number; but that there will always

be room for the family farm, and even, if properly organized, the smallholding. For this, surely, is one of the instances where we cannot think only of efficiency. We want to plan a land in which people are happy to live, where they can find satisfaction and the means of self-expression. It may be a great nuisance, but there are many people in this island who set greater store by independence and running a show of their own than by earning possibly more money with less anxiety. They are not a separate race, they are part of us, of our community, our sons and daughters, and provided the smaller type of farm is not too extravagant to run compared with the larger, we must try to satisfy this deep human instinct. There are not so many spheres of human activity where that is still possible. I can imagine nothing more horrible than a countryside of factory farms run by departmental managers with no roots in the districts where they live, no interest or responsibility for the social life of the locality; with gangs of robots rushed from place to place in motor lorries to hurl seed into the artificially stimulated soil, or to snatch its produce without even time to feel gratitude or wonder at the miracle of harvest. It would introduce the chain gang to put the chain store into farming, and, by sapping the very spirit of the life of the countryside, would remove the main reason for trying to build a living agriculture at all.

But even on practical grounds, is there any excuse for thus 'Woolworthizing' rural Britain? If, as most people now seem to agree, our agricultural future lies mainly along the lines of mixed farming, with livestock our main pre-occupation, but with the plough moving round the farm to produce good pasture and keep the soil fertile and healthy, the smallish farm is an ideal unit for the greater part of our country. On the very large farm with wide expanses of field it is not so easy to give that high degree of supervision so necessary with animal husbandry, nor to control the grazing, so important for good management of pasture. Even in cropping, that pioneer of mechanized farming, Mr. Roland Dudley, once told me that careful costings showed very little gain in cheap cultivation from fields exceeding twenty acres and none at all above twenty-seven acres. When I was in Denmark just before the war, one of the first sights I saw was the unemployed from Copenhagen replanting the hedges which had been pulled up a little time before under the misdirection of science. They found that the land began to blow and the stock could not get shelter. How would our livestock fare in western England, in Devon

for example, if there were no hedges and banks at reasonably close intervals to shelter stock from gales and tempests? Smallish farms and not too large fields are good for mixed farming. On this point I will call the evidence of Dr. Ruston, formerly of Leeds University, who analysed results for Danish farms and translated them into English conditions. Dr. Ruston found that the efficiency of farms increases with their size up to a certain maximum. But this maximum is reached on farms between 75 and 100 acres, and then falls off steadily as the size increases. Thus the output per acre on a 25 acre holding was £20 1s. od., and cost of upkeep £17 10s. od., leaving a net balance of £2 11s. od. Balance, after allowing interest on capital, was 4s. per acre. On farms above 250 acres, output was £12 4s. od. per acre, cost of upkeep £9 4s. od. and the balance £3, or £1 after allowing interest on capital. But in the 75-100 acre group the output was £13 18s. od., upkeep £10 4s. od., net balance £3 14s. od., balance after deducting interest £1 10s. od.

So the case for the small farm does not rest only upon what some will call 'sentimental' grounds, although it is they who actually are unrealistic, because they pre-suppose the existence of an 'economic man', and he, thank heaven, has not yet been bred. When I was in the United States last autumn I was interested to find that even in that country of wide open spaces, mechanical development and a fairly tough attitude towards the business of bread-winning, one of the main activities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, was the development of the family farm, rescuing it from some of the troubles that have beset it and launching it out on a new lease of life in line with modern conditions. It is farms of this type that show the most resilience to times of depression; they weather economic storms that sink the large farming enterprises that have never, in this country, shown the slightest ability to survive. Farm has been laid to farm on many an occasion, but, as Sir John Russell has pointed out, the time comes round, and fairly quickly, when they revert to independent holdings again.

But I do not mean by this that we should leave things exactly as they are. What seems to me important, is not so much the size of the farm, but the adequacy of the services behind the farm. The Land Settlement Association, for example, in spite of some mistakes, has shown how holdings of even only four acres can give a return of £6 a week to good men, provided there is a central buying and selling

agency, a central farm for supplying stock, both of seed and animals, and certain cultivating services, which are, of course, paid for. I do not think we should rule out smallholding schemes of this kind if there is a demand for them from the right type of men. They might well provide the answer to the wish of ambitious farm workers to rise above the rank of wage-earners.

Co-operative Services

These and other services are no less essential to groups of smallish farms but of a larger type. I mean such things as central grass drying plants, egg collecting stations, fruit grading centres and even engineering and repair shops specially designed to serve a farming area. Ploughing and threshing contractors would serve these areas and perhaps there might also be implement depots where the smaller cultivators could hire implements for their own use. Recently it has been proved, both in this country and America, that farm implements can be used co-operatively by small farmers. Water supplies and drainage schemes must obviously be applied and administered over a larger area than one or two farms, and in many cases it will be possible for each group of farms to organize much of its transport co-operatively. All this really seems no more than expressing the well-run estate of the last two centuries in modern terms, and if we are not to have universal nationalization of the land, we must insist that an estate is large enough and well enough capitalized to provide these services. Owners of small estates should be given the alternative of joining up with their neighbours to create an agricultural enterprise of the requisite size and resources, or being bought out on fair terms. Much is said about inefficient farmers, but we cannot afford inefficient owners any better and there is no room for the landowner who is merely a rent-receiver or a pheasant-rearer.

Thus we can plan the land, making it more likely that this limited asset of ours is put to its best use, raising the efficiency of farming, creating the technical equipment for agriculture to function in modern conditions. Such a scheme as this would give central control of our food production, but decentralized and democratic execution of that control. The land would not be peopled by robots or regimented by dehumanized bureaucrats. Remembering the eighteenth century, we must not be frightened of creating beauty as well as efficiency and, by working on a broader canvas and with less limited

resources, we ought to be able to create a lovelier England than even those great landscape artists of Georgian times.

Village Colleges

Only a little space remains to deal with other matters of the first importance. Here in Cambridge I need only refer in the briefest terms to that stimulating experiment of your Director of Education, Henry Morris. I mean the Village Colleges. In these, it seems to me, is the key to ending the boredom of life in so many villages. In them is not only the means for a liberal education for all, extending from childhood to old age, but the opportunity for the villages to express most of the attractions of the towns in rural terms and also to develop the greater advantages that the village has in the way of social intercourse, sports and the happy serenity of life in a community not too large to be soulless, a community where none need feel lonely. But the Village College, to realize its full potentialities, must be linked up with an adequate and cheap transport service, so that those who live in villages around the College can easily enjoy its benefits. I have often thought that one of the best subsidies to agriculture would be a subsidy for rural transport. Main electricity to every village, an adequate—not necessarily a main—water supply are also essential, and, of course, proper housing, goes without saying.

An International Plan

Now I have left the biggest thing of all to the last. We may plan perfect conditions for agriculture to function, we may have Governments determined that Agriculture shall never be allowed to suffer what it suffered after the last war. But we shall be deluding ourselves if we think we can plan a little oasis of agricultural prosperity in just our own island. For the day would surely come, the day of world depression, when the taxpayer, hard pressed by the bad times, would survey with a pretty nasty look the prices he was paying at home compared with those that were being realized abroad and he would say, 'This is no time for Arcady. We must buy the food where it is cheapest.' So it is not enough to have a national plan. We must have an international plan to organize both production and distribution, for the time has come when we can think—when we must think—in terms of World Agriculture.

The position is not unpromising. When Sir Reginald Dorman-

Smith attended the Sydney Conference in Australia in 1938, he brought back with him a resolution agreed to by the farmers of Canada, Australia and New Zealand, with Britain, that they would work together to adjust distribution and supplies. I have just been in the United States, where I travelled over 6,000 miles meeting farmers and their leaders in the Middle West to suggest to them that the time had come for the farmers of the world to unite in producing the food and distributing it and doing all in their power to see that no one in the world goes hungry. To get this food produced, of course, it is essential that the producer receives sufficient reward to keep him in business. I addressed about thirty meetings, some of them Middle West audiences of 4,000 or so and I had many private talks with their farm leaders and agricultural administrators. I found no dissentient voice. The only criticisms were, 'Why hasn't this been done before; why can't we start to get round a table, our farmers and yours and the farmers of the British Commonwealth, next month?' On two things I found general insistence. First, that the plan should be based upon a philosophy of plenty and not upon one of restriction. Secondly, that although it would be desirable that the farmers of the English-speaking race should give a lead, the alliance should be open eventually for all nations to join, provided they are willing to keep the rules.

That is something to be thankful for. Because a reconstructed and prosperous Europe is essential to the prosperity of us all. We must help to build up Europe after the war so that it is released from desperate poverty, from low standards of living and nutrition. There is no other way of keeping it out of the orbit of Germany, or of any other country that might come along and claim the right to manage its soil properly. That is the basis of any agricultural policy. And in Europe, just as in England, that means that the plough must flourish to keep the soil healthy and fertile, and that in turn means a certain amount of grain-growing. But not for self-sufficiency. And that means that less grain would be grown in Europe as a whole. And so Europe's farms would be able to concentrate more upon the 'protective' foods, such as milk, butter, cheese, eggs, fruit, vegetables and meat as well, importing from the New Countries more grain and probably a certain amount of butter and cheese. Other produce too, of course. In return for this, the New Countries would be asked to adopt a more liberal attitude towards European exports, and European emigrants

also. And, by adopting in turn a more balanced system of farming and ceasing to exploit the fertility of their land, the New Countries would make an important contribution by reducing genuinely surplus production and bringing world prices better into line with the production costs of a sound farming system.

I believe that this can be done, that we can look forward within the lifetime of most of us to a planned world agriculture; and I believe that this is the most practical contribution to permanent world peace that any single group of persons can make. Do not forget that three people out of every four in the world are food producers. If they will work together, they can not only banish hunger from the earth, but also war.

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY

DISCUSSION AT THE END OF SESSION I

MR. H. ROLF GARDINER (Shaftesbury) said Sir Daniel Hall had ignored the whole question of motive and substituted for it expediency and the worn-out ideas of Fabianism. Directly one started interfering with the tenure and stability of occupation there was a tendency to bring about instability of the soil. They needed as many men and women as possible working in the fields, woodlands, and rural industries, and they should restore the English principle of the responsibility of the man on the spot. Why should they not make the big estates the pivots of rural reconstruction? They could have modern forms of co-operation, but they should not break up the organic and natural unities which had grown up through the centuries. We wanted leadership and co-operation, not bureaucracy.

The CHAIRMAN remarked that there seemed to be a tendency to run counter to Sir Daniel Hall's proposals for State ownership, but he did not himself believe that the State would have the smallest intention of taking over all the land of England at once. There should be some increase of State ownership for a start and they could see how it went. What would happen after the war would be a very large breakdown of the great estate system owing to taxation, which he did not believe would ever be reduced. Most of the big estates would go bankrupt as agricultural units and the community would be forced to deal with that situation. There was no one solution of the problem.

MR. AMBROSE APPELBE, M.A., LL.B. thought the addresses were based on the sincere belief that we should get back a large part of the Empire now already lost. If we did not, we should have to support ourselves much more than we had done in the past. Sir Daniel Hall's policy might not be agreeable, but it was inevitable. The only effective way for the nation to get full advantage from the land was through some form of State ownership.

DISCUSSION

MR. G. A. HOLLAND wanted more details of how the planned allocation of the land, after nationalization, would be decided. Would either rent itself, or implied economic rent continue to be the deciding consideration? Was this administration going to be on an economic basis, or on some conception of what was in the public interest? In the former case, if the town could pay the higher rent, it would get the land.

MRS. PETER TENNANT considered that those who were already dealing with the land and farming it on an economic basis should be left alone. A start should be made on land that was not being properly dealt with. In Worcestershire they had acres of very concentrated market gardening, and what was needed was co-operative machinery and co-operative selling, but in order to get co-operative selling they had to change the mentality of most of the English farmers. Derelict land was excellent in the days when they wanted foxes, but now they wanted not foxes but food. The War Agricultural Executive Committees were now producing good crops from reclaimed land, and such land should be let to farmers who would keep it up.

MRS. M. WALLER said that much of our inefficient farming was due to the Government's agricultural policy before the war. Many of the small farms had suffered from our sentimental hospitality to other nations in the past.

LORD BROCKET: High taxation, so far from breaking up big estates should have the effect of maintaining them, since those who are paying 19s. 6d. in the pound income- and sur-tax would have nearly the whole of the cost of their repairs borne by the Government, and as the owners would only get sixpence in the pound in any case it would be more to their advantage to improve their estates.

MR. PAUL S. CADBURY (West Midland Group on Post-War Reconstruction and Planning): Agriculture was an industry and could only survive if it was extremely efficient. However unpalatable the fact, it must be recognized that agriculture had worked too long on subsidies. After the war the 90 per cent of the inhabitants who lived in the towns would leave it in the lurch as they did after the last war if there was not evidence of real efficiency.

MR. E. L. LEEMING (Urmston U.D.C.): The idea of farmers being independent was out of date. In regard to Mr. Easterbrook's suggestion for subsidized transport, they had that already from the

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY

public and other transport pools which made up for the losses on the country runs by the more profitable urban routes. If that were carried further, rents and land values would go up.

SIR DANIEL HALL, replying, said that the first prime basis of land was letting value, but the State as owner could put forward reasons for retaining land for agricultural development, having regard to the needs of the community and also the need of getting the maximum production from the land. As far as he could see, the whole economic trend of history had been a movement for larger and more productive holdings. Now the time had come when they must have still larger holdings if they were to make use of the powers of engineering at their disposal. The problem was how they could adapt themselves to it. The effect of large farms would probably not result in the losing of a lot of people from the land. A great deal of our land was second class and could not produce much an acre, so that the small farmers on it lived in a state of semi-starvation. A reasonable living could be made, however, if this land were divided into blocks of three or four thousand acres.

MR. EASTERBROOK repeated that he considered the War Agricultural Executive Committees should form the basis of control in the future. While these committees were the nominees of the Ministry of Agriculture there was a great deal to be said in favour of selection as opposed to election. Having no axe to grind, they could go ahead and do their job. He would like to say that England was not the only country in which Agriculture did not pay. It was true all over the world.

SESSION II

Requirements of Decentralized Industry

CHAIRMAN: SIR P. MALCOLM STEWART, Bt., O.B.E.
(Commissioner for Special Areas, 1934-6)

REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Sir Malcolm Stewart, in introducing Professor Sargent Florence, made reference to his wide knowledge and activities in the fields of economics and industrial research in Great Britain and America. It was essential in these difficult times to endeavour to see ahead with clear vision in order that when the time came we should be able to put forth our best personal contribution in the colossal task of reorganizing the world, and in the formation of ideas and plans to that end the paper by Professor Sargent Florence would render valuable assistance.

REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

STATEMENT

by PROFESSOR SARGANT FLORENCE, M.A., Ph.D.
(Professor of Commerce: University of Birmingham)

Professor Sargent Florence presents a method of approach to the problem of decentralizing or dispersing industry into rural areas, rather than setting out any final policy. His scientific study of the very different requirements and characteristics of the various industries falls under four headings: (A) Possibilities of Dispersion of Certain Industries; (B) Desirability of Dispersion of Certain Industries; (C) Selection of Possible Industries; (D) Selection of Desirable Industries.

* * * * *

The policy of decentralizing or dispersing industries into rural areas must take account of the very different requirements and characteristics of different industries.

Some characteristics may impose limitations on dispersion or make dispersion socially undesirable. Other characteristics may make dispersion economically possible and socially desirable.

A. Possibilities of Dispersion of Certain Industries

It has often enough been pointed out by now that the location of certain industries can hardly be tampered with. *Extractive* industries require to coincide with raw materials. *Residential* industries that make products wasteful and costly to transport such as baking, brewing and aerated waters; or services such as laundries, garages and repairing of all sorts, require to coincide with consumers the majority of whom in Britain live in urban areas. And even among mobile or 'footloose' industries, which can get an economic footing in most areas, there are limitations to a dispersion in agricultural areas.

(1) Certain industries require to be organized in large plants. The low density of population in rural areas may make impossible the employment of large bodies of persons in one place, unless extensive housing is undertaken, or the workers are prepared to travel long distances to and from work. Until more workers own their own motor-cars and are prepared to give lifts to their neighbours, the 'commuting radius' as it is called in America is, in English country areas, not large. For the present therefore large factories placed in rural areas necessitate considerable house building. The country village or small town will in that case become a large or largish town, and the policy may perhaps become a policy of filling up market towns or building garden cities, but certainly not one of dispersion among existing small towns and villages. On the other hand small-plant industry such as shoemaking may settle in the country and keep it country.

(2) Certain industries may be linked to other industries not found in rural areas, and all the linked industries would have to be dispersed together, thus tending to create a considerable new industrial district. An instance of such a complex of linked industries is found in Birmingham. There are a number of industries making parts for motor-cars—radiators, bodies, engine-parts, accessories, fittings. These industries require to be near their market—the motor-car manufacturers assembling the parts into the complete whole. They also require to be near their sources of supply, the industries supplying semi-manufactured material for motor parts as well as for other metal manufacturing—brass and iron foundries, tube-makers, makers of electrical components. The presence of all these metal industries may also make it economical for auxiliary industries turning out the metal working machine tools to settle in the neighbourhood. In order not to lose the so-called 'external' economies, a change in the location of one industry may thus imply the concomitant relocation of a whole complex of industries. The new habitat of this whole complex of vertically and diagonally¹ related industries would hardly remain rural. If any of the other linked industries were extractive, dispersion away from concentrated raw material would hardly, of course, be possible at all.

On the other hand industries can be found that are technically or economically linked either to a naturally dispersed extractive in-

¹ See Florence, *Logic of Industrial Organization*, pp. 20-24.

REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

dustry like brickmaking to clay pits or are linked to agriculture. They may use agricultural products or supply agricultural demands.

B. Desirability of Dispersion of Certain Industries

I assume that a balanced economy is desired. The main lesson of the depressed areas in the inter-war period is certainly the danger of 'single industry' districts. The depressed areas were not, and are not deficient in natural resources. Quite the opposite. With their iron and coal deposits next to the sea, they were almost unique over the world in the economic opportunity they offered for shipbuilding, coal exporting and international trade in iron and steel products. This very wealth was, perhaps, their undoing. They concentrated on those heavy industries for which they were so pre-eminently fitted to the neglect of 'second-string' industries, with greater seasonal and cyclical stability and with greater opportunities for the employment of women. There are also social disadvantages in a one-industry area such as a narrow and conservative outlook and a lack of opportunity for a variety of talents.

If some measure of industrial balance is taken as desirable short of forfeiting the economic advantages of specialization, different industries must be examined to find whether they do or do not balance with the predominant rural industry, agriculture. Now British farming has the following characteristics:

- (i) Its workers are 93·8 per cent men as against 70·3 per cent for all industries.
- (ii) Its workers are older than the average of all industries. It employs fewer of the 18-30 year-olds and more of the over 60's. This characteristic is partly due to (iv) below.
- (iii) It is seasonal, offering less employment in winter.
- (iv) The numbers employed were decreasing in the period before the war.

For balancing up with agriculture therefore, the dispersed industries should be selected among those that *are growing, employ women and younger persons, and require more work in winter than the other seasons.*

C. Selection of Possible Industries

Leaving social desirability for the moment what are the industries that pass the tests of economic possibility?

As a first approach to the question of possibility a survey can be

made of the industries that are now in fact found to prevail in rural regions. A simple test of prevalence is to note those industries that have more than a given 'location factor'¹ in the six census regions of Britain which specialize in agriculture, namely, East, South-West, North II (North and East Riding, Westmorland and Cumberland), Wales II (Mid and North Wales), Scotland I (Southern Lowlands) and the Highlands. Industries with high location factors in these regions include woodworking other than furniture and boxes, saw-mills and joinery, forging, agricultural engineering, fertilizers, dips and disinfectants, grain-milling and many miscellaneous food industries such as bacons, hams and sausages, butter, cheese and condensed milk, sugar beet refining. Such industries are obviously economically linked to agriculture. But in searching for possible industries for dispersion, note should also be taken of footloose industries with only moderate location factors in the rural regions. Such industries though not prevalent are demonstrably *possible*, economically, in rural areas. The broad *regional* statistics discover aeroplane making; boots and shoes; bricks, tiles, and fireclay; rope, cord, and twine; carriage bodies and carts as among the industries with considerable rural incidence. And statistical analysis *county by county* would certainly discover other possible industries.

Since the possibilities of rural incidence depend largely on economic and technical conditions, lessons may be learned from other industrially developed countries. Statistical analysis has gone further in this matter in the United States and from experience there we may add to industries with considerable rural incidence, glass-making, rayon, hosiery, printing and publishing, chemicals, stoves and ranges.

This list of possibly rural industries obtained by statistical analysis of existing circumstances must not be taken as exclusive. It serves to provide precedents but not to bar industries for which there are hitherto no precedents. New precedent in rural location may be set in Great Britain by at least three new factors:

- (i) New developments in the cultivation of the land. More forestry might tempt woodworking and furniture factories

¹ The Location factor or quotient is found by dividing the local percentage of all workers in the *given* industry by the local percentage of workers in *all* industry. Example: If a particular area contains 40 per cent of all those working in a particular industry, but only 30 per cent of workers in all industry, the factor or quotient is $\frac{40}{30}=1.33$.

REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

and possibly paper-making, into the forestry areas; growing of more fruit and vegetables might induce more processing and canning factories into the horticultural areas.

- (ii) Cheaper rural electrical power. Where industries require considerable power per man or per given output (e.g. saw-milling, grain-milling, glass-making, paper-making, sugar refinery) power costs may at present be preventing decentralization.
- (iii) Self-contained factories or factory estates with their own auxiliary and servicing departments, or factories owned by a large firm prepared to service from headquarters will not need other factories and an industrialized neighbourhood for securing external economies; the same economies will be obtained internally.

D. Selection of Desirable Industries

Not all industries that *could* possibly disperse into the country, *should* necessarily do so, if economic and social balance is taken into account.

Some balance in the employment of the sexes is already assured in the English countryside by the remarkable statistical linkage shown between agriculture and domestic service. The location quotients show that every census region that has more than its proportion of agriculturalists has more than its proportion of domestics, and vice versa. This is no doubt mainly due to the custom peculiar to Britain for the rich to live in the country; and it certainly helps to solve the problem of the women not occupied in agriculture. But if the rich who can afford to live in style in the country diminish greatly (as they well may after war taxation has finished with them) those unoccupied women must find other industries that have a possible rural incidence.

Of the manufacturing industries mentioned as having a possible rural incidence in Britain the following have desirable characteristics for balancing with agriculture.

- (i) *High or average proportion of women to men.*
Boots and shoes; rope, cord, and twine; hosiery; rayon, miscellaneous food processing.
- (ii) *Employment of the younger generation.*
Aircraft, glass, carriage-bodies and carts.

(iii) *Winter activity.*

Sugar-refining; rope, cord, and twine; carriage-bodies and carts.

(iv) *Growing number employed.*

Rayon, miscellaneous food processing, glass, printing and publishing.

If we wish to distinguish between dispersion into existing towns and dispersion into villages, it should be noted that some of these industries are composed on the whole of large plants and for their labour supply probably require dispersion into new cities (possibly garden cities) or larger existing cities and towns, rather than into existing villages. Such large-plant industries include aircraft, glass, rayon, sugar-refining.

Finally, I must emphasize that this paper is to be regarded as illustrating a method of approach rather than the laying down of a final policy. Research on these lines is still in its infancy but is developing lustily.

REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

DISCUSSION AT THE END OF SESSION II

DR. L. DUDLEY STAMP, D.Sc. (Land Utilisation Survey) said he was very anxious that the discussion should take into consideration the point where the speaker left off. Everything except the half dozen very large cities had been classed as countryside. He would like a threefold distinction of large cities, country towns and countryside proper. Dispersal of industry into some of the old country towns with populations of from five to fifty thousand inhabitants might benefit them greatly, but that was a very different thing from introducing industry into the open countryside of rural Britain. Out of the industries mentioned as suitable for transfer, many could go to country towns with very great benefit, but he failed to find a single one which could properly be taken to the real villages.

MR. G. A. HOLLAND (Derby): Some industries could quite well go into the villages: for example, dairying processes and the servicing of agricultural machinery. The reason why such industries had gone into the towns was largely historical. It was not justified by present circumstances.

MR. PETER SCOTT (Wales Survey Board) suggested that of the four characteristics of farming given only two were fundamental—the proportion of men to women, and the seasonal nature of agriculture. The relatively high age of the men employed he considered to be due to the depression over a number of years. The older men were those who had been rooted in the rural areas before the last war, and they were the only men who could do such skilled work as thatching. The best of the middle-aged men had gone into the towns. It appeared that the boys were finding agriculture attractive, and as they now felt it might offer possibilities after the war, many were prepared to go into it. The decrease in the number of those engaged in agriculture was also due to the depression, and there was also the factor of mechanization. The numbers engaged now were approximately the

DISCUSSION

same as those at the beginning of the war, but the output had increased enormously. With a revitalized agriculture, the numbers employed should at least not decrease. Too much stress should not be laid on the movement of such industries as printing into the country, in this particular case the main reason was the lower rates of pay in the country compared with the town.

LT. P. J. MARSHALL (Coventry): There were large areas in England covered by industries that had been left derelict. In view of the fact that it had been stated that not another acre of agricultural land could be spared for industry, could not industry be fitted into those areas so that the need for covering more land for industry would be avoided?

MR. GEORGE CADBURY (West Midland Group): One was apt to overlook the value and necessity of developing the small country towns. Industries required such services as gas, and that was not to be found in the villages. He was amazed at the possibilities that lay in using up-to-date methods in farming. If half the developments which had been proved possible could be applied they would affect the value of agriculture enormously. It would not only be possible to produce more per acre but more per man. More also could be done with the products. Research would show the best varieties of fruits and vegetables to grow for canning. The speaker had mentioned that the Government had closed down a small agricultural college during the war. He regarded this as a retrograde step. They would need highly trained young men and women after the war, for if the research work were put into practice, they would gain enormously. They should give a place in their thoughts to education in agriculture if they were to make the best use of the land and apply recent discoveries.

COUNCILLOR MRS. B. G. REID (Ruislip-Northwood U.D.C.) made a plea on behalf of the urban districts on the fringes of London. Jerry buildings had been spreading over land reserved for factories, and the areas were becoming mere dormitories for London. She was anxious that they should become not dormitories but communities. If industries from London were going to be taken out into the rural areas, what would become of the schools and libraries and other public buildings that had been put up? She would like to see some way in which industries could be attracted to their remaining factory areas to absorb the workers in the district. The war industries would

REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

close down after the war and the employees would be dispersed to other districts or would be unemployed.

DR. W. K. SLATER (Dartington Hall, Devon), wanted those industries which were connected with agriculture moved to the country. He agreed that the non-employment of young persons was partly due to the depression, but instanced the case of Devonshire where a large number of young men started on the land and then entered the Navy, returning later to the land. He also spoke of the advantage of locating the furniture industry in the country where the saving of carriage costs on raw material made it definitely more profitable.

MR. A. P. D. PENROSE: The need was to recreate a life of real community all over England. The community had largely vanished. It had decayed in the large and small towns, but survived, though partially decayed even there, in the villages. The village was the last surviving unit where you often found a balanced all-class society.

MR. H. ROLF GARDINER (Shaftesbury) mentioned the spinning and weaving mills of Wessex which had once sprung up because the land was particularly suitable for the flax and hemp necessary for textiles and ropes. During the nineteenth century the spinning became concentrated in certain areas of N. Ireland and Dundee. It was wrong to have to send flax away from where it had been grown and could be spun and woven. That was an outlook which could surely be changed when England became a more self-contained economic unit. He urged the decentralization of specialized industries and the redevelopment of mills in small towns. Regions could be self-supporting to a far greater degree than at present.

MR. AMBROSE APPELBE, M.A., LL.B.: It was exceedingly difficult to find unemployed women in the country. The farmer's wife was not a registered worker, but she was the most important person. Agriculture could not carry on without her.

MR. OSBORN pointed out that they had met as a conference with the Barlow Report as a basis. Some decentralization was necessary for the industries and people of the cities. The Association had never stressed the decentralization of isolated industries into the countryside but advocated their settlement in new and existing small towns. The size of the towns into which they should be moved was one of the questions they had to study. The causes of factories coming to certain sites were extraordinarily accidental, and industry was

DISCUSSION

even more mobile than Professor Florence had stated. There was also an enormous amount of office work that could be carried on in small towns. He would agree that the number of industries that could be accommodated in purely rural areas was strictly limited, but probably more than half could have been accommodated in the small towns.

MR. R. H. MATTOCKS (Leeds) instanced surgical dressings, which had to be manufactured in pure air, as an industry needing a rural site.

SIR MALCOLM STEWART (Chairman): Professor Florence did not stress the overriding factor affecting the dispersal of industry; it is essential that the economic factors securing efficiency should prevail.

PROFESSOR FLORENCE, replying, said that the market for motor accessories was not the general public, but the motor industry. The aeroplane industry was not in the same category, as both we and America were finding out. The parts manufactured were much lighter and the industry was not nearly so much held down to the heavy industries. He was quite prepared to distinguish between small town and completely country areas. In regard to lower wages being paid in industries moved into the country, he did not see why this should not be so, for the cost of living was lower. He agreed with the social disadvantages of the one-industry city. Trade Unions were conservative bodies and apt to hold down one-industry towns to their old practices and to allow foreign imports to come in at lower prices.

SESSION III

Social Life in Villages and Small Towns

CHAIRMAN: MAJOR JOHN A. ROSEVEAR, F.S.I., D.T.P.(LOND.)

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Major Rosevear expressed his regret for the unavoidable absence of Viscount Samuel and emphasized the prime importance of the subject of the paper they were about to hear in stemming the continual drift of population from the countryside to the great cities. He felt sure they were all in accord with the principle that this 'drift' must be stopped and some control placed upon the unwieldy size of the great centres of population.

It was therefore necessary to give the countryman of villages and small towns all possible social amenities and he considered that a primary essential was a public centre in each community where all could meet on common ground both for religious and social life, sports and games and all sides of a full community life.

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

STATEMENT I

by PROFESSOR A. W. ASHBY

(Professor of Agricultural Economics, University College of Wales)

Professor Ashby presents a broad survey of problems in the organization and development of rural social life. Subjects covered include education, sports, libraries, music and drama, health services, and general social organization. In the course of summarizing requirements, he states that the greatest need in many rural areas is an increase in the density of population, which will have to rely on occupations other than agriculture. This invasion by industries is, he thinks, likely to cause the main controversy, but, given other appropriate conditions, the broadest possible occupational basis is desirable for rural communities. He says: 'In the long run, no endeavour to protect the innocence and contentment of the villages is likely to succeed. They will change. Provisions for enlightenment, activity and adjustment rather than conservative protection are required.'

* * * * *

The amount and quality of social life in villages previously depended on: the size of the community group; the scatter of residences; age and sex-distribution in the group; income levels; previous social activities.

Village communities have suffered loss of their people mainly from the rise of efficiency in agricultural production. The general tendency is to regard loss of agricultural population as a sign and a measure of decline in agriculture. Whatever small decline there may have been in production, and the decline if any is very small, the main factor is the increase in efficiency of agricultural processes and organization. Production per hour of human labour has probably risen about 87 per cent in the last seventy years, and has risen about 25 per cent in the last twenty years.

This process will continue. It is in fact almost certain to be accelerated by new factors arising from war conditions.

Rural population has been about steady. We have increased the non-agricultural portion of the rural population. But it has suffered from disturbance of the sex ratio—from shortage of women. This is not marked over the whole rural population, but it is marked in some districts. It has suffered from a general shortage of the age-groups 20-49, and from an excess of the age-groups 50 and over. These conditions are accentuated in the more generally agricultural districts.

Here, as regards social life, we have these strange results. Rising efficiency in agricultural production has given higher incomes. But it has diminished the size of the group and increased the time and money costs of all sorts of social satisfactions.

There is great need of increasing density of rural population, especially in the more purely agricultural areas. Some population movements are still going on. The smaller villages tend to get smaller still. The larger villages tend to grow. The conditions of growth are: satisfactory schools; housing; good water supplies—especially piped; electricity or gas; transport facilities.

Among the conditions necessary for development of full and healthy social life I could put: (1) Increase in population and in sizes of communities; (2) Extension of public provisions for housing; (3) Piped water supplies; (4) Electricity supplies at reasonable cost; (5) Satisfactory schools; (6) Good transport facilities.

We need an immediate survey of possible supplies of piped water in rural areas and control of their use. Many rural areas are being robbed of possible sources, without being able to use supplies drawn from them. We need also thorough consideration of rural electricity supplies and charges from the point of view of rural development, residential, social and industrial. We may provide cinemas, dances, and libraries, but unless we provide the physical bases of satisfactory living we will not increase our rural population.

We need dispersal of population to rural areas. The primary conditions of satisfactory dispersal are small groups which can be absorbed, and public provision of housing. We must avoid the 'factory camp' system of settlement. We do not want a single firm dominating the economic, the social or the political life of any rural areas. We need industries providing employment for young women. We need industries providing regular employment. We should not encourage firms

to think they can associate part-time industrial employment with smallholdings. We need families with children; for these are most quickly absorbed in the rural community.

Some Aspects of Rural Education

We should recognize that a population of at least 700-800 is needed to provide anything like a satisfactory school of all ages. With normal distribution of age-groups, 16 per cent will lie in the group 5-14 years. A population group of 700 will provide a school of ten age-groups of about 120 children or twelve in each group. At the higher ages this only means say six boys and six girls in each year group. This is not enough. In order to give rural children the necessary education and social training for healthy and full development of personality and social life in the future we must extend the central school system.

These central schools should be built in or near the larger villages and the small towns. Unless in special circumstances, they should not be in the open country. There has been a recent tendency in some areas to site, and consider siting, new central schools in open country: perhaps to avoid having to make an invidious choice between one village and another, but also on a theory that contact with the large village or small town endangers the allegiance of the child to agriculture or rural life.

There is not a scrap of evidence that open country schools retard rural or agricultural migration. There is, in fact, danger that they may increase the sense of isolation and restriction which is so dangerous in the case of rural youth.

We have to recognize that some villages are likely to grow, while others will remain stationary or even show further decline. We should survey the conditions and make deliberate social choices of the villages whose growth should be stimulated. But we must recognize the time and money cost of satisfactory facilities for education in rural areas.

Because so few of us know how rural children really live it may be useful to describe some features of secondary education in one agricultural county. There are seven secondary schools, of which at the moment I have figures for six.

Six schools have 1,724 scholars. Of these only 554 live at home at the school centres.

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

153 scholars from isolated farms and hamlets live in lodgings in the small towns from Monday to Friday.

1,017 travel daily to school.

That is less than one-third live in the towns in which the schools are situated; more than two-thirds have to travel at week-ends or daily.

9 per cent live in lodgings Monday to Friday.

59 per cent travel daily.

32 per cent live in towns.

Of those who travel daily:

89 per cent by bus (891).

4 per cent by rail (41).

4 per cent by cycle (42).

2 per cent walk (21).

1.3 per cent by car (13).

1 per cent by other means (11).

There are cases of dual modes of travel each day. Of those travelling daily and living in lodgings:

95 get dinner in lodgings.

17 in cafés.

23 with relatives.

923 take the school dinners.

112 carry dinners from home.

Under such conditions there is need of provision of proper school hostels. If the public school system is good for the upper middle classes it is good for country children. Nearly 10 per cent of these children must live the greater part of their week away from home if they are to get secondary education. Considerable developments and improvements in rural education—primary, secondary, technical, and agricultural are necessary for healthy social development. It is not possible to complete even an outline of the problems of rural education, but in many areas the system needs overhauling. There is need of greater financial provisions for improvement of schools and equipment, and for developments beyond the primary stage. The Village Colleges of Cambridgeshire are providing one model for development, but their organization may not be suitable for every area or form of community settlement. In other areas the functions of these Village Colleges may be fulfilled with a less integrated set of organizations.

Religious Organization and Adolescent Development

Churches, and especially the educational and social training aspects of their work, have suffered from the depletion of rural population. There are many villages with a church and a chapel, and sometimes two chapels, and neither has a satisfactory congregation. This is not only because the people do not attend, but because the necessary population does not exist within a reasonable travelling distance.

This division of religious organization is specially bad for their work with children and adolescents. A village with fifty children of school age trying to run two Sunday schools is attempting an almost impossible task. A village with twenty-five young people between the ages of fifteen and twenty cannot possibly run two young people's societies. It could only hope to run one at all effectively. Religious organizations waste their personnel who have capacity for voluntary teaching and for religious and intellectual leadership of adolescents. As time goes on, we may make other provisions for the intellectual and social leadership of adolescents—in central and continuation schools, and village colleges. The adult education system scarcely touches them.

•

Adult Education

But the adult education system is now an integral part of the intellectual and social life of villages. It has done and is doing remarkable work in many areas. In Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Berkshire, for instance, the Oxford Delegacy for Extra-Mural Studies had sixty-two centres in 1939-40 and fifty centres in 1940-1.

Courses: Oxfordshire 16; Buckinghamshire 16; Berkshire 18.

The same story could be told of other areas.

Village Halls

An adequate village hall is the first essential of the full development of social activities. We do not know what proportion of villages have halls of any sort. We do know that the proportion which has adequate village halls, properly run, is very small indeed. We also know that demand has been strong, and that strenuous efforts have been made by some villages to equip themselves with halls. A recent Report of the National Council of Social Service provides evidence of needs and of the efforts made by villagers on their own behalf.

"The National Council of Social Service is in touch with 1,400

Village Halls. Grant aid amounting to £81,597 and loans totalling £96,000 have been administered by the Council for 490 halls since the inception of the funds in 1925. The Loan Fund of £32,500 has now been turned over more than three times without a single default on repayment of loans.' (Report 1940-1.)

The village hall may have to provide accommodation for the Parish Council, for some functions associated with church or chapel, for the Women's Institute, babies and children's clinic, the village library, the British Legion, Men's Club, Nursing Association, trade union or friendly society, allotments society, the pig club, sports societies, Girl Guides and Boy Scouts, and similar organizations.

The accommodation needed in Village Halls will vary from one village to another. Each one ought to provide a central meeting hall with platform and curtain, one or more committee rooms and a small kitchen with cupboard space. If it is to be used as a men's club it should also include a clubroom which will always be available to members. According to the size of the village population, variety of their social activities, and economic means, it may offer other accommodation. If the hall can be set on the recreation ground it may provide changing room with washing facilities. A gymnasium or room which can be used for physical training may be desirable. Where there is no central or similar school it may also be useful to equip it with a room which can be used for technical instruction, particularly in handicraft classes. Where the school does not provide a cinema, a screen and projector room will then be desirable. Adequate heating and ventilation, water supply, cloakroom space with proper sanitation, electric light and one or more power plugs and storage room should be regarded as minimum conditions. In the larger villages, or where women's organizations are expected to make frequent use of the accommodation, a room which can be used as a children's playroom, with simple equipment, may be desirable.

Every case has to be considered in relation to means, to provisions made by other institutions, and to the needs of the community to be served. There is danger in overloading schemes, but there are also risks to success in too meagre accommodation. Where the accommodation to be provided in the first instance is limited, the design of the building and use of the site should be such as will allow for economical, convenient and otherwise satisfactory extension. The choice of sites for village halls may often be limited. Necessity for something

like a central site will depend on the area of scatter of residences and on the existence of a common meeting point for people moving about the village. The natural, unorganized meeting point for the young men of the area may often indicate the area in which the hall ought to be situated if a site can be obtained. There are many conditions to be taken into account. Wherever possible the site should be larger than is required for immediate building purposes. If the hall can be situated near the road on a public recreation ground readily accessible to all the village, that may be the ideal condition. Where this is not the case, space for a children's playground, or for some games like tennis which do not require a large area may well be provided. A children's playground with shade trees and seats for adults may be very appropriate accompaniment.¹

Playing Fields and Sports Organization

The position in respect of playing fields is best described in the words of a recent report by the Playing Fields Association:

'Many villages have hitherto depended upon the squire to allow football or cricket to be played in his park or on some farmer to lend a pasture field for this purpose. But the experience of the National Playing Fields Association has shown how dangerous it is to depend upon the continuance of voluntary facilities of this kind. Large estates are being broken up, and farms often change hands, with the result that the village suddenly finds itself without any facilities for outdoor recreation.

'The actual shortage varies greatly in many parts of the country. For instance in one county in the north there is only one public playing field in every forty-five parishes; in a few counties the proportion is far more satisfactory, and here and there 33 per cent or 50 per cent of the parishes have public recreation grounds. As far as can be ascertained, however, the average for the whole country is only about 10 per cent.

'Whatever the actual percentage may be a serious deficiency in public playing fields exists in rural areas generally.'

Applications for grants in recent years show that an active demand exists. One trouble has been that the Parish Councils have financial

¹ For details respecting provision and control of village halls, accommodation, equipment and design, see *Village Halls: Their Construction and Management*. National Council of Social Service.

power entirely inadequate to the provision of recreation grounds. Grants are needed if an adequate supply is to be provided.

The needs are:

A small space reserved for children, with more space for juvenile team games.

Adolescents and adults need space for team games, especially cricket, football, hockey, and tennis. In some areas provisions for a quoits pitch or a bowling ground are necessary.

'The area required varies in proportion to the population of the village,' the report continues. 'There should be sufficient space to permit football to be played without damage to the cricket pitch. Much depends on the shape of the pitch and on whether it is level and well drained. A parish having a population of 1,000 needs a ground of six acres, a village with a population of 250 would probably find four acres sufficient.

'The shortage of playing fields has seriously affected the physical, mental, and moral welfare of the youth of the nation, and a bold effort is needed to remedy social conditions under which young people have been compelled to pass through life without reasonable opportunities for health-giving play.'

For development of rural sports the chief requisites are:

Playing fields—properly laid out and kept; minimum equipment for games to be played; leadership in organization and in play; coaching in team play; sports fêtes and competitions.¹

Rural Libraries

There is a country library service throughout the British Isles, with central and sometimes local depositories, and arrangements for circulating books to villages. Many small urban authorities have independent libraries of whose autonomy they are somewhat jealous. They are often, perhaps, generally, not inclined to forgo independence and autonomy in favour of participation in a service with much greater existing resources and potentialities for future development. But some small towns which have agreed to amalgamation have not apparently regretted their decision. There is need of education of authorities in charge of small urban libraries.² Between the

¹ The best available survey of leisure pursuits is Tyrwhitt, *Leisure Pursuits Outside the Family Circle* (National Institute of Industrial Psychology, Aldwych House, London, W.C.2, 1939).

² 27th Annual Report of Carnegie U.K. Trustees, 1940, pp. 18-19.

National Central Library, the Library Bureaux established for eight Regions, and the County Libraries, a library anywhere in the British Isles can now, with very few exceptions, borrow any book from any other public library. On the other hand, there are still over 600,000 persons in country library areas in the United Kingdom without any library service. 'It is difficult to explain or excuse such a figure. In every case the library concerned has been in existence well over ten years, and some serve areas of very high rateable value. It would seem that some ratepayers have, for periods of between ten and twenty years, been contributing towards the cost of a service which they have had no opportunity of enjoying.'¹

The total number of rural 'service points' is nearly 14,000, but the great majority of these have less than 500 books each and nearly 2,500 had less than 100 books each. Statistics of borrowers are poor, but possibly 12 per cent of the population are amongst the users. In England the percentage varies between 7 and 34 and the results reported suggest that 15 per cent can be achieved in any type of county, and that any lower figure should be regarded as a matter for concern.'² In the Welsh counties in which records are kept the percentage varies between 3.5 and 22.1, and in Scotland between 8.1 and 61.3.

The supply of books is:

	<i>Books per 1,000 of Population</i>			<i>Issues per head of population</i>
	<i>Average</i>	<i>Lowest</i>	<i>Highest</i>	
England ..	45.0	19.4	96.8	3.7
Wales ..	42.5	20.4	88.5	2.0
Scotland ..	64.8	34.1	158.2	4.0
N. Ireland ..	21.9	13.4	28.7	1.7

'Serious doubts arise as to whether some county library authorities are making any real efforts to provide proper library service and are not rather deliberately restricting the cost of their libraries to pre-conceived and inadequate levels.

'In general, agricultural areas in which it is particularly difficult to provide adequate services, suffer from the handicap of low rateable

¹ County Libraries Report, 1938-9. Libraries Association—County Libraries Section.

² Report 1938-9.

value per capita, and residential districts enjoy a converse position.'

Expenditure per head of population:

				<i>Pence</i>
England	..	..	..	8·28
Wales	..	..	..	4·99
Scotland	..	..	..	9·84
Northern Ireland			..	2·82

Total cost of library service is about 2d. per issue.

Arts Galleries and Museums

As regards exhibitions of pictorial art relatively little has been done. Before the war began the British Institute arranged the circulation to various centres of a loan collection of good pictures. Local Education Authorities were concerned in this enterprise. Since the war began this activity has been taken over by the Council for Education in Music and the Arts. This activity has reached some small towns, and through them a small number of selected villages. Many counties have local museums, some of which are extremely attractive and most of which are useful. There should be one museum adequately housed, arranged, and advertised in every county. A few county museums have arranged circulating collections for the use of schools.

The Rural Cinema

There is room for great development of cinema services in small towns and villages, and the technical possibilities of extension appear to exist in many areas. Perhaps the greatest possibilities lie in the direction of supply of cinema entertainment for persons of school age, and for a supply of films of educational and informational character, together with other types of short films for both special and general groups of adults. The village cinema will never supplant the entertainment which will be provided by the best houses of towns with 8,000 population upward. Indeed, any attempt to make the village cinema the competitor with the town entertainment is likely to prejudice possibilities of success with the services which the village cinema as such might well provide. Every village hall ought to include facilities for cinema displays unless these are provided in a

continuation or similar school which is equipped with seating accommodation for adults.¹

Music and Drama

Amateur dramatic activities are known to exist in over thirty counties in England and Wales. A few counties have full-time drama advisors, and in other cases there are some provisions for assistance to interested groups. It would almost certainly be wrong to suggest that amateur dramatic activities are widespread in relation to the total number of villages and small towns, or that they will ever become universal. But during the last forty years there have been strong sporadic movements in many parts of the country, and there are some areas in which movements have been continuous. There is, undoubtedly, frequent interest in dramatic presentations, with great willingness to take part in them, and much talent which is worthy of development and local display.

Village drama activities should cover their costs inside the village, but groups may need some initial assistance, and activities of federated or affiliated groups may need financial assistance. As far as physical planning is concerned the only requirement is a hall with suitable accommodation and equipment. But it is desirable to say that amateur dramatic activities in small towns and villages are not to be judged on their artistic success alone. Production of drama is a social and may be an educational as well as an artistic activity, or in some cases it would be true to say that it is primarily a social activity. It rests on the close working together of a voluntary group, and, although possibly no other activity offers quite the same temptation to envy and even jealousy, successful operation does entail voluntary acceptance of discipline and the wholehearted fulfilment of allotted function. It involves study and thought and it provides opportunities for the public expression of ideas and emotions which would otherwise find no such expression in rural areas.

'There is a Joint Committee for Drama consisting of representatives of the British Drama League, the County Councils Association, the

¹ In five counties in which there are Rural Community Councils experiments with portable cinema equipment have been successful. National Council of Social Service Report, 1939-40.

For information on rural population and the commercial cinema, see Tyrwhitt, *Leisure Activities, Outside the Family Circle, in a Rural District*.

National Federation of Women's Institutes, the Carnegie U.K. Trust, and the National Council of Social Service. One of the interesting experiments which has been sponsored by the Committee has been the organization of a travelling school for variety entertainment. This experiment was undertaken because of the difficulties experienced by village drama societies in producing dramatic performances under war conditions. Forty schools, held in a period of nine weeks in various parts of the country were attended by nearly 4,000 students. The experiment has been greatly welcomed.'—National Council of Social Service Report 1940-1.

From the point of view of social analyses and social value, musical activities take two distinct forms—the individual and the corporate; and either may be followed for profit or for artistic and non-material satisfactions. There are links between the two, from the duet to the octette, but the duet and the quartet may be nearer to the individual than the corporate form. The soloist, whether vocal or instrumental, must be acutely conscious of individuality. On the other hand, the chorister or the orchestral player must be acutely conscious of the corporate group, of his place within it, and of the necessity of activity which is fully co-operative. 'Individual performers play an indispensable part in the music of our civilization, and they and the corporate bodies depend mutually on one another.'¹ In comprehensive plans for village musical activities, especially village concerts, it is essential that the two be combined. Activities in personal profit-making are rare in rural communities, but musical and dramatic performances (in the widest sense) are, of course, often used for raising funds for many institutional or social purposes. The corporate, non-profit making, musical activities are inherently social as well as aesthetic in character. The combination of individual and corporate amateur performances in villages and small towns are also social in character. In the corporate and the combined forms music is 'inherently a social activity, and adds to its specifically musical claim this further claim to be one of the most potent agents of a corporate life and outlook.'

'The development of musical activities for adults and adolescents in rural areas has been promoted through county music committees which work in close co-operation with County Education Committees, Rural Community Councils, Rural Music Schools, and other local organizations. It is hoped that before long every county in

¹ 26th Annual Report Carnegie U.K. Trust, 1939.

England and Wales will have its county music committee for this work.¹

Provision for assistance to rural musical development includes pioneer lectures or conferences to ascertain needs and possibilities, courses of lectures or short schools, and advisory visits. There are also provisions for bursaries for potential leaders. The special assistance includes provision for purchase of instruments, for classes in orchestral playing, for combined concert performances (without competition), for festivals, competitive or non-competitive. At present there are over forty music committees recognized as qualifying for assistance.

There is a special problem in the development of high standards of corporate musical activities in rural areas. The cost of music, particularly copyright music, and orchestral parts whether copyright or not, deters societies from launching unfamiliar parts, however suitable or promising they may be. Purchase is necessary for copyright works cannot be loaned, and libraries cannot very well deal with non-copyright works because copies so quickly deteriorate.

Finance of Aesthetic Development

In the case of cultural activities of the more esoteric type—music, drama, etc., special assistance has come largely, if not almost wholly, from private funds. The assistance of the Carnegie U.K. Trust and the Pilgrim Trust has been of the greatest value. Indeed, movements with any sense of widespread common interests could scarcely have developed without it. But there is need of some provisions which may be obtained as of right. In the case of adult education grants are available for classes organized by voluntary associations which comply with the reasonable conditions laid down for their administration. Similar provisions are necessary in some other cases. The voluntary principle is essential, but freedom and right for voluntary associations of different types is equally necessary. Affiliation of cultural groups is desirable but single types of application are not only unnecessary, they are likely to become handicaps to the widest development.

Health Services: Finance and Control

Although only brief treatment is possible this survey would be inadequate without some reference to health services, for improve-

¹ National Council of Social Service Report, 1940-1.

ment of these is urgently necessary for satisfactory rural living. There are certain services which should be entirely covered either by public provisions or by public provisions coupled with definite contributory systems. During recent years there have been intensive and intelligent efforts to support and strengthen the voluntary hospitals and to improve and extend their services. These efforts have attained considerable success, but at the same time there is still need of greater public provisions of hospital services. The needs of villages and small towns are not likely to be fully met until more financial assistance is available from public sources. But here we have to recognize that it is where rural needs are greatest that any public hospital system is likely to be most affected by ideas of public assistance with poor law associations. On the whole, the hospital system is one for treatment by experts assisted by people with an interest in general social administration. There are, however, two branches of health services from which local social-class philanthropy should be banished—namely, nursing services and the feeding of schoolchildren. Both these should be covered by public provisions, and, to the extent to which this is practicable, by definite contributory systems.

Committee service of District Nursing Associations is frequently a social preserve which is very carefully guarded. Many District Nurses are treated more or less as the social retainers of members of their Committees. Very few rural people, even amongst intelligent and active citizens, know how their local hospitals are provided and governed, or how they are maintained.

Planning health services for rural areas will be easier and more efficient as public provisions are extended. And public provision does not necessarily imply control by local authorities. There are various methods by which control may be exercised by representatives of local authorities, and if necessary of the national government, with representatives of voluntary associations.

General Social Organization

Rural Community Councils have been established in twenty-five counties of England, Wales, and Scotland. Each is a voluntary organization consisting of representatives of the Statutory and Voluntary bodies of the county in which it is formed. The objects are to inspire and marshal voluntary effort, to provide information and advice, to increase economy and efficiency of effort by co-ordination, in order

to promote the welfare of rural communities. They have covered a wide field of work in assisting parish councils, providing village halls, developing rural industries, providing or improving facilities for musical and dramatic activities and adult education, providing playing fields and opportunities for physical training, improving health services, and stimulating the study of local history. There are also some Village Community Councils acting as units of the councils set up for counties. Rural Community Councils are linked together through the National Council of Social Service. For various purposes this Council has administered considerable funds provided by the Carnegie U.K. Trustees, the Development Commissioners, the Pilgrim Trust, National Fitness Council and other sources.

Women's Institutes are now widely established over the whole country, in local Institutes, County Federations and the National Federation. Their activities are of educational, cultural, and general social character. Setting out to preserve and develop the characteristics and the values of rural life mainly from the woman's point of view, they have been concerned with the development of the domestic arts, with women's activities in gardens, with small livestock and some other farming processes and enterprises, with entertainments of musical and dramatic types, and with the general social education of women. They have developed all kinds of powers of personal expression in their members, and where they are strong they have created a considerable degree of solidarity amongst rural women. Their services have been of inestimable value.

Conclusion

This survey, extended as it is, is still entirely inadequate as a description and discussion of the present organization of rural social activities, needs and practical ways of meeting them. But from the point of view of physical planning it may be useful to summarize requirements. The chief bases of healthy and adequate social life in small towns and villages are:

- (1) Increased incomes in the agricultural groups.
- (2) Adequate housing of reasonable quality.
- (3) Piped water supplies.
- (4) Where a concentrated population exceeds 600, or where other conditions make it desirable, a public sewage system.
- (5) Electricity supply at reasonable cost.

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

- (6) Public recreation ground, including children's playground, and accompanied wherever possible by a place for open-air swimming.
- (7) A public hall for use as a community centre, with accommodation determined according to needs in relation to facilities provided by existing institutions.
- (8) Good transport facilities by road and (or) rail.

The chief social factors involved in the physical replanning of small towns and villages are:

- (1) The modes of residential developments in relation to types of occupation.
- (2) The numbers in the population groups concerned.
- (3) The age distributions within these groups.
- (4) The levels of cash incomes within these groups—both the average for each town and village community, and the averages of different class groups within these communities.
- (5) The types of occupations by which people live, and the working conditions in these occupations—hours of seasonal and daily work and leisure, and existence of the shift system and night work.
- (6) The social needs now recognized by the people themselves, and those recognized by their leaders and mentors.
- (7) The economic means and facilities and modes of travel available.
- (8) Political conditions and national aims in economic, political and social development.
- (9) The existing standard of general education of (a) the mass; (b) the leaders of communities and the degree to which the prevailing standard may be quickly raised, especially by adult and adolescent education.
- (10) The numbers and types of leaders available and of those who can be discovered and developed.

For communities of known sizes and forms (concentrated, nucleated with scatter, and scattered), with known transport facilities, it would be possible to plan minimum and optimum supplies of social institutions and services on the basis of themselves, provisions in their associated towns of 2,000 to 7,000 population, and then still others in larger towns. Any attempt to make villages self-contained as regards the social life of inhabitants of all ages and classes is to be deprecated and in any case it would not succeed.

The greatest need in development of social life in many rural areas is an increase in the density of population, especially an increase in the numbers of normal families. In certain areas there may be increase in numbers engaged in agriculture, in other areas further decreases are possible. The net increase, if any, is likely to be small.

Thus if there is to be an increase in rural population it has to rest on occupations other than agriculture.

Amongst recent tendencies there has been an increase in the number of retired persons and their families seeking residence in the larger and more attractive villages, and if the provisions for retirement from various occupations increase this tendency will almost certainly become stronger. Much depends on provision of houses, water supplies, with satisfactory sanitation, and supply of gas or electricity. But in general, the number of retired families may be expected to increase.

Objections have been raised to this invasion. It is said that it often takes the better houses from the native families, that it breaks the homogeneity of the social group, that it increases the number of households of the older age-groups, and that in some degree it 'upsets the village' concerned. There have been many cases of uncomfortable relations. A few invaders have adopted airs of superiority, or expected some degrees of social acceptance, some kinds of social recognition, which they did not receive. On the other hand, there are cases of very quick absorption of newcomers in the social life and some of them have given considerable service in their adopted communities. Modesty of attitude, caution in approach, consideration of the treasured rules and acceptances of the village, are always necessary if newcomers are to settle comfortably in their new life.

The other tendency is for people to live in villages and work elsewhere. Sometimes these are native families who have found new occupations; sometimes they are newcomers. The native families have already their social connections, and if the occupations of the earners in the family give them a fair amount of leisure, they need not suffer socially from the separation of work and residence. Conditions for the newcomers are similar to those for the retired group, but with the important exception that they often have children, and when these attend the same schools as the native children they greatly assist in establishing social bonds.

It is difficult to forecast conditions for this group. Recent and

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

prospective changes in transport facilities must make difficulties for them, and it is possible that these will not be entirely removed until some time after the war. But sooner or later the trend towards increase in residents not actually occupied in villages may be expected to appear again.

The great controversy, however, is likely to arise on invasion by industries. For a long time the general attitude has been that establishment of some industries in rural areas was desirable. But some people concerned with agriculture and rural life have always been doubtful of the advantage of any industrial change except the revival of traditional rural industries. The objections to infiltrations of groups of industrial workers have been that they caused disturbance of agricultural workers by comparisons of wages, even by competition for labour, and that they brought in alien elements with conflicting social attitudes and habits, conflicting moral and political standards, with bad effects on the community life. The situation is now changing. If the present relative level of agricultural wages is maintained, differences in earnings will not be so marked. They may, occasionally, be in favour of agriculture. But one objection still remains and is probably growing stronger—that the hours of work, daily and weekly, and especially the week-end freedom of the industrial workers cause difficulties for agricultural employers. The objections of a social, religious, and political character still remain.

The problem is not a simple one and should not be treated in relation to villages and small towns only. But it must be said that given other appropriate conditions, the broadest possible occupational basis is desirable for rural communities. Variety of occupational experience and interest is of social value, variety of occupational opportunity for young people is certainly to be sought. An amalgamation of social attitudes and habits may be achieved if the social agencies, schools, churches, sports clubs, village halls, and the various social and cultural societies are functioning properly. The trouble is that we sometimes let industrial and economic changes proceed a long way before we begin to make the necessary adjustments in social institutions and agencies.

In the long run, no endeavour to protect the innocence and contentment of the villages is likely to succeed. They will change. Provisions for enlightenment, activity and adjustment rather than conservative protection are required.

The only possible alternatives to increasing density of population for development of rural social life are more leisure and higher incomes for rural residents which will enable them to travel for some of their social satisfactions, with high social expenditure per head on practically all the social services, the material such as water supplies, electricity, and health services, and the intellectual—moral, and cultural, religious, educational, and all the rest.

These alternatives would break up the social life of rural communities almost as much and as rapidly as infiltration of persons in new occupations. But in fact there are no effective alternatives to increasing density, for the time cost of social satisfactions increases with expenditure on travel. Time and distance disabilities will always remain with populations of low density. And there does not appear to be any prospect of inducing the State and Local Government Authorities to spend at the rate per head necessary to reduce some other disabilities.

References

- (1) National Council of Social Service, 26 Bedford Square, London, W.C.1.
- (2) Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees, Comely Park House, Dunfermline, Scotland.
- (3) National Federation of Women's Institutes, 39 Eccleston Street, Victoria, London, S.W.1.
- (4) National Playing Fields Association, 71 Eccleston Square, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1.
- (5) National Fitness Council, 1 Queen Anne's Gate Building, Dartmouth Street, London, S.W.1.
- (6) Workers' Educational Association, 29 Tavistock Square, London, W.C.1.
- (7) The Library Association—County Libraries Section, Chaucer House, Malet Place, London, W.C.1.
- (8) Rural Industries Bureau, 42 Bridge Street, Taunton.

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

STATEMENT II

by DR. W. K. SLATER

(Director of Agricultural Research, Dartington Hall)

Dr. Slater contrasts the separate problems involved in enriching the cultural life of the existing village on the one hand, and of the new urban settlement on the other, detailing possible destructive influences to both types of community, and suggesting means by which they may be countered. In the case of the existing village, the most powerful disruptive factor in his opinion is the uncontrolled introduction of 'foreign' elements. The primary necessity is to arrange in planning the distribution of population so that the village is not swamped by a new group from the towns, either through industrial development or residential expansion. With the new urban settlement, the major problem is to provide a focus for all the individual desires and ambitions of the many separate units of which it is composed.

* * * * *

The problems involved in the enrichment of the cultural life of the existing village are largely dissimilar from those entering into the corresponding problem in the new urban settlement. In the village there is a living community of closely related families with tradition, with background, and with its own existing culture; in the new urban settlement there are only a number of discrete unrelated families, without common tradition or background, and each with its own individual culture. In the village the problem is to preserve the community from disruption and expand its culture; in the new urban settlement to weld the settlers into a gregarious whole and create from their separate ways of life a new common culture.

I propose therefore to divide what I have to say into two sections,

stressing this difference rather than the general problem of the necessity for developing cultural life as an integral part of post-war planning.

Destructive Influences

There are many factors in modern life which are exercising a destructive influence on our village communities. The most powerful of these is the uncontrolled introduction of 'foreign' elements into the village. The new population may come as the result of migration of industries, or as the adoption of the village as a dormitory area for an adjoining town. Where new industries move into a village their type and size is of great importance; if the industry is associated with the agriculture of the region and employs relatively few work-people compared with the existing population, the village can absorb any imported workers. The inclusion of these workers may be slow, but the process will not materially affect the existing culture, and may in fact enrich it by bringing in fresh ideas and enthusiasm. Where, however, the factory is not related to the land and the workers required represent a large proportion of the final population of the village, the existing community cannot absorb the new population. The result is the establishment side by side of two communities, the old and the new; the one with unity and tradition, the other with undirected energy and unco-ordinated desires. Between the two conflict must arise for the possession of existing recreational facilities, and it will continue until one group overpowers the other. The new urban element in the population will regard with undisguised amusement the simpler and less sophisticated cultural efforts of the old village, and under the blight of this ridicule the village life will die, the villagers joining the factory workers in their vague search for sophisticated pleasure and recreation.

The difficulties are even greater when the influx of population takes the form of workers from a neighbouring town. The employees of a factory in the village have at least the unity created by their place of work, and their whole life is in the village; the worker from a larger town has no interest in the village except as his geographic home. He will seek his leisure occupation in the larger town in which he works, or in other places to which his better financial position enables him to travel. From time to time he will condescend to patronize local activities, full of criticism and suggestions, but with

little willingness to take personal responsibility. This is only to be expected, for in the town amusement and cultural recreation are all professionally provided, and hence of a higher technical standard, yet calling for no effort on the part of the audience other than the ability to pay a fee.

Under this influence voluntary communal effort will be discouraged and as the numbers of the foreign element grow, be replaced by a culture bought either in the towns, as transport improves, or in the village itself as the demand justifies the commercial development of local amusements. The village inn adds on a lounge where cocktails take the place of beer, and jazz music from a wireless set the place of the traditional songs. The village hall is no longer the centre of communal activities, but a hired hall for subscription dances and private entertainment.

Another cause of the disruption of village life is the introduction of modern transport and wireless. The cultural life of the countryside is traditional and simple; but interesting and beautiful in its own sense; it must be judged by different standards from those applied to the culture of the town. So long as the village remained isolated the countryman judged on his old standards and found his leisure occupations satisfying, but now that he may travel by bus to a neighbouring town or by turning the knobs of his wireless listen to music from the ends of the earth, he compares the village performance with the technical excellence of the professional musician and actor, and finds it poor and unsatisfying. If the music and drama he hears were designed to encourage self-expression, to raise the technical standard of the amateur, and to create real cultural understanding, the result might be wholly good. But urban entertainment, and to a large extent the programmes of the B.B.C., have to be designed to meet the taste of the townsman and to amuse and entertain. They serve only to produce in the villager a sense of frustration in that he cannot enter fully into this life which has been revealed to him, whilst his own no longer satisfies. He may take a bus to the nearest town, but it is expensive and often difficult; he can do so probably only once a week, whilst he knows that the townsman is entering daily into those pleasures which for him are only for the occasion. He may listen to a concert, a dance band or an opera on the wireless, but he can never hope to see and hear the actual performance unless he migrates to the town.

The Need for Central Meeting Places

Apart from the outside disruptive influences on cultural life, there is the internal one arising from lack of physical provision in the form of a central meeting place in the village. The provision of village halls has gone far to meet this need, but they are rarely open as a continuous meeting place for the village. The church once provided the common ground where rich and poor met, and the church porch and the chat after the service the place and time where plans were laid for village festivities; the parson and the organist were often the centre round which the cultural life of the village gathered. This is now largely lost, and in few villages does the church hold its old place. The village inn still draws its group of habitués, but country women rarely go to the inn, and so the bar is not representative of the communal opinion, nor does it take a lead in the organization of village life. What is needed is a village club to which everyone goes irrespective of creed, political opinion or social status, where discussion is free and the communal life and culture can express itself. If this is adjoining the village hall so much the better, since then the transition from idea to practice becomes more simple and natural.

The new senior schools are in many places partly fulfilling this need by providing suitable premises. Their usefulness can be further expanded as they are rendered more fully available for all purposes and their number increases.

If, therefore, we are to enrich the cultural life of the village we must first take action to preserve that which exists, and then build carefully on the old foundation, making certain that our structure is designed to meet the impact of the modern world.

The primary necessity is to arrange in planning the distribution of population that the village is not swamped by a new group from the towns, either through industrial development or residential expansion. If this can be ensured the most serious disruptive influence will be avoided.

A New Sense of Values

The next consideration must be to prevent the influence of urban culture from reacting harmfully on the village. To do this a new sense of values must be created, to combat the accepted professional standard of the town. Such values can only be established by providing for the village entertainment which is based on definite,

logical, and educational ideas. It is not sufficient to send to the villages a pale reflection of urban culture; what they need is the expression of their own culture performed with an efficiency which will bear comparison with the wireless and the professional entertainment of the town.

Actors, musicians, and dancers, who understand the native ideals, should be sent to the villages to give performances of works as much in sympathy with the traditional culture as possible, but at the same time with a high technical standard of production. The performers must beware throughout of two difficulties. The first is the error into which many artistes fall of assuming that what they like will please the village; many modern settings of folksongs are, for example, not acceptable to the countryman, whereas he may enjoy a modern sentimental ballad. Again, the artiste must avoid any difficult works, contenting himself with the excellence of his performance of the more simple, since to present to the amateur something which he himself can never hope to perform will only drive him back to the wireless and the bus to the nearest town.

Following these demonstrators of the arts should go teachers who again have a sympathetic understanding of village life, and possess the ability to encourage the local people to entertain themselves. The village choir can be taught to give adequate performances of simple works, and to understand how much greater is the joy of singing themselves, rather than listening to any but the best performers. Orchestral music and simple chamber music can be encouraged. There is no call to despise the brass band or the dance band if it is a natural expression of the communal life. Brass bands have indeed done much to develop the musical culture in the North Midlands. The acting of the right type of play has been shown to be possible, and has reached remarkably high standards, but the country people need help in selecting the play, in producing it, and in the proper utilization of their simple stage and properties.

With this encouragement and help, the village culture would resist the influence of the urban life brought to its door by modern science, and might in turn have its effect in building the lives of new urban settlements in rural surroundings.

It may be argued that this is an over-simplification of the problem of the development of village culture, but I have attempted to state the bald outline to clear away that confusion which must arise in the

discussion of detail, in order to focus attention on what I believe to be the basic elements of the situation.

Again, much of what I have suggested is already being done, much more is proposed, and I do not wish to minimize these efforts. What I do feel, however, is that each positive action, whether actual or contemplated, should be re-examined against the simple background which I have outlined, to test its possible ultimate influence on village culture.

The New Urban Settlement

With the new urban settlement the major problem is to provide a focus for all the individual desires and ambitions of the many separate units of which it is composed. The newcomers will be largely drawn from towns where they have been accustomed to occupy their leisure with the ready-made amusement of the cinema and the dance hall, and will have little skill in self-entertainment.

In the past the churches would have formed the natural rallying point for the newly settled population, but in a freshly established settlement the church, if it already exists, will be struggling to find its own place. Moreover, few of the urban settlers will have so definite a connection with any church as to be drawn into communal life through its influence.

We must start, therefore, not from any existing organization, but from our knowledge of the background of the folk who are to form the new community. Most young people who have been brought up in our towns find relaxation and enjoyment primarily in the cinema, but only to a slightly less extent in dancing. Many have also become accustomed to youth clubs with their facilities for games and physical exercise. Again, numbers are interested in outdoor sports, including cycling and walking; and others would like to be, if they had the opportunity.

When a new urban settlement is established, those who think of making their life there will look for the forms of relaxation which they know and understand. They will expect to find the non-communal enjoyment of the cinema and the dance hall, and the sectional activities of the social and sports clubs. If the settlement is to make a rapid start these facilities must be provided, but should they be separately established the new group will never form itself into a conscious—not a self-conscious—community. It will become another

unit of population like the dormitory areas around the large towns, its activities will be for the individual or the clique, and it will have no means of self-expression.

A Municipal Centre

In designing a new urban settlement it should be the aim of the planner to provide a municipal centre based on the old habits of the population. The first and most important building must be the cinema—not one which specializes in high-brow films, but one which would compete favourably with those of any big town; the time for education will come later. The next essential is a hall for dancing with a good band. This hall can be arranged so that with the cinema it provides facilities for theatrical performances and concerts. Adjoining the cinema and dance hall should be clubs. These should be so arranged that those attending the cinema and the dance hall are automatically drawn into them. Membership should be easy and attractive, and there should be provision for all interests; rooms for quiet games and reading, rooms for hobbies, rooms for meetings and lectures, and a gymnasium and swimming bath.

The outdoor games should also have their headquarters in these buildings, so that those attracted in the first place only by sports may find other opportunities for the enjoyment of leisure.

Such a club must have at least simple catering facilities so that members may obtain food if they wish to go straight from their work to join in some leisure occupation.

Most important of all, both evening and day classes for adolescents and adults, together with a library, should be in a building adjoining this municipal centre, students passing freely from one to the other so that learning becomes only one more leisure occupation, the class in gymnastics taking its proper place in the general educational scheme. At present attendance at an evening class only too often closes to the student the way to other social activities; it should be our object to make such study possible without the sacrifice of the pleasures available to those who turn their backs on learning. It should not be impossible for a boy to attend an evening class and enjoy a swim; in most towns the evening school and the swimming bath are far apart, and the swimming bath in any case will be shut when the class is over.

The juxtaposition and inter-relation of all these activities would

lead to an increase in the numbers interested in any particular leisure occupation. A man primarily interested in gymnastics, swimming or dancing, might become interested in amateur theatricals or in music.

Such a group of activities would not run under a voluntary organization, and a skilled social worker with a number of assistants would be required to manage it. The function of the management however, would be to provide opportunity and not to control, to give every possible help without dominating the centre.

It would also be necessary to provide opportunities in the form of rooms and equipment for clubs, which formed spontaneously. To restrict the use of a municipal centre only to those pursuits which were originated by the controlling interests would result in an unwarranted domination of the life of the town by the civic authority. It is the function of that authority to provide the means for enjoyment, not to dictate the way.

Co-ordination and Enthusiasm

Such a scheme may appear unduly ambitious, and involving too great an expenditure to be possible of achievement, but consideration will show that it contains little that is new other than the planning of the municipal activities as a whole. Many towns already have all the buildings that would be required; a technical school, a library, a swimming bath, a public gymnasium or classes in gymnastics in an existing school, a municipal restaurant, and a public hall. Private enterprise provides the cinema and the dance hall because they are profitable, and private generosity, supported by public funds, the youth clubs. But each is a thing apart, they are frequently run without co-ordination and often without the necessary enthusiasm and joy in life.

Finally, I want to make a plea for the municipal offices and those in particular concerned with health to form part of this central group of buildings. If the health of our people is to be steadily improved, it must be due to application of preventive medicine and this involves the contact between the medical services and the citizen who is not a sick man. Such a centre as I have suggested would give the opportunity for this contact, in the same way as it was largely achieved in the Peckham Health Centre.

The presence of the municipal offices would link up the general management of the town with the life of the people. At the present

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

time the government of a town appears to take all possible pains to avoid any suggestion of responsibility for more than sewers and other equally necessary but uninteresting services. This is, of course, only superficial, and we all know that much is done to brighten the lives of the townsman, but it remains not the less true that our people look to private enterprise for their amusement and enjoyment, and to the town council only for their convenience and comfort. Even the names of the committees seem to be designed for this purpose. Why, for example, the Parks and Cemeteries Committee, whose essential purpose is to provide open spaces, flowers, and playing fields?

If the municipal buildings formed an integral part of the central leisure time activities, many young men and women who at present have no urge to join in the government of the town would realize that on that government depends the happiness of the people, and feel it their duty to take part in the planning and development of communal life. It is certain that the government of a new urban settlement would benefit by the introduction of those who looked at life to give happiness and pleasure, rather than dignity and power, and that even the sewers and cemeteries would be better places under their control. We might indeed end by having a committee for Public Enjoyment ranking equal with those for Highways and Finance.

SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

DISCUSSION AT THE END OF SESSION III

ALDERMAN E. L. D. LAKE, J.P. (Mayor of Bury St. Edmunds), who was prevented by ill-health from attending to open the discussion, stated in a letter to the Conference that it looked as if villages in the future might well be considerably bigger than at present, and if that was the case it was essential that more amenities should be afforded. Admirable cultural work in this respect was being done by the Village Colleges in Cambridgeshire and he hoped that some members of the Conference would be able to pay a visit to one of these villages. He would have pleaded for greater security of tenure, the abolition of the tied cottage, better amenities, better shopping facilities, more playing fields, and the further development of the village pub as a centre of social life. Above all, he would have urged that education must go hand in hand with good planning, and that the miserable conditions under which many of the evacuees from large towns appeared to have lived must be changed at the earliest possible moment.

MR. H. ROLF GARDINER (Shaftesbury) said that a village with diversified industry had more social and cultural vitality. The village needed modern housing and other improvements, but he doubted if all those things, or even higher wages, were sufficient to hold people to the countryside. What was needed was a kind of excitement, the excitement which in the towns became that of people jostling one another, the lights and amusements. Somehow we had to restore that feeling of enjoyment in our fields and workshops. The people we had to think about were those between eighteen and twenty-five, and we should have to encourage an English equivalent of the Danish 'Folk Schools' which might be associated with the Young Farmers' Clubs. He was surprised no one had mentioned the work of the Women's Institutes: they were very valuable centres of social life. Rural Society did not want to be spoon fed. There was a great deal of rural

'slumming' by well-meaning societies in London. The regions should use the money available for them as they themselves thought fit. There was a natural restlessness in young people to get away from their villages. Facilities should be provided for travel. The things to be preserved were the spirit of initiative and the genius of a place.

MR. G. SALTER DAVIES (Watford) spoke of 'manual intelligence' of the man who could work and think but was often not good at talking.

MRS. PETER TENNANT hoped they would continue after the war to encourage village interests. In her own district they had discussions on growing food which were invaluable to those people who had never before had a garden or owned animals. It was no use having more and better schools unless they taught the children a great deal more about the agricultural aspect, about gardens and livestock and machinery, and the girls about cooking. These schools should also provide a hall for the village and a projector for films.

MR. F. STREETON STEED said he had a profound admiration for the Women's Institutes which had done an invaluable work for village life, and he would like to see similar organizations for the men. They did not want school desk education for the farming lads, but educational organizations, of the Young Farmers' Club type, extended in scope and function.

PROFESSOR ASHBY (University College of Wales) asked how it would be possible to get adequate village clubs without outside financial assistance. As for agricultural education for children under fourteen years of age, if the members believed in vocational training why did they not see that their own children got it. Why treat the agricultural people as being subservient and inferior?

DR SLATER (Dartington Hall) wanted to see village institutes for both sexes where the men and women could meet and evolve the communal life of the villages. He agreed that the introduction of other industries enriched the cultural life, but great care was necessary to ensure that these industries were related to Agriculture.

SESSION IV

Architecture and Amenities

CHAIRMAN: THE RT. HON. SIR MONTAGUE BARLOW, Bt. K.B.E.

ARCHITECTURE AND AMENITIES

STATEMENT

by PROFESSOR PATRICK ABERCROMBIE, F.R.I.B.A.
(Chairman, Council for the Preservation of Rural England)

Professor Abercrombie sets before us suggestions, assertions, and questions—chiefly concerning the administration of planning powers—with a view to the retention and promotion of beauty in town and country, without attempting to raise the fundamental issue of what constitutes good or bad design.

* * * * *

Professor Abercrombie's paper consisted of, in his own words, some dogmatic assertions accompanied by a few rhetorical questions on the best means of maintaining existing and of obtaining fresh beauty in town and country, during the necessary adjustments of our environment particularly occasioned by reconstruction and new developments after the war:

A high standard of Design should be inherent in all environmental works in town and country. The position of beauty, in civic and landscape design, is of equal importance in the trinity with health and economic convenience.

Landscape is as important as architectural design: the two interpenetrate, architecture being predominant in the town, landscapism in the country. The same technician does not necessarily practise both arts.

Design should enter into the conception at the very beginning; not at any later stage. Nor is there any aspect of our environment in which the quality of design can be ignored on the grounds of mere

utility: it is present in the laying down of the line of a new trunk road or railway, in a deciding on a policy of economic decentralization, in a proposal for afforestation, in the installation of a sewage disposal plant, or the reorganization of a farm.

The administration aspect is grouped under two headings:

(a) Positive Planning by the Public Authority (National, Regional, Local).

(b) Guidance and Control of Works of Private Initiative.

The obtaining of good design in positive planning and building by the public authority is a comparatively simple affair. It postulates that every authority, whether National, Regional, or Local, should have on its staff first-rate designers in the arts of architecture and/or landscape design (e.g., The Office of Works, the Ministry of Planning, The Forestry Commission, etc., Nationally; Planning Authorities, Regionally; Housing, Park, etc. Authorities, Locally).

Guidance or control of works by private enterprise: this is granted to be essential for health and convenience: is it necessary or possible for beauty? Was there any such control in fifth-century Greece, or thirteenth- or eighteenth-century England? Are there epochs of universal good and of general bad taste?

Is the usual argument against control valid? i.e. the danger of bureaucracy stifling original masterpieces and fostering a dead level of mediocrity. Must there be complete licence lest police arrest one genius mistaken for a criminal?

The answer is that artistically we are in the same state as socially, requiring police, international and local, for keeping order.

If control is applied, it must be universal with no exceptions, no one above the law: the works of the crown, of statutory undertakers, of eminent architects: farm buildings, bridges, roads, etc. Control of work by public authorities will necessarily differ in its machinery from that by private enterprise.

Control is of no real value without guidance. The policy of mere rejection without comment will take too long to produce results. Prevention of outrage by flat refusal is necessary, but not enough.

The professional objection to guidance—that it discourages the employment of good designers for private works as they will be improved by public assistance—is specious but not valid. The Royal Fine Art Commission has a store of experience as to the value of positive guidance.

Control should only be exercisable by law if adequate artistic advice is taken. The universal practice of this country puts the final decision in the hands of the plain man (whether chosen at random, e.g. jury, or elected by his fellows, e.g. local authority) but he must act upon competent advice.

(a) If an appeal against refusal is allowed, there should equally be an appeal against consents, exercisable in the latter case by certain recognized societies. (b) In certain special areas and for certain special buildings no consent should be valid until the public has had a right of objecting.

Control of design will be exercisable according to variable degrees of severity according to situation: e.g. in National Park areas where human additions are to be subservient to dominant natural features; or at the centre of the city where individual assertion must not interfere with communal effect: in both cases the utmost severity is required.

Is it necessary to provide localized hells, fly-papers or dust-bins where unregeneratable human ugliness may be massed out of sight. This is a pessimistic doctrine, not necessarily Manichæan, which is already practised for certain human functions. If air travel becomes more frequent such localized hells would be difficult to render invisible.

For town purposes, perhaps, three degrees of stringency in architectural control may be required:

- (a) Absolute—imposition of design.
- (b) Relative—adherence to general treatment.
- (c) Freedom to submit individual designs.

(a) This is necessary at certain focal points (e.g. Civic Centre) or for certain special streets. An architect, or group of architects, make a single design for the whole. This is the method adopted for the Royal Crescent at Bath, the Place Vendôme, and Rue de Rivoli, Paris.

(b) A sketch of general treatment is prepared by or for the Planning Authority and reasonable variation within this framework is allowed: height and material being probably the most constant factor. This method is being adopted with success on Government property at Haifa.

(c) In outer areas or where looser coherence is sufficient, individual architects may be left to submit their designs separately which may be harmonized or adjusted where necessary.

ARCHITECTURE AND AMENITIES

A good example of where (b) was necessary and where (c) it has proved insufficient is to be seen on the south side of Hyde Park, where three eminent architects have designed buildings which however good in themselves have failed to produce a good effect owing to there being no prescribed general treatment of height, design or material. The older buildings along this front were superior in these respects.

Machinery for control may be either:

- (a) Dictatorial.
- (b) Democratic.

(a) Dictatorial would be by means of a permanent official. It is the easiest to apply, but there is a danger (i) of the official pushing, instinctively perhaps, his individual taste, (ii) of the official opinion becoming ossified. It is often found that architects who recommend the dictatorial method, do so with the implication that they themselves or their stylistic friends shall be the dictators.

(b) Democratic machinery would be by means of a jury or panel of architects, elected by themselves and changed from time to time.

The panel system which has been invented by the C.P.R.E. and R.I.B.A., for rural areas, was intended to include a builder on each architectural panel. The work was unremunerated and the advice offered to the Planning Authority. In certain cases the panel delegated a single member from time to time who collaborated with the official planning officer. The system has worked well, but not extensively.

The present law requires a Tribunal of Appeal from the decision of a Planning Authority (whether acting on the advice of a panel, of their official architect planner, or on their own unaided initiative) to refuse consent on the external appearance of a building design submitted.

A special tribunal, set up for the purpose, consisting of an architect, a surveyor, and a J.P. is preferable to the alternatives permitted i.e. a Court of Summary Jurisdiction or the Minister of Health.

Such a tribunal must be appointed for each scheme: if the county is to be subdivided into regions, one tribunal would suffice for each region.

The Royal Fine Art Commission should be made a more intimate part of the system of control of design, by being required:

(a) To give an opinion upon all public buildings, before a loan is granted.

(b) To act as a court of final appeal from the decision of a tribunal: some means would have to be found to prevent every case being referred to the Commission; perhaps if the requirements of the Planning Authority, endorsed by the tribunal, materially increased the cost (the experience of the R.F.A.C. is that improvement of design almost invariably reduces the cost of building).

(c) To act as the court of appeal under 13a.

(d) The nomination or approval of tribunals and panels.

These administrative suggestions, assertions, and questions do not attempt to raise the fundamental issue of what is good and bad design. But the following subsidiary or tentative assertion may be made:

(a) An improvement in the general level of architecture and landscape art depends ultimately upon a general improvement of public taste: the interaction between the supply by the speculative builder and the demand by the public is close.

(b) No amount of control alone can produce an inspired work of art.

(c) Control can present manifest outrage.

(d) Architecture, unlike the other arts, must be practised whether there is direct inspiration or not. A high level of competence is all that can be expected during a period of low public and not very elevated architectural taste.

(e) Civic design is not achieved even if individual buildings are good and there is the superadded requirement of general effect. This need not mean uniformity (see *Country Life* for 29 May for an illustration, Burford High Street, of this).

(f) Appropriate design in the country is more difficult than in the town: in the latter it is a predominantly human environment, in the former man is in competition with nature. In an old town modern man finds himself in competition with human history.

(g) It is an error of over-simplification to say that buildings in the country should harmonize with their surroundings or only be built of local materials. Some of the finest effects are obtained by contrast, e.g. the spire of a village church, and the whitewashed cottage on the fell-side. Neither civic nor landscape design can be reduced to the application of a few formulæ or by-laws.

(h) In a period of architectural transition, like the present, the difficulties of obtaining agreement on matters of design are extreme. Do we see any signs of the evolution of one of those grand periods of

artistic coherence, as described by Dante as 'Lo bello Stile'? (Dante took Virgil for his master but there is no stylistic resemblance between hexameters and terza-rima.)

Not only does the public require to be educated, but the planner. Are we to expect and require the emergence of a new profession? Can a single individual resume in his person the technical qualifications of:

- (a) An architect.
- (b) An engineer.
- (c) A surveyor;

and be inspired by the combined knowledge of:

- (d) The geographer.
- (e) The sociologist.
- (f) The industrialist.
- (g) The agriculturalist.
- (h) The lawyer.
- (i) The financier.

Or is it necessary that positive planning must be achieved by group working—an orchestra under a conductor?

And if a conductor, must he be an architect, in order that the quality of inspired design must interpenetrate the whole?

It must never be forgotten that planning is merely a means to the end of three dimensional emergence in building, engineering, planting and agrimensorial works: on the results of these as affecting human pleasure no less than health and economy, will its success or failure be judged. Therefore, however much building and constructive works are necessary, arts which must be practised as regularly as Anthony Trollope produced his novels, we must not be content with any standard of low-grade mediocrity. What the French call *pompier*—there is quite a lot of *pompier* Georgian—and pumps water that can be drawn at will by the bucket full is not good enough: wine for the city, cider or sparkling spring water for the country and I suppose beer for the suburbs: crude sewage should not be tolerated. But Nature is kind and even sewage can be purified by judicious treatment.

ARCHITECTURE AND AMENITIES

DISCUSSION AT THE END OF SESSION IV

MR. W. A. EDEN (Liverpool University) suggested that an answer to the question, 'Is it possible for the taste of a whole period to be at fault?' was that perhaps it could be. He wondered if the fact that we could see good things in the Victorian period was because we ourselves were worse! It was really a problem of tradition, and the tradition of architecture had been deteriorating for the last three hundred years, in the last hundred years rapidly and in the last twenty years catastrophically. We must think very carefully about whatever steps we took to control buildings, and while he would not suggest that nothing should be done, we must be careful that the blind did not lead the blind. The knowledge of architecture could be spread by example. Notice was always taken of the way in which prominent people lived, the sort of houses they had and the places they went to for their holidays. One particularly important way was in the schools the children had to attend. If we were to have good schools, we must have good architects, and if we were to have good architects, we must not disdain to follow good examples. Perhaps we should do as Dante did, and by a careful study of the classics, learn once more the meaning of 'lo bello stile' in architecture.

MAJOR C. W. C. NEEDHAM (York) considered that the control of the appearance of new buildings was just as important as the control of sanitation and structural soundness, in the public interest.

Until the industrial revolution there had been a gradually built up tradition of design and craftsmanship, but mechanization had killed craftsmanship and resulted in an almost entire lack of appreciation of good building design on the part of the general public. Until a better sense of what is fitting is gained generally, the public should be protected against ugly buildings, and the Advisory Panel system, if properly applied, has been proved a satisfactory method of exercising the needed control.

LT. P. J. MARSHALL (Coventry) said there would be an entirely

different world after the war, but there was a tendency to say that we would come back to 1939 and begin again where we left off. The planning of our smashed cities was a thing that ought to be going on to-day, and he would question the ability of some of the people planning now for what would be critically important to-morrow.

MR. AMBROSE APPELBE, M.A., LL.B., wanted to know the exact areas where 'licensed hells' were to be permitted. They would be interesting experiments. They had one at Peacehaven and another here in Cambridge. They were not always bad. We must be careful that the planning did not become a purely academic thing, especially as the young people seemed to be out of it at present and they would have to live in what we plan.

MR. D. E. E. GIBSON, M.A., A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I (City Architect, Coventry) believed that we were rapidly approaching a period in architecture as significant as was produced in the Gothic Age. The effect of the present war on the young people of to-day, with the strong feeling engendered for international collaboration, security, and equality of opportunity would be crystallized in post-war architecture—an invariable expression of the culture of the period. It is clear that, to fight the war well we must have an ideal to aim for and the people should be told now of the great advances in living conditions and amenities made possible by modern building technique. In his opinion they should be told not only of the possibilities but that these things would be placed at the head of the Government's post-war programme and that plans were even now being prepared for an immediate start when the war was won.

MR. GEORGE CADBURY said that in one of the clauses of Bournville buildings must satisfy the architects whom they consulted. They had adopted the rule that all buildings must be designed by the panel of architects, and they had a unity of design which was rather remarkable and very satisfying. It was found impossible to fit in designs prepared by outside architects. There was in Birmingham an advisory body, the Civic Society, which advised the various corporation departments on their designs for buildings, and which worked quite effectively. He suggested that special areas should be set aside in which a panel of architects would be responsible for working out a complete architectural scheme.

MR. T. LAWRENCE DALE, F.R.I.B.A. (Oxford) said that what was good architecture was only known to good architects and that all

DISCUSSION

good architecture was harmonious. Education to create both the demand and supply of good architecture was at the root of the problem and, in this condition, the less control they had the better. The speculative builder was the most difficult person to control. He suggested that a step in the right direction would be to enact that all plans for submission to local authorities should be prepared by architects.

MR. H. M. CLEMINSON said that the Town and Country Planning Association and the Council for the Preservation of Rural England had approached the Minister of Education, urging that the Ministry should feel that the primary responsibility for good architecture rested with them in that not only do architects, builders, and decorators pass through the schools but the millions who are their customers and who, sooner or later, will build, buy or rent a house; and the interest of all children should be aroused, beginning in the infants' class when modelling and drawing are being taught.

MR. E. H. FORD M.INST.C.E. (Coventry) warned the meeting to be very careful of the structural engineer who should be the servant and not the master of the architect. He looked forward to a Faculty of Planning, but at present a primary qualification for a planner should be that he should have training in one of the allied professions.

MR. ALAN COLLINGRIDGE said that mass observation had done some very interesting work lately. They should realize how very keen and widespread was the interest in planning: there was a new enthusiasm and formed opinion. The profession could do an enormous amount of work by undertaking more research.

MISS ESTHER HAMILTON agreed that the interest was there, but good taste was not prevalent because there was as yet no general acceptance of the principles of design. The public had not thought out the functions of buildings and materials. Even the best designed town was of little value unless the people were aware of it, and until this happened, by-laws and building restrictions would, to a great extent, remain a dead letter. We should start by educating the children in order to revolutionize people's way of thinking about design.

MR. F. L. HALLIDAY (Manchester) did not think that satisfactory creative design would ever be achieved through restrictive control. Design was not a matter of elevation alone; the panel system as generally operated was an attempt to make unsatisfactory designs into good ones, and meant doing work twice, once by the developer

and again by the panel. Good architecture is not usually obtained by this means. MR. GEOFFREY KNOWLES, LL.B. (Deputy Town Clerk, Bristol), gave a warning against placing too much reliance on education. Surely some real control was necessary before they could rely on the moral effect of education.

MR. MAX LOCK (Hull School of Architecture) said the key to the future of our buildings lay in architectural education. People demanded the highest standard in medical attention, but they did not take care over their environment. In outlook the students of to-day were realists. They saw things of beauty produced by machines—aeroplanes, ships, and machinery. They looked at our buildings and were a little puzzled when they saw buildings being shaped by the architect into Georgian styles or by the speculative builder into Tudor imitations. The students were seeking to bring the same sort of honesty of material that they found to hand as did their forebears three to six hundred years ago. They were not anxious just to accept what they were taught, but wanted to break down restrictions and incorporate the good principles of past building styles into present work. They were bewildered that they were supposed to spend a great deal of their lives designing things and were never brought into touch with the factory where things were made. What was wanted was an interjection of technics into architecture. Reconstruction could not be undertaken by one man, but only by co-operative planning.

PROFESSOR ABERCROMBIE said that architecture differed from the other arts and while it was not necessary to have a lot of paintings and sculpture, it was necessary to have a lot of buildings. They had to recreate the cities, and unless they had some machinery for doing so they would get outrages. The suggestion of Mr. George Cadbury for areas to be developed by architects could be described as localized paradises. It was essential to do something now: the main lines of a plan which included the artistic treatment could be put in hand at once, but that plan must remain flexible. Towns would be rebuilt over a period of years, and they must have the services of the young men. Hand in hand with the education of the children they must have the education of the people to know what was good. Then they would have no need for control. Quality of design should be inherent in everything we did.

SESSION V

Rural Land-Ownership and Planning

(Alternative methods by which areas of land may be reserved for agriculture or special development with fair play to owners and the public. Does Planning Control necessitate public acquisition of the freehold or of development rights?)

CHAIRMAN: MAJOR W. HARDING THOMPSON, F.R.I.B.A., P.P.T.P.I.

RURAL LAND-OWNERSHIP AND PLANNING

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Major Harding Thompson, introducing the session, said that the subject before them formed the crux of planning for the future. During and after the war the use of land would be a major question. He had nearly said a major *political* question, but he sincerely hoped that their discussions would not become political. It would be most unfortunate if they did. They were concerned with planning in the interests of the people as a whole, with due regard for the rights of owners. They were fortunate in having Dr. Orwin, who was well known for his independent point of view as to the future of Agriculture. Next they had Lord Brocket, who would, he took it, adopt a different point of view. He was the owner of 15,000 acres in England and 50,000 in Scotland. He had had practical experience in the management of the land, and was Chairman of the Land Union.

RURAL LAND-OWNERSHIP AND PLANNING

STATEMENT I

by C. S. ORWIN, M.A., D.LITT.

(Director of Research in Agricultural Economics, Oxford)

Dr. Orwin points out that the conception of private ownership is firmly rooted. The right of the individual to own land and control its use has never been effectively challenged; although the question of State ownership has often been discussed, it has been kept on a debating society basis, as an ethical problem. Now, however, it has become a fundamental issue owing to the need for reconstruction of our social and industrial life on an immense scale, and the growing realization of the disabilities under which development has proceeded in the past.

He comes to the conclusion that it seems impossible to be fair to the community so long as private property in land persists. Acquisition of the freehold of the land by the State at valuations based upon its present use, not upon its prospective value, must be accepted as a pre-requisite of planning control.

* * * * *

WE have now to consider what is probably the most contentious subject in this Conference, namely, how to reconcile the need for the control of planning and the rights of the public to access to land, with justice to the rights of the private owner. Put plainly, is it possible to perpetuate the recognition of private rights in land in the light of past experience and in the face of an ever growing demand for land for public purposes, whether for the housing of the people, for the accommodation of industry, for the development of agriculture, or for the preservation of public health and social amenities?

Conception of Private Ownership Firmly Rooted

The conception of private ownership in the practical if not in the abstract legal sense, is firmly rooted. Many financial corporations

exist to assist people to buy the houses they occupy. When rural landowners were selling out and taking their profits during the land boom in the period of inflation which followed the last war, there was no suggestion that the nation should acquire their interests. On the contrary, the State itself was the sponsor of a corporation to help farmers to buy their farms. Even though we are constantly assured by those who are troubled by the national indifference to Agriculture in the past hundred years that 'the land is the nation's greatest asset', nothing is more remote from their minds than the idea that the nation should possess it.

The experience of landowning in this country, since the development of transport and foreign trade extended the sources from which our food supplies are drawn to include all parts of the world, is by no means uniform. On the one hand are those who, by their chance monopoly of land which public or private corporations needed, have been able to dictate the terms upon which such bodies could acquire it, and thereby have greatly enhanced their own material wealth. On the other hand are those whose property has continued to serve only its original purpose of food production, and they have found themselves possessed of an asset which has tended to diminish in value during the past two generations, as the development of farming in various parts of the globe and of the means of food preservation and transport have withdrawn the natural protection which home agriculture enjoyed for so long. Some landowners have got richer during the past hundred years, along with the general prosperity of the nation, and some have got poorer. But over all land, in this small and densely populated island, however remote some of it may be, seemingly, from development for purposes other than farming, there floats a speculative value, and it is the hope of every owner that it may materialize some day.

No Effective Challenge to Individual Ownership

The right of the individual to own land and to control the use of it, has never been effectively challenged, and although the question of State ownership has often been discussed it has been more on the debating society basis, than as a live issue. It has been approached as an ethical problem, on the grounds that 'God gave the land to the people'; as a political problem, the right of the State to control the actions of the individual; as a social problem, the 'haves' and the

'have-nots'; and as an economic problem, the inefficiency of private ownership and its hampering influence on the orderly development of national life. But at no time has the issue been brought before Parliament. The Labour Party has never tabled a Bill to nationalize the land, nor have the Conservative Party, following the usual way in which social reforms are brought about in our country, concluded at any time that the moment had come when public opinion required that this question should be faced. Recently, public opinion seems to have been developing rapidly. The effects of the Small Holdings and Allotments Act, 1907, for example, has been to make several of the County Councils the largest landowners in their counties, and no one, whatever they may think of the economics of small holdings, has protested against this form of nationalization. Even larger landowners are the Forestry Commission, and here again, public protests have been directed only against the aesthetics of afforestation, not against the socialization of land-ownership which its operations involve.

State Control now a Fundamental Issue

The County Councils and the Forestry Commission, together with the Crown, the Church, educational and charitable trusts of one kind or another, are all public landowners on a very large scale, who even before this war occupied collectively an area as large as the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex and Kent. With the enormous acquisitions of the Air Ministry and War Office in the last three years, the area under public ownership of one kind or another has vastly increased. Experience in the acquisition of land for these purposes and very much more, even, in the purchase of smaller but more costly areas by municipalities and other public authorities to meet the various needs of the community, has shown that it is not sufficient to have compulsory powers to acquire land. The merest hint of public need causes the floating value to roll up like a tidal wave inundating every piece of land which the public may want. To-day, when planning for the reconstruction of our social and industrial life on an immense scale has been forced upon us, and everyone is conscious of the disabilities under which development has proceeded in the past, the question of State control of the land has ceased to be a subject for academic discussion and has become the fundamental issue.

Legislation to Mitigate Difficulties Created by Private Ownership

It is a remarkable fact that practically all the legislation affecting land during the past hundred years has been directed towards mitigating the difficulties created by private ownership. It began with the need to free the landowner himself from the trammels of the laws of settlement and entail. A hundred years ago, a period of great activity in agricultural improvement was beginning, involving considerable capital outlay on the equipment of the land. But tenants for life were generally not allowed to charge their estates in order to raise money for these improvements, and they were reluctant, not unnaturally, to cripple themselves by paying from their own resources for improvements the benefits of which would not be returned to them fully in their own lifetime. During the great agricultural prosperity of the mid-Victorian era, therefore, there was considerable legislation to free the landlords' hands.

With the passing of this prosperity, legislation continued on a generous scale, but now it was necessitated by the tenants' disabilities, following the decline of the landlords' interest in rural development. From 1883 onwards, to 1923, a series of Agricultural Holdings' Acts were passed, each one designed to remove some of the handicaps on good farming which were inevitable under the landlord and tenant system if the landlord had lost interest or could not play his part.

Acts have had to be passed to give the improving tenant compensation for the value of his improvements unexhausted at the end of his tenancy, so that it could be said no longer of the twenty-one year agricultural lease that it gave a tenant seven years in which to work up the fertility of his holding, seven years in which to farm high, and seven years in which to drain out the fertility he had put into it. There have been Acts to free the tenant from obsolete covenants which handicapped progressive farming; to give him the right to kill game which damaged his crops or to compensate him instead; to give him security of tenure so long as he farmed well and paid his rent. There was even an Act to supersede landowners who failed to maintain their estates, so that food production suffered. Unfortunately it was repealed, for reasons quite unconnected with the principle involved, before it had been applied, and recent legislation has been definitely reactionary, for Acts have been passed to bribe landlords to reconstruct defective cottages and to build new ones. To-day, in the interests of food production, unknown sums of public money are

being lavished on grants to private landowners and loans to them without interest, to enable them to repair some of the past neglect of good estate management.

Legislation not Restricted to Needs of Agriculture

Nor has legislation been restricted to the needs of agriculture. Parliament has had to intervene to enable railway companies, local authorities and other public bodies to acquire land for public services, and Town Planning Acts and Ribbon Development Acts have been passed, in attempts to control the unconscionable exploitation of building sites and the destruction of amenities.

What success has attended all this effort? The agricultural landowner has been divested of the control of the land, while being still responsible for its proper maintenance for food production. Local authorities and public corporations can acquire the land they need, but at values created solely by that need. Control of town planning and ribbon development has come too late to save many places from the evils of exploitation for private gain.

Nor is this the whole story. State action has been supplemented by voluntary action, representing a further great expenditure of effort and money, necessitated by the difficulties which private ownership of land creates. Thus we have the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings and the National Trust for Places of Historic Interest or Natural Beauty. There is the Council for the Preservation of Rural England, the Oxford and Cambridge Preservation Trusts, the Friends of the Lake District, and so on. Each of these organizations originates in the need of the community to protect itself from the loss or damage consequent on the indifference or the financial necessities of the private owner of land. And every few weeks before the outbreak of war, appeals to private charity were issued through the Press to save some beauty spot or natural feature from some form of exploitation contrary to the public interest.

I have analysed those which appeared in *The Times* for a period of eighteen months. There were seventy-eight of them in all, exactly one a week, sixty-five being appeals to secure the preservation of open spaces, seven to prevent the spoliation of amenities, five for the purchase and upkeep of places of historic interest and one to acquire land for national purposes.

Private Advantage versus Public Utility

The problem as stated in the Conference programme is—how can the right (and the use of this term seems rather to beg the question), of the private owner to unearned increment be reconciled with the right of the public to determine the use to which the land shall be put in the general interest? If the public decides that an acre of bare land in the heart of a city, which has cost the owner a few hundred pounds as his share of road making, sewerage and so forth, along its frontages, is to remain as an open space in the interests of public health, is the owner entitled to compensation because he could have sold it for £5,000 as a building site? Alternatively, is he entitled to make a charge of £5,000 as a return for his expenditure of a few hundreds, if the area has been planned for building development in the public interest? The issue is a simple one. Does the chance possession of land, or its deliberate acquisition in the hope of capital profits, entitle the owner to exploit the needs of the community for fresh air, for housing, for transport, for recreation, or for any other public purpose, for his own financial advantage?

As the law stands to-day, the answer is emphatically, 'yes'. All over the country men have been making money out of the necessities of their neighbours and town-planners themselves have been restricted in their efforts by the knowledge that any tendency towards spaciousness in their work is going to increase the heavy financial burden which the provision of better conditions of life will place upon the community. From time to time, attempts have been made to secure some of the profits of this exploitation for the community which creates them, as when Mr. Lloyd George tackled the problem, unsuccessfully, as it proved, in 1910. More recently, we have seen the principle of Betterment embodied in legislation. Compensation is payable by public authorities using compulsory powers to acquire land, to landowners who may suffer loss of value by their action, and conversely, payment may be required by public authorities from those landowners whose property is enhanced in value also through their action. However, this legislation has not been effective, for we have it on the authority of Mr. F. J. Osborn, the Hon. Secretary of this Association, that whereas no difficulty has been experienced in making payments for loss of value, it has proved almost impossible to enforce payments for betterment.

To-day, the subject is again in the forefront chiefly with the pur-

pose, apparently, not of rejecting once and for all the claim of the private owner to profit by the necessities of the community, but of ascertaining, by some arbitrary valuation, the present value of the prospective development rights, and buying them up, all over the country. The landowner would receive a lump sum down, and thereafter he could traffic in his land only on the basis of its agricultural value. Payments by the community over and above this value would accrue to the State as compensation for what it had already paid out in anticipation of the transaction. The estimation of development values on most of the land of the country would be made, perforce, on the basis of hit or miss. Who could have foretold, five years ago, the demand for agricultural land for the Royal Air Force? Who can foretell where the public demand will fall in five years' time?

Surely all that can be said for this proposal is that it would simplify the conveyance of land for public purposes in future, and that it would prevent any further appreciation of land values. Otherwise it is no more than a tacit acknowledgement of the justice of the unrestricted operation of the law of supply and demand, and of the right of the individual to corner the land market if he can.

Multiplicity of Owners

However, the question of private advantage *versus* public utility is not the only difficulty in planning the use of the land. There is the added difficulty of the multiplicity of owners so often involved in an improvement scheme which makes it almost impossible to do more than to secure the *minimum* which planning should achieve. And so, as we pass through Greater London, for example, we see how bungalow estates alternate with estates of sham half-timbered houses or of stucco or cement, or of straight brickwork, good, bad or indifferent, without any control of design or aesthetics; and how municipal gardens and recreation grounds are substituted for the Epping Forests and the Richmond Parks which alone could meet the need for an escape from bricks and pavements.

Legislation, past, present and prospective seems to stand condemned in that it fails entirely to reconcile the continuance of private rights in land with the exercise of the rights of the community of access to land.

Whatever way the problem is regarded, it seems impossible to be

C. S. ORWIN, M.A., D.LITT.

fair to the community so long as private property in land persists. Acquisition of the freehold of the land by the State at valuations based upon its present use, not upon its prospective value, must be accepted as a pre-requisite of planning control.

RURAL LAND-OWNERSHIP AND PLANNING

STATEMENT II

By LORD BROCKET
(Chairman of the Land Union)

Lord Brocket champions the cause of private land-ownership which, granted the eradication of inefficiency, in his opinion best serves the national interest. He urges that the question of land-ownership be kept away from party politics and approached with strict impartiality, and that agricultural policy be placed upon a long term non-party basis.

He considers that the landowner on the spot does his job better than Government officials and says: 'The Englishman's home is his castle, whether it be in fact a castle or a cottage, and upon this sturdy and thrifty outlook on life and upon the spirit of service has the greatness of our nation been built. Long may it continue!'

* * * * *

Lord Brocket said that the question of land-ownership should be kept out of party politics, but he could not feel that Dr. Orwin's point of view was non-political. His speech was inherently bound up with politics. Dr. Orwin talked about land-owners looking after their own material wealth, that 'there floats a speculative value, and it is the hope of every owner that it may materialize some day'. This was a very popular theme amongst people who did not own any land; but why should it not apply to those who own stocks and shares? He was sincerely sorry that such phrases as 'exploitation of the community' and 'trafficking in land' had come into the debate. There might be black sheep amongst landowners, but these were also found in other walks of life. Lord Brocket yielded to no one in his contention that, where the private landowner lived on the spot, farmed some of his own land, knew about repairs, etc., he was the best person to support his tenants, carry out the necessary repairs and administer his estate; in fact he was of great benefit to the countryside.

He continued: Now I will come to the more practical side. Last July I moved a resolution in the House of Lords as follows: 'That an agreed long-term policy for Agriculture is essential in the interest of the Nation.' This resolution was supported by all parties, passed unanimously by the House and accepted by the Government.

In my speech I put forward five points for the basis of a long-term agricultural policy based on the keyword 'Security';

1. Security for the land itself by the maintenance of fertility.
2. Security of good wages and improved amenities for the agricultural worker.
3. Security in guaranteed reasonably profitable prices for the farmer.
4. Security of tenure for the efficient landowner.
5. Security for the provision of adequate finance.

Regarding the fourth point, I do not attempt to justify in any way an *inefficient landowner* any more than an inefficient farmer, as the times are too serious for inefficiency in any walk of life. If rural land-ownership is taken out of party politics, both sides must give up something. I do not consider that it would be possible for the Conservatives to give up their antipathy to land nationalization, nor their antipathy to the view that private enterprise is necessarily wrong, and I do not consider that the Socialist side would be right in agreeing to the absolute uncontrolled use of land.

We have heard it said in this Conference that the ownership of land does not matter so much as control of its use. I agree. With regard to the present War Executive Committees which Mr. Easterbrook preferred to be selected rather than elected, I agree again. They are local agents of the Ministry of Agriculture. Now, about the statement that 'grants made always find their way into the pockets of the land-owners'. If a grant is made for draining a farm, it goes to the tenant. I have told my tenants that if they put forward a scheme of drainage and they get a grant of 50 per cent of the cost from the Ministry of Agriculture, I will pay half of their share, and I have never increased any rents because of an improvement of this kind. If I relet a farm, and someone else is willing to pay a slightly higher rent, well even then there is income tax and surtax; so that it is not true that the grant goes into the pocket of the landowner.

The Good Landowner an Asset to the Country

If rural landowners are good, they are an asset to the nation and fulfil a role in the countryside which is so personal that no Government Department can take their place, and it would be absolutely wrong to change at one fell swoop a system of land tenure which has gradually been developed through many centuries.

Much of the loveliness of the British Isles is due to the landowners of past centuries—the cultivation of the land, the woodlands, the parks, the country houses and the villages, and in fact that whole heritage of man-made beauty so admired by people of all centuries. ‘England is a garden,’ tended by the love and care of generations of landowners, farmers and householders, who exercised this care and spent money on their estates and farms and houses, partly perhaps because they were their own and they hoped that these beautiful properties, farms and houses, might remain in the possession of their children and grandchildren. Even in these days I am not ashamed to admit that pride of ownership is a stimulus to efficiency. The hereditary interest of landowners not only in the properties themselves but in agriculture and in the people on their estates, and in the local affairs of the parish, rural district or county gave to England a spirit of service which has been most beneficial for hundreds of years, and has contributed also to the success of the Army, Navy, Church, and State. Such a spirit of service should be encouraged, and will be more than ever necessary in the years to come.

In a recent book, *The Hope of a New World*, Dr. Temple, the new Archbishop of Canterbury, sums up the advantage of private rural land-ownership as follows: In that book, on page fifty-three, he says:

It must, however, be recognized, that the rural landlord discharges many social functions, and ownership of agricultural land, subject to consideration of the public welfare, should not be subject to the same restrictions as ownership of industrial stocks and shares; moreover, as family tradition is in this field a valuable social asset, I should personally urge the total exemption of all agricultural land from Death Duties.

Further on, at page fifty-seven, he discusses bureaucracy, and he says:

But the bane of our democracy is the red-tape in the clerical de-

partments of national and municipal offices. To let this loose upon rural England would lead to calamity.

The present system combines all the disadvantages. We leave the private landlord in possession and make it impossible for him properly to discharge the social responsibilities of his station.

I can do no better than quote such an eminent authority, and I fully endorse his opinions. I do not intend to enter into a financial discussion on Death Duties on agricultural land save to say that in an agreed long-term policy I consider that for all the revenue which they bring in (only two millions a year) it would be far better for Agriculture and the countryside that they should be remitted. And it would be far cheaper for the State, to encourage private land-owners in this way to continue and to spend their own money than for the State to do all the repairs and improvements at the taxpayers' expense.

In this agreed long-term policy which would remove agriculture and rural land-ownership from party politics, I would suggest that in consideration of Death Duties being remitted from agricultural land, such agricultural control as is now exercised by the Ministry of Agriculture through the County War Agricultural Committees should continue in peace-time, and that a permanent Land Commission with local branches should be formed to deal with land where neither the owner nor the tenant were capable financially or otherwise of dealing with it themselves.

The question as to whether a landowner (and this of course includes the farmer owner and occupier) was or was not capable of dealing efficiently with his land would have to be referred for settlement to an independent tribunal of impartial persons.

The Forestry Commission now owns or rents a large acreage of land, and no friction is caused between it and private landowners on this account. Both can exist perfectly well together, as I know from my own experience having 1,200 acres let on long lease to the Commission. I would split the Forestry Commission into two parts—one to administer its own forests and one to help with private forestry, and I would make it part of the newly constructed Land Commission.

In this way the best landowners would be preserved, and the land of the worst would be administered by the Land Commission which

could recondition it and sell it to a satisfactory owner at the improved value, as is provided for under the powers of the Agriculture (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1941.

Dr. Orwin has mentioned the difficulty of planning owing to 'Multiplicity of owners'. In my experience this should present no difficulty in either agricultural schemes such as drainage nor in planning schemes, if the planning authority has sufficient power. In my own case, in Herefordshire, a drainage scheme is at present being carried out on land belonging to twenty or more different owners, including myself; we have each to pay our share and are co-operating successfully for the common good. I could also cite many instances where perfectly satisfactory planning schemes have been agreed to by landowners large and small, even though Dr. Orwin has stated that 'it is the hope of every owner' that 'the floating speculative value will materialize some day'. There are, I am glad to say, many landowners who take public spirited views regarding the function and development of their estates.

State Acquisition Not In Public Interest

I now come to the subject of nationalization advocated by Dr. Orwin. Not only am I definitely of opinion that planning control does *not* 'necessitate public acquisition of the freehold', but I sincerely believe that this acquisition by the State would not be in the National interest. I say this emphatically, apart entirely from the fact that I am a landowner myself.

Land nationalization is not an end in itself. It will neither make for a prosperous agriculture if the prices of the farmers' produce are not enough, nor will it bring about a perfectly planned Britain if the planners themselves are at fault.

You will remember that earlier in my remarks I dealt with the personal duties which could be performed by rural landowners and I now wish to justify their retention from a financial point of view.

A well conducted agricultural estate produces a very small money return on its capital value, and in many instances owners are contented with their small returns because of family associations, the pride of ownership or the amenities of agriculture, sport and a country life. Many owners are content with a return of 1 per cent or 2 per cent on their capital, therefore how could it pay the State to borrow at 3 per cent or 3½ per cent and acquire land which gave

a lower return? If the landowners are willing to continue, why not allow them to do so in the interests of the nation?

As Chairman of the Land Union, I have confidentially seen figures of many estates and you may be surprised to learn that expenditure such as 16 per cent on repairs or the 16 per cent on improvements claimed to have been spent by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners on their estates, are lower than nearly all of the figures for repairs which have been shown to me, which in various instances are as high as 60 per cent or 70 per cent of the gross rents and in one instance were for a period of years over 100 per cent.

Much agricultural development and reclamation of lands have been undertaken by such landowners as Coke of Norfolk and many others, and afforestation has been carried out by successive generations of landowners who have taken a personal interest in their plantations. The breeds of cattle, horses, and sheep, etc., in England have largely been developed and supported by our farmers and landowners, who have made our country the pedigree livestock centre of the world.

I see no difficulty whatever in an extension of the Town and Country Planning Act, in such a way that control of buildings and elevations should be readily enforceable. This matter should be exercised on a broadminded, national and regional basis; in cases of hardship compensation should be paid out of a national fund, into which sums for betterment would be paid. It will be admitted that in the past the lack of provision of a suitable national fund of this kind has often prevented the proper carrying out of such Acts as the Ribbon Development and Town Planning Acts.

Frankly I do not like the suggestion of the acquisition of Development Rights by the State, as dual control would then exist over any and every development; having had too much experience of controls, licences, forms, and all other kinds of bureaucratic administration during this war, I do not relish the prospect of the State owning the development rights in land. I have already given lengthy evidence of this before the Uthwatt Committee. The Country Planning Acts should be amended and extended so that undesirable development and building should be prevented from taking place. Under a Central Planning Department working in conjunction with regional and local authorities, which have in most instances good local knowledge of the required conditions, a reasonable and satisfactory

scheme for the orderly planning of the country should be carried out. A broad view should be taken and large areas should be scheduled for agriculture, just as the placing of industries in the appropriate parts of the country should be considered and arranged.

It is plainly not possible to limit land nationalization to agricultural land outside the boundaries of urban districts, as suggested by Sir Daniel Hall. The boundaries of the nationalized land might even run through the middle of fields or gardens. All town property including garden cities would have to be nationalized as well—a stupendous and vastly expensive task.

It is interesting to note that no country except Russia has nationalized its land, and even in the Ukraine I read the other day that the Germans were bringing in a scheme for the peasants to *own* their own land in order to encourage agricultural production.

In addition how can a centralized Government Department or even decentralized departments exercise the same love and care which an Englishman has for his home, his land or his farm?

For all these reasons, I am strongly of opinion that it would be a sad day for our country were the land to become nationalized. If politicians with predatory instincts wish to expropriate the big land-owners, how in fairness could they fail to include the small? If the big house is to be taken, what of the small house owned by the widow, or purchased through the Building Society? The Englishman's home is his castle, whether it be in fact a castle or a cottage, and upon this sturdy and thrifty outlook on life, and upon the spirit of service, has the greatness of our nation been built. Long may it continue!

RURAL LAND-OWNERSHIP AND PLANNING

COMMENT AT THE END OF SESSION V

by E. P. WELLER, M.A.

(Bursar of Gonville and Caius College)

Dr. Orwin and Lord Brocket have spoken of the advantages and disadvantages of nationalization and private ownership, but we have not heard much of the subject of Rural Landownership and Planning as it appears on the programme. It may be considered from two points of view: the needs of urban development, for expansion and for restriction; and the needs of the countryside itself. Before attempting to decide between alternative systems of ownership it may be well to consider what we are aiming at and what obstacles stand in the way of achieving our aim.

There seems to be a widespread belief, which was fostered by the Report of the Barlow Commission, that compensation has been a serious hindrance to the public control of the use of land. This is contradicted by such evidence as is available. The Barlow Report states that at 1 April 1939 less than 2 per cent of Great Britain's total area was covered by approved planning schemes. As the right to claim compensation does not arise until after a scheme has come into operation it must clearly be some long time yet before any final judgment can be passed on the working of the existing compensation provisions. But the Annual Reports of the Ministry of Health show that in a large proportion of operative schemes no compensation claims whatever have been received, and in very few cases have any substantial claims been made. The Reports also remark on the willingness of owners to co-operate in the preparation of schemes and to enter into restrictive covenants in respect of their land. The Report on Compensation and Betterment issued by the Town Planning Institute in 1940 states that it is worthy of note that few claims had been made in respect of operative schemes. I was recently concerned in the collection of information from estates affected by some one

hundred and forty planning schemes in different parts of the country, and this also showed that claims are few while agreements are many and co-operation is general.

I am afraid the fact is that planners and planning authorities are inclined to blame owners and the compensation provisions for their own shortcomings. The Barlow Report draws attention to weaknesses in schemes and to the reluctance of authorities to prepare strong schemes although there is no reason to suppose that such schemes would not be readily accepted by landowners. Professor Abercrombie referred to the desire of authorities to secure increase of rateable value within their own boundaries. The Report of the Town and Country Planning Advisory Committee on the Preservation of the Countryside states that some planning authorities have disclosed at the outset of preparing a scheme that in no circumstances will they face a claim to compensation. There are also the intolerable delays—as much as fifteen years or more—between the resolution to prepare a scheme and its coming into operation—often due, no doubt, to the fact that the authority finds it convenient to exercise control by means of interim development procedure without having to make up its mind about the planning proposals; but that is not planning.

I suggest that some of the difficulties would be removed if the finance of compensation and betterment were put on a much broader basis. It should be national rather than local and, as in most forms of land development, the benefits should be compared with the cost over a period of years and not merely at the inception of the scheme.

An even more serious difficulty is found in the impression that planners have by no means made up their minds what they want and that their attitude is mainly negative and restrictive, so that they have failed to convince the public, or even a good many local authorities, that planning is worth while or justifies any substantial expenditure. If people could see that planning would produce positive benefits they would be willing to spend money on it.

Dr. Orwin may say that even if it could be shown that planning is well worth the cost it would be wrong that the private owner should be paid. He says that private owners can dictate the terms upon which public bodies may acquire the land they need, and that such bodies must acquire at values created solely by their need. But surely the facts are quite otherwise. Public bodies usually have power to acquire compulsorily and in the absence of provisions to the contrary they

could therefore acquire on their own terms. Parliament has intervened to ensure that both parties are fairly treated, and purchase money or compensation is usually assessed under the terms of the Lands Clauses Acts as amended by the Acquisition of Land (Assessment of Compensation) Act, 1919, which excludes not only any special value due to the compulsory purchase but also any special value which the land may possess for the owner himself. The Town Planning Institute expressed the view that the terms of the 1919 Act are, on the whole, equitable, and that it did not find that existing legislation is, in general, unjust to either private or public interests.

These matters arise mainly in connection with urban development and although we hear so much about them they are of relatively small importance in regard to planning for the needs of the countryside itself. It is here that the negative attitude towards planning is particularly evident and particularly unfortunate. It can be summed up in the word 'preservation'. It is not uncommon for owners to be asked to enter into agreements which begin something like this: 'Whereas the owner is desirous of preserving his estate in the condition in which it is at present' and when he has executed such an agreement he is regarded as having done his duty from a planning point of view. The needs of a healthy and prosperous countryside can only be satisfied by change and development, yet every kind of development there is stigmatized as 'immoral', 'speculation', 'exploitation', however much it may contribute to the economic and social requirements of both rural and urban communities.

This negative attitude towards planning, coupled with 'the fear of compensation' seems to produce a determination to do nothing rather than run the risk of incurring any expenditure however reasonable and however well justified by positive advantages to the community. This attitude is illustrated by the proposed State acquisition of development rights. After the war the great need will be for the rapid building of houses. Does anyone seriously maintain that this proposal would do anything towards getting more and better houses and getting them more quickly? As I understand the proposal it seems certain that several years would elapse before the completion of the formalities which must precede the building of the first house. In recent years an immense volume of time and energy has been expended in stopping people from doing things and it may well be

thought that we should be much better off now if this effort could have been employed in creative work.

If the object of planning is to arrest development, to keep things as they are, and to avoid expenditure, it is possible that these objects would be promoted by transferring the ownership of land to the State. But if rural planning ought to aim at improving the productivity, efficiency, and prosperity of Agriculture and other rural activities, nothing has been said to show that nationalization of the land would give any assistance whatever towards achieving these aims. Let us suppose that rural land and its management are going to be important in the national economy and will therefore need initiative, energy, and enterprise. Is there any precedent or example which shows that these are more likely to be forthcoming under public ownership than under private ownership? All experience points in the opposite direction.

The question on the paper speaks of reserving land for Agriculture and not as a national park or playground. It is only worth while doing that if Agriculture is going to be a prosperous and important national industry. If it is, then the best form of ownership of rural land should be decided according to the needs of rural development and management. If, in the past, private ownership has fallen short in these respects it is because prolonged depression has drained it of capital and enterprise. Indeed, it is remarkable how, by adaptability and ingenuity, the agricultural industry kept itself going through the lean years, and with what vitality it immediately responded to the call for increased production and the stimulus of more prosperous conditions. What is needed is that such conditions should continue while, at the same time, owners and farmers are assisted to improve the efficiency of their layout, equipment and methods so that prices or subsidies may fall without reducing the margin necessary for the efficient working of the industry. If these conditions are assured there will be no lack of private owners, whether individuals, corporations, or land investment companies, with the necessary capital and enterprise and ready to do their duty by the land and to look for their return from what it produces and not from the so-called 'exploitation'.

SESSION VI

Design and Development of New Towns

CHAIRMAN : MR. ERIC MACFADYEN
(Chairman, First Garden City Ltd.)

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TOWNS

STATEMENT I

by THOMAS SHARP, M.A., M.T.P.I.

Mr. Sharp calls for a proper attention to beauty and seemliness. He feels that unless we can make our towns fine as well as healthy—keep our countryside beautiful as well as prosperous, we shall largely have failed in what is expected of us. He enumerates some of the principles which he considers should be practised, one of them being a return to true street architecture.

* * * * *

Mr. Sharp said he was going to attempt quite briefly a single and simple thesis, namely, the necessity and possibility of bringing the quality of beauty into the architectural form of our towns and villages. He continued:

In limiting my remarks to the architectural aspect of planning I am not in the least ignoring the necessity of planning for health and convenience. The improvement of housing, the provision of necessary open spaces, the proper relationship between homes and workplaces, the facilitation of easy traffic movement, all these and a multitude of other matters of organization I regard as basic to any planning worthy of the name. But I regard the creation of beauty, or at least of seemliness, as being *equally* basic, and it is because of that, as well as because the matter is so often ignored, that I want to speak of it now.

A More Gracious World

What the people want is a more *gracious* as well as a more comfort-

able and healthy world. And it is natural that it should be so, for what can be appreciated visually is generally capable of giving far deeper and more permanent satisfaction to the human spirit than mere matters of organizational planning. We can plan for good organization for all we are worth; we can get our land pattern perfectly devised; we can get the health of the people most carefully provided for; we can get our social relationships happily arranged; we can put our agriculture in the way of prosperity; we can do all that kind of organizational planning in the most excellent manner. But unless, in the end, we can make our towns fine as well as healthy; unless we can keep our countryside beautiful as well as make it prosperous, then I think we will largely have failed in what is expected of us.

I am not for a moment asking for an exclusive attention to beauty. Nothing could be more hollow than appearance bought at the cost of other human needs. All I am asking is that it be given its *proper* attention. A thousand sad suburban areas which have been developed under planning schemes show only too well that this has not been the case so far. Of recent years there has even been something of contempt for it in certain powerful quarters. I regret, for example, that Mr. Osborn has of late taken to gibing at those of us who continue to advocate the desirability of giving our towns a genuine urban beauty, who desire them to have a fine architectural form as well as a satisfactory ground plan. He has been calling us 'façade mongers' and 'vista fanciers', implying that we are merely irresponsible people whose only interest is in the creation of architectural scenery. I want to suggest to him and to others who take that line that their attitude is narrow and lopsided. Town and country planning is not merely a matter of land planning and social organization. It is a matter of making our environment satisfying and inspiring to look at as well as comfortable and healthy to live in.

The Only Proper Planning

This, of course, does not mean that beauty is something which is planted on, a mere dressing of an efficiency plan. It should be an inherent consideration in the preparation of any plan. I think what it amounts to is this. Organizational planning is largely land use planning, two-dimensional planning. I maintain that the only proper planning for town and countryside is three-dimensional

planning: planning the visual effect of what is put upon the ground plan, as well as the ground plan itself; planning the vistas and façades to use Mr. Osborn's phrase, but not, I hope, merely mongering and fancying them.

This architectural planning has to some extent been practised in the two garden cities that have so far been built in this country. The matter of appearance, in fact, was given high importance among the ideals of the reformers who in the early part of this century advocated the establishment of garden cities. I myself think that architectural planning in these places has gone wrong in a number of ways, though far less than in the thousands of romantic suburbs that have spread all over the country. I do not, however, wish to analyse the faults of any one particular place, so it will be better for me to attempt briefly to enumerate some of the principles which I think should be practised in all our town building.

But first I must say that the principles of architectural Civic Design do not apply only in the building of new towns. They apply equally to the rebuilding of old towns. The problem of rehabilitating these indeed is infinitely more important than any building of new towns. And these principles apply to the building of villages in the countryside also; to the building of the new villages and extensions of old villages which I hope will house many of the agricultural workers now living in isolated tied cottages. They should apply in fact to all collections of buildings wherever they may be.

Necessity of Street Architecture

I believe that buildings that are in association should *express* their association in their physical relationship with each other. The houses of people who are grouped together in a particular place for a particular purpose should themselves be grouped together. This is desirable on social grounds. The architecture of the habitations of any groups should symbolize the social significance of the group. And certainly a group of buildings can only be architecturally satisfying, can only have any claim to beauty *en masse*, when they subscribe to the principles of large-scale architectural composition. That is why I believe so firmly in the necessity of street architecture.

I believe we can never again build architecturally satisfying towns, or towns that have any genuine claim to beauty, until we transfer the architectural emphasis from the individual home, from the

individual house, to the collective home; that is to say to that part of a town which can be seen at any one time, namely, the street. The only beauty you can give to any collection of buildings that is erected at one time, is a formal beauty. Informality has its attractions. But, in building, its creation is generally accidental; it is the result of a series of accidents over a long period of time, the slow addition of one building to another. The informality which has been aimed at in nearly all our recent building, especially our suburban building, has been hopelessly unattainable from the beginning. We can only achieve order and seemliness by formalizing and co-ordinating into one whole, any related buildings which are put up together or within a short space of time of each other.

I believe that this applies to building in villages as well as in towns. There is no fundamental difference, so far as I can see, in building a town or a village. The formality which is both inevitable and desirable in a town may probably be relaxed a bit in a village, but it is a matter of degree, not of fundamental difference. So the new and improved villages which one hopes will follow upon the improvement of agriculture, and of the rural economy generally, will, I hope, be rational architecturally—composed affairs, and neither attempted imitations of the sentimental picture postcard village nor merely bits of romantic suburbanism such as we have lately been given in connection with our land settlement schemes. The new villages, as I see them, should be clean straightforward streets of honest modern buildings, grouped in a square or a series of squares or similar formations, round a simple green or gravelled space where maybe the telephone box may take the place of the village pump.

Building in terrace formation is not only the best way to get order and shape and beauty into the individual street, it is, I believe, the only way to overcome the danger of monotony which is likely to occur in all large collections of similar buildings, such as a town necessarily is. If your unit of architectural design is the individual house, and you vary that unit within every individual street, then you are pretty well bound to get every street looking exactly alike, and your deliberate attempt to create variety in that way ends up in the unintentional creation of a general monotony. That is where practically all building has gone wrong during the greater part of this century. But if you make the street, and not the house, the unit of design, then you have a real opportunity of achieving variety between the various

streets of a town, and of avoiding monotony in the town as a whole.

I hope it will be clear that in speaking of the necessity of some degree of formality, and in advocating a return to true street architecture, I am not suggesting that our towns should be made monumental, that their layouts should consist of rigid symmetrical patterns and that kind of thing. Actually, with each street regarded as an entity in itself, the plan of the town itself would be left free and organic. There need be no forcing of the large plan, no strangulation by symmetry, no sacrifice to mere pattern when the emphasis is put on the street. It is strange how so many of our municipal housing schemes, and particularly architect-designed schemes, have gone wrong in this direction. They have been built up of great sweeping circles and semi-circles, with deliberately set axes, and all the paraphernalia of monumental design. But on the ground these features simply don't tell at all. And in truth they don't matter in the least. I am certainly not suggesting anything of that kind. What I want to see is a far freer and more vital, and at the same time more logical planning than that which we've had hitherto. And, incidentally, I think that a free rectangular layout form, declared in the cores between a town's radial traffic ways, is far more logical and far more capable of architectural treatment than the curly so-called landscape streets of the romantic school of planners.

Intimate Planning

So far from advocating a monumental planning I want to see the more intimate planning which I believe is nearer the English tradition, and is more appealing to the English character. And here the question of scale comes in. To get anything like a successful architectural appearance, the space between buildings has got to be considered in relation to the height of the buildings. If this relationship is not considered, what may look monumental and grand on paper may look merely trivial or incongruous in reality. An example of what I mean occurs at Welwyn Garden City, where the wide boulevard, called Parkway, is lined with low-pitched houses. There you have an attempt at monumentality which just does not come off. It's an instance of false merely two-dimensional planning. The sense of scale has gone wrong. And it has gone wrong on most of our recent housing estates. Indeed it has been made to go wrong by regulations

which have insisted on unnecessarily deep building lines and too great space between buildings.

No Virtue in Space as Such

There seems to have got about an idea that there is virtue in mere space as such. There is a demand for towns to be full of wide open spaces. It is, of course, fundamental to any town planning that all proper requirements for recreational space should be provided, that the full requirements of space for proper sunlight incidence and ventilation should be met. But I want to suggest that, that having been done, there is a great deal to be said for maintaining a sense of enclosure in a town, a sense of compactness and intimacy. Most of our recent building estates are far too wide open. They are loose, draughty, somehow 'uncontained' places. They lack snugness and a sense of intimacy. A sense of enclosure should, I think, be maintained. Not, of course, to the degree which brings an oppressive feeling of being imprisoned or shut in. That is going to the other extreme. But enough to induce a sense of snugness, of comfort and intimacy.

The actual size of spaces is, itself, an important matter. They should be in proportion, in scale, to the town in which they are set. A square the size of Trafalgar Square set in a small town is obviously out of scale, though one not infrequently comes across suggestions of that sort in actual planning schemes. Similarly a Champs Élysées in a town the size of say Wigan would be incongruous. But large spaces, as well as small, need somehow to have this sense of enclosure given to them. As an example of what I mean, take the matter of the design of a square. The whole beauty of a square depends on the amount of wallage given by enclosing buildings, and on its not having great wide roads cutting through it. There is a pleasure in the limitation of the view: much the same kind of pleasure, I suppose, as one gets in a walled garden.

Occasional Contrast

As an occasional contrast to this subtle sense of enclosure, a sense of spaciousness may also be very attractive. It is in contrasts of this kind rather than in an all over sameness that delight and beauty in a town may lie. For myself, I think that a town should be a combination of concentration and openness. A concentrated quarter here; a

wedge of open space coming in there in much the way it occurs in this lovely town that we are now in. But what I feel quite sure about is that the recent suburban ideals of a thinly-spread sameness, the negative half-town half-country ideal, will never form a visually satisfactory environment for human living.

Our towns should be completely and truly urban, middle and edge alike. They should have architectural cohesion. They should depend for their beauty on their architectural form. They should be as compact as the requirements of healthy living will permit. They should not trail out into the country in a waste of suburbs. We need to revive something of the conception of the city wall, where the town ends emphatically, unmistakably, finally; and beyond which the country stretches green and undefiled by suburban intrusions. This applies to villages also. I believe that town and country, though they must be fully integrated, should be physically distinct, and that there should be no intermingling of them in any suburban half-way house. I believe that not only the beauty but also the functional and social efficiency of town and country alike requires that.

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TOWNS

STATEMENT II

by F. J. OSBORN

(Hon. Secretary, Town and Country Planning Association)

Mr. Osborn deals with the subject from the aspect of improved housing and environment for the 'City millions' which, in his opinion, may be secured without detriment to Agriculture. He reminds us that the housing effort of 1919-39, though 'in scale and quality the most remarkable achievement of any nation in any age', mainly catered for the immigrants to the growing cities. Relatively small progress was made with rehousing the slum-dwellers and opening out City Centres. He submits recommendations for the provision of new towns, the redevelopment of bombed areas and slum areas, and the industrial development of existing small towns, describing, inter alia, legislation needed, initiation of schemes, development grants, finance, and administration.

* * * * *

Planning, like peace and war, is indivisible. At this Conference we are focusing on its countryside and small-town aspects. But these are bound up with the metropolitan and large-town aspects. The primary impulse of modern town and country planning is derived from the chronic or age-old space-pressure in the industrial towns and commercial centres. Perhaps 90 per cent of the people of this island derive their direct livings from non-agricultural pursuits; and for a great number of these the problem is still that of overcrowded, lifeless, graceless surroundings for their homes and workplaces.

The past two centuries have seen a vast rise in productive power, some of the benefits of which have percolated down even to the lowest income groups in the form of shorter working hours and more purchasing power. A big average rise in the possible standard of housing—floor-space, building quality, fittings and environmental amenities—should be one of the most important expressions of a rising standard of life. The absence of adequate control of town

building has robbed the poorer city workers of much of the potential benefit of advanced industrialism; their desire for more spacious houses is thwarted by over-concentration of work places in too few large centres; their leisure is tragically reduced by long journeys to work; or at best they have a choice between these two frustrations of the results of their skill and hard work.

Those of us who love the countryside, who understand it, who know that it also has suffered by the dominance of a morbid and constipated urban mentality, must rejoice that at last the town populations, in their own way, are becoming country-conscious. But I doubt if all of us fully realize either the significance or the consequences of this awakening. The movement for countryside preservation, for agricultural revival, is highly intense and vocal and is gathering strength; but so far it is a narrowly-based movement—an alliance of country house dwellers, literary architects, and (as we have seen at this Conference) a new class of cultured weekend farmers. It is, most fortunately, at last gaining the ears of the city millions whose votes, cast intelligently or unintelligently, determine the policy of the nation. But it has not yet come to terms with these millions. Its dilemma is that the more successful it is in registering in their minds the values and virtues of the countryside, the more the town dwellers will desire to share those values and exercise those virtues.

I do not want to see the two thousand years' war between town and country enter into an overt political phase. In long-term historical perspective the town is a device of an agricultural race to improve its resources and standards; and, as I see it, the country has lost control of the machinery it created, and has had in many ways a very bad bargain. But the poorer town dwellers have fared even worse. If we are now to start, as I hope we are not, a polemical battle on the popular level, what a case could be made out against the wealthy and sophisticated champions of rural Britain as it is to-day! We talk at Conferences like this of rural Britain as if it were wholly an agricultural estate, and our jealousy of a little extra land for the inhumanly-packed town dwellers becomes at times so acute as to amount to stinginess. Rural Britain, however, is not solely an agricultural estate. It is also, for those who can afford it, and they are not negligible in numbers or political articulateness, the most attractive residential district in the world. No one has measured the area of rural Britain given over to country houses, large and small;

but at a rough guess I should say it is comparable with the area occupied by congested city populations and the factories and offices in which they work. The L.C.C. area contains four million people, who, for all their purposes of living, work, and recreation, have less than one acre for fifty-five persons—a state of affairs that ought to make angels and country-lovers weep. The purely residential density is of course far greater; over considerable areas of our cities it rises above two hundred persons per acre. Farmers and their workers, all too poor as they are, have room to breathe. I doubt if, on the average, they are housed at more than six to ten *persons* to the acre. Country-house dwellers have far more spacious surroundings even than this.

It is not mainly the demand of the town dwellers for a decent ration of living-space that has sent land out of cultivation. The net loss of arable and grassland in England and Wales between about 1890 and 1938, according to Sir Daniel Hall, was 3,100,000 acres. Of this 2,500,000 acres reverted to rough grazings, and though the population increased by *twelve millions* in that period, only 600,000 acres were taken for urban uses—and this I think includes many one to five acre sites for the homes of lovers of the countryside, who now want to join in the space-blockade of the overcrowded townsfolk.

One more point on this cardinal issue. The policy; or tendency to a policy, of maintaining the compression of the towns—what I might call the policy of town-canning—cannot be defended on the ground of the necessity of home food production either in peace or war. The value of the output of food in domestic gardens, when they are devoted to that purpose, is for every acre occupied four or five times that of farmland, while the work devoted to it is a part of leisure and is recreative.

We need not therefore be too jealous of the additional land required for urban extensions, especially as it is in any case a relatively negligible area compared even with what could be reclaimed from virtual waste under a positive national agricultural policy. With a rising awareness of the values of closer contact with growing things, the demand of the town dwellers for more space cannot possibly be defeated, whether by the selfishness of the satisfied or by literary-aesthetic sentimentality about the countryside. It is possible, if we plan well, to meet the awakening requirements of the towns without injury to agriculture, and with positive advantages to the minority of the nation who are engaged in agriculture.

The housing effort of 1919-39 (in scale and quality the most remarkable achievement of any nation in any age) mainly housed the immigrants to the growing cities. Relatively small progress was made with the rehousing of slum dwellers and the opening out of city centres that were the main driving force of the housing movement.

The nearest thing to a classic analysis of city development in modern times is that of the Barlow Report. That report was completed in 1939. Since the Report sporadic bombing and organized and spontaneous war-time dispersal of factories and offices have broken some ties that will not automatically be connected. Some new opportunities have been created, and some new difficulties. The problems of priorities and of synchronization of related developments will be difficult at the end of the war, especially as the economic requirements and possibilities have elements of vagueness. All the more reason for crystallizing proposals as far as we can; even though we have to modify them as new information comes to hand.

The Barlow Commission gave thought to the methods by which new towns could be started; and recommended, as the best method, their development by the large municipalities having congested areas that need some opening out (par. 291). The decision as to which congested areas need decentralization, they considered, should be in the hands of the central planning authority; as also should the choice as to whether the developments should take the form of new towns, trading estates, or the extension of existing towns. The use of 'authorized associations' as an executive machinery was suggested.

This is certainly one good method, but as circumstances vary in different areas, legislative provision should be made for several types of executive machinery for large-scale development. The types of machinery needed for new towns would also be useful in the re-development of bombed areas and slum areas and the industrial extension of existing small towns.

Legislation Needed

General powers should be given to urban authorities and county councils, and to any two or more such authorities jointly, subject in every case to the approval of the Planning Ministry:

(a) To acquire suitable areas of land for new towns, trading estates, town extensions, or replanned development, within or outside their own boundaries. (Partially this is covered by Section 35 of the Town

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TOWNS

and Country Planning Act of 1932, but some amendment is necessary.)

(b) To undertake any form of estate and building development and the provision of any kind of buildings, and the maintenance, sale or lease of lands and buildings. (In other words to have similar freedom of development to that of a private landowner. The Liverpool Act of 1936 substantially grants these powers. The Birmingham Act of 1936 is subject to limitations which would hamper development and the economic return obtainable from it by the authority.)

(c) To promote, finance, and/or make loans to an 'authorized association'—a company not trading for profit or trading within defined profit limits—for town development and redevelopment.

Similar powers should be granted to a central Commission or Development Board under the Planning Ministry, or Ministry of Reconstruction, so that it could act through authorized associations, or finance approved private initiatives subject to proper safeguards.

Initiation of Schemes

The initiation of schemes and proposals for sites should be open to all local authorities, regional planning authorities, unofficial survey bodies or civic societies, industrialists contemplating new enterprises, or authorized associations. Decision would, under national planning, rest with the central authority after local and regional consultations. The policy would, of course, be related to the policy of guidance of location of industry and of agricultural reservations as it gradually takes shape. In some areas progress may well be possible earlier than in other areas. Obviously also schemes for new towns and industrial extensions of existing towns would both take into account, and lead to modifications of, existing planning schemes. In the choice of sites and detailed planning the A 1 and G 3 land should generally be avoided as building areas.

Development Grants

To complete the central powers the Planning Ministry (or the Commission suggested above) should be enabled to make grants to local authorities or associations undertaking these developments, for the following purposes:

(a) Payment of approved removal expenses of industrial and com-

mercial establishments, and of their employees, who agree to transfer to new towns or town extensions.

(b) Contributions to the loss on public services or community facilities provided in advance of the settlement of a population adequate to carry them.

(The 'inducements' which the Commissioners for the Special Areas were empowered to grant went much further, and included subsidies to factory rents, rates and taxes. I doubt if these are necessary under a national policy of guidance of location.)

If the system of housing subsidies is resumed, decentralized development should receive 'most favoured district' terms. In other words the 'weighting' of subsidies to favour housing on expensive central sites should be reversed. This does not exclude fair compensation to authorities or owners where a reduction of density is imposed by new national planning standards.

Daughter Towns

In all cases new settlements of the type under discussion should be well separated by stretches of open country from existing large cities. This is one of a number of reasons why a site for a 'daughter town' should preferably *not* be within the boundaries of the parent city. The latter would have ample powers and financial control as owner of the freehold. It could even maintain roads and construct water and sewage works and make charges for these under its leases. If, as I suggest, it operates through an authorized association, wholly financed by it, it would appoint the directorate for a term of years. Minor services (lighting, burial, libraries, even housing) could be left to the local parochial committee, which should become an urban district council as early as possible. The revenue from shops, factories and ground rents will be more important than the rate revenue. No insuperable difficulty should arise with regard to the provision of educational facilities and health and hospital services by the county council. In the case of the Letchworth and Welwyn schemes the landowning company co-operated cordially with both the county authority and the newly-created urban district council, and local electoral responsibility rapidly emerged, to the great advantage of the towns. There is much to be said for the local council having some representation on the directorate of the authorized association at a fairly early stage.

Other New Towns

A new town not specifically related to decentralization from a particular city might be promoted by a county council, by the central authority, or by private enterprise. In each case some form of authorized association will again be the most suitable machinery, the promoting authority appointing the directorate. In the case of private enterprise, the subscribed capital would take some risk, and public loans would be conditional on a profit limit and perhaps the appointment of a minority of the directorate.

Extension of Small Towns

If a large village or small town or war factory is selected as a nucleus for the development, the authority or authorized association should be empowered to acquire, in addition to the land required for the extended town area, the existing built-up area. Industrial and residential property could be leased to the existing occupiers on terms guaranteeing their security of tenure. But economic difficulty would occur unless the commercial properties were bought out and let on short leases at current rack-rents, so that the authority could secure increments of value due to the extensions and growth of population. If this were done there would be some advantages in having an established town as a core of the development, and careful study of the character and tradition of the place would give interest to the extension. Many local interests would necessarily prove obstructive, however, even if the local authority were in full co-operation.

Finance for New Towns

For simplicity I deal only with the case of a new settlement on land previously in use for agriculture or as woodland or parkland, or (as is probable) a mixture of all these with perhaps a small village on the site. I assume the town is to be a town of light and medium industry, with some office businesses, and a fair balance of employment as between these and local services; and that its planned maximum population is to be 35,000. The composition of the town would vary widely according to local circumstances, but very roughly it would have 10,000 houses, something like half its people (17,500) would be occupied, and of these 9,000 to 12,000 would be resident industrial workers. The area required for the town itself (apart from

the agricultural belt) would be about 1,750 to 2,000 acres, of which about 250 to 300 acres would be needed for factories, about 1,250 for houses, and the rest for shops, open spaces, schools, other public buildings, railways, roads and car parks. In my rough estimates I have assumed the purchase of an estate of about 8,000 acres, of which the outer portion (6,000 acres) would be zoned for permanent agricultural use. I have, for convenience, used round figures of pre-war costs.

A. Primary Development Costs

Purchase of land: Town area (2,000 acres)	say £100,000
Purchase of land: Agricultural belt	„ £150,000
Total cost of land (8,000) acres	£250,000
Initial development, including first stages of water supply and sewage disposal	say £500,000
Open spaces and community buildings ..	„ £350,000
Total land and 'general development'	£1,100,000

B. Principal Building Costs

10,000 houses and local development (average £500, including any flats over shops)	£5,000,000
Factories (say 2,000,000 sq. ft. at 10s.)	£1,000,000
Shops (say 350,000 sq. ft. at £1)	£350,000
	£6,350,000

C. Special Buildings and Public Services

Gas, Electricity, Telephones, District Heating ..	—
Schools, Institutes, Churches, Public Buildings ..	—
Cinemas, Public Houses, Hotels, etc.	—

I have not estimated group C, most of which would either be fully remunerative or would be provided by other agencies. Under group B, many of the larger houses would probably be provided by private enterprise; as also would some of the factories.

But it is interesting to note that even if the whole cost of groups A and B were borne by the developing body, the cost of land, houses, factories and shops for 35,000 people would be of the order of £7½ millions, of which land and housing and special 'cultural'

amenities would represent about £6 millions. Under the 1938 housing scheme the Ministry of Health contemplated a cost of something like £8½ millions for rehousing an equivalent 35,000 persons on 'expensive sites' in city centres, and this was a bare housing cost.

Of this expenditure the greater part will be self-supporting, or at least as self-supporting as it would be in alternative forms of development, but not likely to produce a surplus. Housing, local roads, and factories together come into this class. Interest on the cost of the town site and general development would have to be recovered mainly from surplus revenues on commercial sites and premises and on sites for houses above the minimum standard. The capital cost to be covered in this way may be something of the order of £1,000,000 including community buildings. It is meaningless to prepare a detailed profit and loss account when there are so many variables. But any analysis of the experience of Letchworth and Welwyn will make it clear that with finance at public borrowing rates of interest, with reasonably rapid and economical development, and with due conservation of the shopping and business values for the benefit of the scheme, a revenue surplus should be assured by the time the town reaches a population of 10,000 to 15,000.

Much importance is attached to that phrase 'due conservation of shopping and business values'. As we all know, it is land devoted to those purposes which most gains in value through population growth. But few estates, private or public, have yet realized how much secular increase in value is in fact lost to the landowners and pocketed by building owners on long leases and by shopkeepers, who are often lucky *rentiers* masquerading as clever merchants. A wise authority building a new town may grant building leases for houses and factories, but it will grant no building leases for shops. It will build them itself and let them at carefully considered market rents rising as the town grows. I am pretty sure that a similar policy should be applied to certain other types of commercial premises.

When there are surplus revenues, I see no reason why the surplus (or so much of it as is not taken by the Government under a national Compensation and Betterment scheme) should not be taken for the benefit of the parent authority, if there is one, and used for redevelopment and improvements in the old centre. The new town has lost nothing by having a prudent landlord, and every resident has an inalienable dividend in his home surroundings. But there is much to

be said on practical grounds for the local community having a right to a percentage of any such surplus.

Administration of Development

Planning is team-work. A minimum team for satisfactory design and development of a new town (or of a redevelopment area) might contain:

(1) A Chairman, Managing Director or Estate Manager responsible for the policy, balancing all the social, economic and technical factors.

(2) An Engineer-Surveyor responsible for the 'mechanics' of development.

(3) A third man in touch with public or 'consumer' demands; he might be an Estate Agent or 'salesman', but whatever he is called he is there to keep to the fore what industrialists, residents, builders, workers and the infinite variety of groups of citizens want. (But see comment below.)

(4) A man with a grip on finance, costing, economics. He might be Clerk, Secretary, Accountant or Finance Officer; the name does not matter; the function is indispensable.

(5) A Civic Designer or Architect. His job is, in close accord with the Engineer, to interpret the work of the team in physical terms in three dimensions, his own special sphere being convenience for the specified functional purposes, amenity, and visual beauty.

No. 3 in the team may seem to have too much on his plate; you really need nowadays a 'sociologist' thinking of group interests as well as an 'estate agent' thinking of all kinds of clients individually.

It is on No. 1, the leader and all-round man, that the success of the plan will largely rest. If any of the others gets away with over-emphasis of his professional obsessions, the plan will suffer.

Survey and Plan

I have no need to stress the necessity of collecting all data about the site before planning, including of course a contour survey and the recording of all trees, hedges, and minor physical features. Engineering factors will dominate the early evolution of the plan—drainage possibilities, water sources and storage, lines of main roads, etc. Broad quantitative zoning, based on the calculated areas needed for each kind of use, will dominate the second phase. But at no stage can

any factor be ignored; for example there may be woodlands or buildings of interest to which even the main plan must be bent. And obviously standards of density and considerations of amenity are integral even to the first rough zoning. Finance, Civic Design, Engineering, Salesmanship, Social Welfare must all have their say, and even the Managing Director, being human, will have his pet fads that citizens in a hundred years' time will wonder at.

I would put round the Conference Room three large labels as the keynotes of Planning: FAMILY; INDUSTRY; COMMUNITY. If all in the team respect these as well as their technical specialities, a good plan will result.

Conclusion

How much land would be required for new towns and town extensions? In the next quarter century I would estimate it at 250,000 to 300,000 acres, re-accommodating perhaps 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 people. If I were an idealist I should argue for some reclamation from urban purposes of the far too widely spread suburbs of the great cities and of the built up land between the individual towns of the town-clusters. But much of that land is the latest built-up, and I can't see reclamation for many years ahead. I would not rule it out as a very long-term objective. In a hundred, or two hundred, or five hundred years the town-country pattern of Britain will certainly be different from what it is to-day; it is inconceivable that London, the West Midlands, and the West Riding towns will extend as far as they do now. But I can't see so far ahead; I don't know what our economic or political system may be capable of in those distant days.

I am thinking of the work immediately before us. We can rebuild the older parts of our cities to meet every side of human needs, and I believe we shall do so.

We can also build new towns and recreate many of our smaller towns, and it is here that the greatest opportunities occur of expressing the modern spirit, which is to use our highly developed techniques, and express our new æsthetic consciousness, in the service of human purposes. Architecture has to grow out of its present childish overpreoccupation with the façade, the street, the tower, into a new and altogether more adult vision of civic design; it should not cease to be visual, but it should see through the eyes of the common man and

woman—from the building through the kitchen window and the office and factory window as well as towards the building from the point of view of the policeman or the sandwich-man or the perambulating visitor. The architect may be better for being able to make bricks or mix concrete; but I'm not sure that he wouldn't be still more usefully educated by bathing a baby or watching a child trying to climb four flights of stone steps. In any case he needs a client for his Civic Design comparable with the client for the house, who has curbed his tendency to fantasy and pictorial escapism. That client is the Town Planner—a new profession, needing an economic and sociological education which so far we have only begun to produce. We have first-class material for these two great professions. Give them the knowledge, give them the tools, and let them get on with the job!

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TOWNS

DISCUSSION AT THE END OF SESSION VI

MR. J. D. RITCHIE (Secretary and Manager, First Garden City Limited) said that beauty was in the eye of the beholder who changed from decade to decade. The Conference had proved a feast of idealism, but now they must return to reality. To start to create a new town they would have to proceed on garden city lines, to have a balanced, self-sufficient town with provision for work, shopping, residence, culture and education. They would call in the practical planner and the technical expert for such matters as water and sewerage. The translation of the plans into facts started the problems, for at this stage they came up against finance. Even with Government assistance they had got to attract some capital to an undertaking which still in the minds of many people bordered on the speculative. They had also got to persuade the industrialists to have a flutter. The industrialist was the backbone of the scheme, and he wanted a return for his money. There was the problem of time-lag. Purchase of land and preparation for building development was costly and the land did not all let or sell at once. The return of sunken capital was slow.

LT. P. J. MARSHALL (Coventry) said this was the only Association to get together people who had the possibility of action. We were on the edge of an abyss, and we needed a new faith for living. They must not be too concerned with the small things of life. International planning was needed.

MAJOR JOHN A. ROSEVEAR (Member of Council) considered that Mr. Ritchie had overstressed the difficulties. As Chairman of the Development Committee of the Directors of the First Garden City Ltd. for a number of years prior to the war, he had seen these difficulties overcome in practice. An important factor had been the retention by the Company of the public services, viz., electricity, water and gas which had largely solved the question of finance and

DISCUSSION

enabled regular payment of dividend—this being the salvation of the Company and the Garden City.

He advised that with regard to the fixing of ground rents in the shopping and business area, power should be taken to revise the amounts of ground rents in all leases granted at early and regular intervals, to avoid the pitfall experienced at Letchworth where some shopkeepers now held important business sites at almost 'nominal' rents, no revisions being possible until the first ninety-nine years of lease expired.

Ebenezer Howard's vision had been proved an actual fact at Letchworth and Welwyn and this was encouraging for the future.

MR. G. A. HOLLAND said that they must decide whether they were going to build a small town or a large industrial town. One could not develop into the other. A garden city should be by-passed by park-roads, and another built on the other side, making increasing provision for wider roads and larger public buildings.

MR. MORRIS (Cambridge) said there was need for the cities to be more aesthetically satisfactory. The failure of visual beauty was part of a breakdown that was world wide. The ultimate objective of all planning was cultural, and that was not sufficiently recognized by the Conference. The revolutionary part of town planning was cultural and not merely instrumental. Our cities would fail unless they provided for the full psycho-physical needs of the adult population.

MRS. JEAN MANN, J.P. (Secretary of Scottish Branch, Town and Country Planning Association) considered that they should transfer the architectural future from the home to the street and plan for design even as far as the landscape. She believed in the virtue of wide open spaces.

MR. MAX LOCK (Hull School of Architecture) asked who were the clients of the planners. Were we going to plan things the way people ought to have them or the way they wanted? A new faith could only be obtained out of a new significance in work and a delight in production. The movement towards open suburbs arose as a palliative to the industrial problems of the last century, and it served its purpose well. But as a result people lived a long way from their work, and one result was suburban neurosis which was sheer boredom. There should be a proper mixture of houses and community living. Let

DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TOWNS

them find out what people really needed and supply it. Did people perhaps not enjoy living in the sort of cities that they now lived in? It was important to build cities on the laboratory principle with proper research into what was really needed. That was their duty as planners.

SESSION VII

Informal Discussion

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

(The last Meeting of the Conference)

On Sunday evening Mr. F. J. Osborn took the Chair at an informal discussion. He said that he would give priority to speakers who had taken no previous part in the Conference.

MR. R. H. MATTOCKS, DIP.C.D., M.T.P.I., F.I.L.A., (Leeds, President, Town Planning Institute) defended Town Planners against Sir Daniel Hall's charge that they had ignored agriculture. Under the old Act they could not zone land for agriculture; they could only drag it into a 'low density' zone, or hold up its development under the General Development procedure through which a cart and horse could be driven. As to the issue of public ownership of land, the Town Planning Institute had mixed opinions about it; he hoped it would in any case not become a party political issue.

Commenting on Professor Sargant Florence's paper, he supported the establishment of food-processing factories in rural areas. Mining developments were still in progress, and it was possible to plan new mining villages to suit these developments, and to insist on provision for the restoration of lost amenities. He agreed with the general principle of siting new industries in small towns rather than in the open country. In some villages there were mill buildings that could be used. You could not bring back agricultural prosperity unless you provided employment for the younger members of farming families in villages and small towns. The villages were losing people to the small towns, the small towns to the big cities. You must bring back life to the small towns or you would finish with many derelict towns and a few bloated conurbations, which did not replace their own populations. In considering the location of industry, water supply was an important factor. Existing towns should be studied. There

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

were many factories wrongly sited, many needing replacement, and many industrial slums. Uncontrolled extension led to agricultural slums, in which farmers cannot have a long-term policy. We should set limits to towns.

He supported Professor Abercrombie's stress on amenity planning. In the eighteenth century they did not hesitate to plan the countryside, even to the extent of moving whole villages. Afforestation could not only add to amenity, but also help to replenish the underground water supply.

Commenting on Mr. Sharp's paper, Mr. Mattocks said there were good practical reasons for setback building lines, as for example the safety of children running into the street, and the prevention of people looking into front windows, and of dirt coming into the houses. He agreed as to the architectural value of terrace building, but short blocks reduced bomb damage by blast. Some parts of a town might be compact, but others should be open, since many people preferred open building.

MR. P. W. MACFARLANE, P.A.S.I., A.M.P.T.I., stressed that it is unfair to blame planners for not zoning agricultural land as such. Landowners in general were not willing to accept agricultural zones and the Ministry of Health's 'Rural Zone' is not really suitable for agricultural areas. Mr. Weller, in contending that very little compensation had been incurred under planning schemes, had overlooked the fact that schemes everywhere had been emasculated because of the impossibility of financing the necessary compensation for a good scheme. Give planners really adequate powers to deal with agricultural zoning and they would use them wisely and with reasonable flexibility. He could not see the difficulty of the State buying the development rights and leaving the ownership of the land with the present owners, whose agricultural activities would not be interfered with. They would only be prevented from selling for building, which is just what is wanted.

He thought Professor Florence put too much emphasis on the moving of industries into the country; the removal should be mainly to our smaller towns, i.e. to those with a population of between 10,000 and 100,000.

It seemed very doubtful if the smaller factories would find the necessary pool of skilled labour they would require in the rural villages.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

MR. M. A. WITNEY (Watford) said that the one thing to be dreaded was that London and the other damaged towns would be patched up instead of being comprehensively replanned. To the ordinary citizen monster blocks of flats were an abomination. His eyes had been opened at the Conference to many new views, and he had found attendance a liberal education.

MR. B. F. BRUETON (Bristol) said that we must, in our planning, take full account of the coming fall in total population. Most planning schemes had provided too large an area for town extensions. The chief reason for this, however, was the fear that if planners did not zone large areas for building, compensation would be payable to the landowners. The model clauses now provided for agricultural zones as distinct from 'reservations' and more positive use should be made of these powers for zoning good land as agricultural areas and also for zoning coastal stretches.

MISS JAQUELINE TYRWHITT (Association for Planning and Regional Reconstruction) said that there had been a call for a creed for planners. In the past planning had been done for Housing; now it should be for Living, and for a full physical and mental life for all, not forgetting life in the workplace. The Peckham Health Centre had found that only 10 per cent of the people were in good health; 10 per cent, at the other extreme, in a state of disease; and the intermediate 80 per cent in a state of compensation. She considered that not more than 10 per cent of people would be found to be living a full life, and the rest eked out various degrees of compensatory existence. This large section included almost all planners, and it was important for them to realize that when they had built the new world they would themselves be anomalies and should commit suicide. Much of the fault of the past had been caused by plans being made, not only by, but for people who were living in a state of compensation.

CAPT. R. G. M. WILSON (Cambridge) spoke as a farmer whose family farmed 7,000 acres. He believed that a good future for agricultural land depended upon the land belonging to the people. He was prepared to hand over the title deeds of his land to the nation to-morrow if by doing so he thought it would help the land to get fair treatment. In the planning of rural areas the co-operation of the farmers would be essential. He believed that the country as a whole should be planned and not just the towns. He did not agree with Sir Daniel Hall in his desire to universalize large holdings. Land differed

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

greatly from place to place. The economic size of fields and holdings was governed by the quality of the soil and weather conditions. Farming was not an industry. An industrialist took the raw material and processed it. Farmers dealt with living soils and living human beings. It was a way of life. It was vital to understand this.

MR. D. B. WILLIAMSON, B.SC., said that the point of view of industry had not been sufficiently stressed at the Conference. It should be borne in mind that 80 per cent of the people of this country directly depended on urban industry. An interesting case had recently come to his notice of an important engineering firm that had dispersed its factories for strategic reasons. As a result of the experience gained the firm had decided never again to concentrate several thousand workers in one factory. They were convinced that dispersion into smaller units ensured greater production and more economical management, and considered that five hundred workers was the limiting number for a sound factory unit, and that this would be found to hold generally, and particularly in engineering. There was no doubt that many hitherto urban industries would find new roots in new towns and market towns, not only without injury, but with ultimate benefit to rural life.

MR. T. B. OXENBURY (East Suffolk County Council) said that planning research had not been mentioned at the Conference. We must prepare a ground plan for the whole country. In his own County of Suffolk maps and statistics of the existing use of land were being prepared, and this ought to be done for the whole country before the war ended.

MR. PHILIP HONEY (Electrical Development Association) referring to Professor Ashby's paper, explained why electricity sometimes cost tenpence per unit for lighting in rural areas, while nearby Grid lines may carry current earning a revenue of three farthings per unit. He emphasized that a flat rate of tenpence per unit was the price for short-hour use such as lighting, in districts remote from centres of distribution. The three-farthing units were no doubt on their way to factories and to large towns, where a greater number of consumers helped to pay for the standing charges so that the average price could easily be three farthings per unit or less.

No other industry had overhead charges so high in relation to its operation costs; taking the tenpenny unit as an example the production cost was probably one penny, but it cost ninepence in capital

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

costs to bring that unit to a village. Double the hours of use, and immediately down comes the overall cost, as there were then a greater number of units over which the capital charges could be spread.

It was for this reason that public utilities were endeavouring to sell their commodities on a two-part basis in which, once the overhead charges had been covered, the service was available at a little above the cost of production and distribution—a great contribution to reconstruction.

MR. MAX TETLOW, B.A., A.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I. (Borough Architect and Planning Officer, Macclesfield) stated that the cost of supplying all services, including electricity, gas, water, drainage and streets, should be equalized over the country, and borne by the community. The fact that house builders had themselves to provide new streets and other services had been mainly responsible for Ribbon Development.

With regard to the control of design, he thought that the idea behind the Panel system was wrong. He, himself, acted on several Panels in Cheshire, and he could say that a large majority of the drawings submitted were rubbish, with which no Panel could do anything. Good design could not be created by criticism. Moreover, many builders were incapable of carrying out the suggested improvement unless it was fully detailed as a scale working drawing. In most cases, the plans were bad and incapable of being elevated, and the Panel Architect would need to visit the site, interview the client and redesign the job altogether, and then follow the building through to completion if a satisfactory result were to be obtained. Why should this work be carried out free by Panel Architects when the Architectural profession as a whole was there to do it? Surely, the only satisfactory solution lay in the better education of the public, and the compulsory employment of an architect by all building promoters.

MRS. G. MARRIAGE (Saxmundham) spoke as the wife of a farmer-owner. State ownership did not appeal to her, but she agreed that there should be some public planning control of the use of land. As an instance of successful settlement of industry in the country there was in Northamptonshire one firm of clothiers with factories in villages giving a good deal of employment to local women. As to culture, she asserted that village women were equal to townswomen. In her experience they were as capable and resourceful human beings as their sisters in the towns.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

MR. H. CROOK (Bristol) said that the City he came from had been much damaged, but the citizens were not discouraged. There was a local Development Board which was making suggestions in regard to the replanning of the City, including the decentralization of industry to new towns. They had sent out a questionnaire to manufacturers in the City, but had found that very few of them were willing to transfer their factories to 'daughter towns'. Some, however, were more willing to transfer to other parts of the City.

MR. H. SUTTON (Great Yarmouth) said he was Chairman of the Finance Committee and the Town Planning Committee of his town. The damage done by the enemy has especially affected the parts that in any case ought to be rebuilt. His Corporation owned a larger proportion of its Borough than any other Corporation, yet he could not say that in the past they had well used their powers as owners. It was the worst planned town in the country, except Salford.

CAPTAIN H. E. R. WIDNELL (New Forest R.D.C.) pointed out that people in towns did not understand the reasons for what was called the 'tied cottage', which was a cottage a farmer had had the planning sense to provide in the right place for his own workers. Where the farm was isolated the cottage must also be isolated, and if a man left the farmer's employment the farmer must get the use of the cottage for his successor.

MRS. MACKENZIE ANDERSON (Glasgow) suggested that every delegate should go back to his own city and consider what could be done to improve the amenities on the spot. Even in the slums they should try to preserve what beauty was there already and create beauty in drab surroundings. They could do much to improve existing surroundings by planting trees. She knew that National Planning was necessary, but there must be intense individual local and social planning as well.

MR. P. A. BARNES (Preston) said after the sacrifices of this war there would have to be more fundamental changes than the Conference realized. National ownership of the land was the minimum change necessary if we were to save the country. Most of the speeches at the Conference had been made by old men and by young men with old ideas. The rebuilding of Manchester and Liverpool could not be left to the hard-headed business men. Russia had given a lead by nationalizing the whole of its land, and it had shown that future culture could spring from the masses.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

MR. MICHAEL H. BRASHIER (Students' Council, Polytechnic, London) speaking as a student of architecture about to be called up before the completion of his studies, said that he had come to the Conference with the idea of finding out how the planning for the post-war world was progressing. He had been very disappointed in what he had found.

During the past few years, he and other young people throughout the land had been dreaming dreams of a Brave New World, where values were real and a common faith restored; and when this war was won and over, it was to this Brave New World that they hoped to return. But here at this Conference, after nearly three years of discussion he had found that the 1939 outlook was still in vogue—the bogies of the Bad Old World were still abroad! By now discussion should have been ended and action begun.

Three aspects of this 1939 complex seemed to him outstanding.

Firstly. How was it that so many speakers could put forward such different and conflicting ideas on the same subjects? Did it mean that their ideals were different too?

Secondly. How was it that to-day in the twentieth century, architects were still designing in styles ranging from Lutyens to Le Corbusier? Was it not time we found a common faith in our new culture and sought to express it in all that was made by man or machine?

Thirdly. How was it that so many separate and rival societies existed for architects, surveyors, engineers and the like? Was it not time they were rationally organized?

With all this confusion how could we ever hope to gain the confidence of the public in our work? How could we ever hope to educate them?

The time had come to face reality. The time had come for action. Throughout this country, in the forces, in the factories, in the homes, there was growing a vast body of people who, day by day, were becoming more and more acutely aware of the vital issues at stake and the need for action now. The immediate necessity was for all such people, including the experts, to be welded together in one corporate body—a *National Planning Front*.

Then, and then alone, could the experts, the architects, the town-planners and others, take their proper place as Brother Servants and Advisors to the public, and not, as they were at present—a medley of squabbling dictators!

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

MR. J. GRIFFITH (Newcastle-under-Lyme) had been greatly interested in the Conference. The Town and Country Planning Association should do all it could to get the Ministry to co-ordinate national research activities. Every city should prepare its plans and take its own people into consultation by means of exhibitions, meetings, etc. and we should get great enthusiasm for new and better cities. If substantial progress is to be made in local developments it will almost entirely depend upon local initiative which should not be unduly hampered by the Central Authority. If this is not done there will be a vast amount of talking and little happening.

MR. ERNEST SCHOFIELD, J.P., M.C.W.A., A.T.P.I. (Mayor of Harrogate and Chairman of the Harrogate and District Regional Planning Committee) asked planners to realize the importance of converting the working people of this country to planning, and also the rank and file of the local authorities. In the north of England there were great difficulties in getting planning ideals understood. He was Chairman of a Joint Planning Committee which covered 320 square miles, most of which they desired to preserve as agricultural land. He thought that nationalization would be necessary if they were to achieve this. He would like to abolish many of the old towns. There were certain areas of these old towns not fit for anybody to live in.

MR. ARNOLD MORRIS, M.INST.C.E. (Ministry of Health) pointed out that the model clause for Rural Zoning, without compensation, had not been very widely adopted by Planning Authorities, and he urged that existing planning powers merited close study by some previous speakers. He thought also that the Tudor Walters Report would still be found a valuable source of help for those speakers who had referred to building lines and house densities.

MR. GEOFFREY KNOWLES, LL.B. (Bristol) agreed with Mr. Osborn that the townsfolk were becoming country-conscious, but it was important that they should have fuller knowledge and understand the special qualities of village life. He understood the impatience of the young people, but it was unfair and dangerous to talk as if all our difficulties were due to 'exploitation' which, he stated, was prevented by the Acquisition of Land (Assessment of Compensation) Act, 1919. The law of Compensation was capable of improvement and the Act should be amended, but there was no need to abandon the principle of fair play and moderation on which the Act was based.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION

MR. B. R. CONNELL (Farnborough and Hartley Wintney Joint Planning Committee) thought that the Conference was rather short-sighted in confining its planning outlook to this country only. The decentralization of industry from great towns was essential, but how could we plan it until we knew whether we were going to have any Export Trade? He urged the Conference to face up to the nationalization of the land and to make people understand the tremendous issues of planning.

MR. WYNANTS (Technical Adviser, Belgian Commission for the Study of Post-War Problems) on the question of control of design, quoted continental experience. In Belgium the employment of architects was enforced by law, but this has proved no solution to jerry-building. In Holland there was a State Commission of Arts, analogous to our Royal Fine Arts Commission, but more frequently used. All the best buildings, however, were those that had been rejected by the State Commission of Arts. He mentioned that much work was proceeding in the matter of international economic planning.

MISS I. E. HORT (Society of Women Housing Managers) urged that every local authority should be obliged to employ architects for its housing schemes, and that the architects should have a part in the subsequent maintenance of the houses. Local authorities ought to take more trouble to find out what the people who were to live in the houses really wanted. In villages the Women's Institutes could help in this.

The CHAIRMAN, in closing the session and the Conference, congratulated the delegates on the full attendance at all the meetings and the vigour of the discussions. He asked the younger people not to despair of being listened to by the older ones. It took some time for any new idea to be understood, but if it were soundly thought out (as not all new ideas were) and answered to what numbers of people really wanted, it would make its way.

Appendixes

I

MEMORANDUM TO LORD JUSTICE SCOTT'S COMMITTEE ON LAND UTILIZATION IN RURAL AREAS

PLANNING AND THE COUNTRYSIDE

Your Committee has asked for a comprehensive written memorandum of evidence on the subject matters under consideration in so far as they concern the Association. It is realized that some of the matters referred to in the present Evidence may seem to be not strictly within the terms of reference of the Committee. They are included because the issues of Town and Country Planning interlock very closely, and the Association feels that some of its proposals (e.g. those for the guidance of the location of industry) and the reasons for these proposals, would not be fully intelligible unless their operation in respect of urban areas were explained.

I. ASSOCIATION'S EVIDENCE TO BARLOW COMMISSION

The Association, in its Evidence in 1938 to the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population, dealt with issues closely related to those now before the Committee. In that Evidence the Association analysed the prevailing trends of urban development and certain consequential effects on the countryside. Recommendations were made for a national policy of planning capable of controlling the density and spread of towns, and suitable administrative machinery was suggested. Since that date, various official and unofficial reports and surveys have been made which would enable later, and in some cases ampler, figures to be given in place of those in the Association's Evidence to the Royal Commission. This latter information, however, in no way qualifies or alters the balance of the considerations put forward in that Evidence, which represents the

RELATION OF URBAN TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Association's considered views on the issues dealt with therein.¹ Agricultural policy was not within the terms of reference of the Barlow Commission, but the Report of that Commission recognized (paragraph 38) that the problems of the location of industry could only be considered against a background of such wider issues of national life as the State policy for agriculture and national amenities.²

2. PRIORITIES: THE FAMILY, INDUSTRY, AND THE COMMUNITY

The Association, as is shown in the document referred to above, attaches equal importance to general living and working conditions in town and country. Its concern is primarily for a good physical environment for all the people of the nation, of whatever class or occupation. It does not overlook in this context the cardinal importance of industrial and agricultural productivity, since the standard of living, in town and country alike, is dependent on this. But exclusive attention to productivity, to the disregard of basic living conditions, would be putting the cart before the horse—repeating in fact the mistake of the Industrial Revolution. The only tenable purposes of increased manufacturing and farming productivity, and of a rising money standard of income, would be, and indeed in many areas has been, defeated, unless the masses of people can obtain good homes in open and pleasant surroundings. Further, if the grouping of the population, both in town and country, is not such as to promote the best attainable community services and structure, both family life and the efficiency of industry and agriculture will fall short of the best attainable. Thus, while the ultimate aim of policy should be to provide the conditions for a 'good life' within the home for the family and the individuals composing the family, parallel attention must be paid to the conditions which make for the productivity of manufacture and farming, and to the grouping of communities in such a way as to make possible the public services and social organization that minister both to happiness and efficiency.

3. RELATION OF URBAN TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Association draws attention to the importance of keeping the

¹ Evidence to the Royal Commission on the distribution of the Industrial Population, 20th and 23rd days.

² Report of the same Royal Commission, 1940. (H.M. Stationery Office.)

RELATIONS OF URBAN TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT

urban and rural aspects of the population-distribution question in due perspective. The broad situation, just before the present war, was that rather more than 80 per cent of the population of Great Britain were living in towns and cities. No less than 50 per cent were living in the twenty-two cities, or urban agglomerations, of 200,000 and upwards. Something like 9,000,000 were living in the one agglomeration of London, and another 9,000,000 in six others; 18 millions of the 46 millions of Great Britain thus being concentrated in seven great agglomerations. In these agglomerations, and in many of the other cities, the inhabitants who could spare the time for travel and could afford the cost, had for the most part sought suburban situations for their dwellings, and during the last forty years there had been vast extensions on the rural fringes. Many people with private cars had gone still further afield. The development of bus-routes, coupled with the desire of people of all classes for houses with private garden space, led to ribbon development along the roads leading out of the towns. The private car permitted a better-off class to make a still further penetration of the countryside in the form of large country houses and isolated villas in gardens of one to ten acres or more, the type characteristic of Surrey, Buckinghamshire, and other counties near the great cities. But as the industrial and business concentrations in these cities continued to increase, there was little if any relief of housing density in and near their centres, where vast numbers of people, especially the poorer workers, continue living in sub-divided houses, or in narrow and congested terrace streets, with inadequate backyards or no backyards at all.

In some of the smaller towns (York is an example), it was possible, with much advantage, to clear the over-dense slum areas and to rehouse part of the displaced population on the same sites at a density of forty-five to fifty persons per acre, the rest being accommodated in suburban extensions at a similar density without imposing on them an undue daily journey to work. This was the essential intention of the housing policy of the inter-war period. But in certain of the greater cities the extension of suburbs succeeded in housing only a number corresponding to the additional, or immigrant, populations of those cities.

These suburban extensions were accompanied and facilitated by a great development of suburban railway traffic and of new tramway and bus routes. The added populations were given good housing

RELATION OF URBAN TO RURAL DEVELOPMENT

conditions, but often at the expense of much waste of time and money in travelling in and out. Very little, if any, relief of over-all housing density per acre in the crowded central areas of the greater cities was achieved. When, as in London and Liverpool, the municipal authorities had filled up almost all their accessible suburban sites in the effort to house their immigrants decently, and turned to slum clearance as the next stage, they found themselves forced to attempt to rehouse slum-dwellers on or near the slum sites, and at a much higher density than was desirable. Very little progress has so far been made (particularly in the greater cities) with the rehousing of populations living in areas where the number of dwellings per acre is excessive. This is the outstanding and long-evaded problem of urban housing. The recent tendency to build tenements at densities of forty dwellings or more per acre (equivalent to 150 persons or more per acre) is only the latest way of evading it. There is overwhelming evidence that it is a method not acceptable to any but a tiny minority of the people needing rehousing.

A drastic decentralization and opening-out of many cities and towns is imperative in order to provide their overcrowded populations with adequate space for dwellings, private gardens, and recreation. A study of the map of any typical city will show that sufficient space for these purposes cannot possibly be provided by internal rearrangement. Marginal relief may be obtained in a few cases by the cutting up of sites of large old middle-class houses for small house-plots; but this process has already proceeded far in London and many other cities, and the number of unwanted large houses is trifling in relation to the number of houses built at excessive densities and the space needed for decent rehousing of their occupants and for playing-fields. The only way to make possible, on a long-term plan, the rehousing of overcrowded great-city populations at a tolerable density is to reduce the industrial and business concentrations to which these housing areas are related. The method proposed by the Association in their Evidence to the Barlow Commission, and supported by a number of other witnesses, was a measure of restriction of the settlement of industrial and business establishments in the larger concentrations, coupled with the promotion or encouragement of settlement of industries and businesses in towns of moderate size and controlled density. Provision by this means for *part* of urban industry and the population employed therein would make possible satisfactory living

CONSERVATION OF RURAL LAND

and working conditions, not only in these latter towns, but in the cities at present overcrowded, on their gradual rebuilding at a lower density. Further, in the view of the Association, this policy would facilitate the imposition of effective checks on scattered and ribbon development; checks which would be more difficult so long as living conditions in the cities are congested.

Thus the safeguarding of large areas of agricultural land, and greater security of tenure for farming, is bound up with a policy of measured and guided decentralization from the overcrowded cities.

4. CONSERVATION OF RURAL LAND

The Association desires to emphasize, in view of certain erroneous impressions that exist on the subject of urban decentralization, that it has always been opposed to the waste of agricultural land in Britain, whether by economic neglect and consequent under-farming and depopulation, or by scattered or badly arranged building development. From the first, it was an essential part of the garden-city policy, with which the Association has been consistently identified, that the rural land around towns should mainly be reserved from ordinary building development, so that it should be devoted to farming and market-gardening. The 'marriage' of town and country advocated in Ebenezer Howard's *Garden Cities of To-morrow* never meant a blending of the urban and rural scene in a sort of universal suburbia. Howard proposed, as an ideal to be aimed at, the grouping of industry and people in smallish and reasonably compact towns, large enough for industrial efficiency and social diversity, but small enough for the townsfolk to have easy access to a surrounding country belt. The objects of the rural belt included not merely amenity and the provision of a more direct supply of fresh food, but also the human and spiritual value of contact with the countryside. The Association has always maintained that principle, and the rural belts within the ownership of the two garden cities of Letchworth and Welwyn have in fact been carefully protected from scattered or ribbon development, and largely devoted to the production of milk and market-garden and other produce for the people of these new towns. That the area within a planned town should itself be developed at limited density, with trees and grass verges in the streets, and private gardens and public recreation spaces, is an elementary principle of decent town development. It is consistent with a strict maintenance of the

DEGREE AND METHODS OF DECENTRALIZATION

distinction between urban and rural areas, which in the opinion of the Association has definite advantages of economy as well as of amenity. No greater disservice has been done to sound planning standards in recent years than the confusion which some controversialists have created between the garden-city idea and the prevalent practice of tentacular or widespread suburban development, which may fairly be said to be as antithetical to the garden-city idea as the overcrowded types of development (by-law streets and tenements) against which the outward sprawl is an unorganized human revolt.

5. DEGREE AND METHODS OF DECENTRALIZATION

It is academic to discuss an ideal regrouping of the whole of the industry and population of an old and long-settled country. The Association has never suggested the 'dispersal' or breaking-up of the great cities. That they should have been allowed to grow to their present excessive size was a mistake of national policy, but it is unnecessary to attempt to assess now the size to which they ought to have been limited. The proposal of the Association is that, in the longest-term policy that is useful or practicable to lay down, the coverage, or extent of the built-up areas, of existing large cities must be accepted, on the whole, as a given fact. It should be the national policy however, *to prevent, or firmly check, their further spread*; while their internal density should be gradually reduced to acceptable standards, and adequate open spaces introduced, as rapidly as industrial and other circumstances permit. In normal times the process of decentralization must largely be limited by opportunities of taking advantage of industrial and business changes—the discontinuance of individual undertakings, removals forced by the difficulty of extensions on existing sites, slum clearances and piecemeal town-improvement schemes, and so on. There are also 'factory slums' and other congested business areas to which the principle of slum-clearance, coupled with the provision of better accommodation elsewhere, might be applied. War damage to industrial and business areas, and war-time evacuations of businesses, have in some towns made possible larger steps to decentralization than would normally be possible in an equivalent period. Re-location of establishments evacuated from all large and congested cities during the war should be subject to the same principle of restriction, or public consent, that was proposed by the Barlow Royal Commission for new establishments in London.

PRINCIPLES OF REGROUPING

The fact that many city workers have also been evacuated, and many houses destroyed, gives exceptional opportunities of opening out areas of the congested cities, and of placing some of the industrial equipment and dwellings in other situations. The severance of social ties, and the upheaval of community life, which would normally be obstacles to change, have occurred on a large scale; and a substantial measure of regrouping is thus rendered possible without addition to the temporary hardships to individuals. For these and other reasons the period immediately after the war will provide a favourable opportunity for *beginning* the policy of decentralization.

6. PRINCIPLES OF REGROUPING

The Barlow Report recommended 'Decentralization or dispersal, both of industries and industrial population' from congested urban areas, and 'the encouragement of a reasonable balance of industrial development', with 'appropriate diversification of industry', in each division or region of Great Britain. It is clear from the Report and from Recommendation 6 (page 202), which was agreed to by all the Commission, that neither decentralization nor dispersal were meant to suggest the scattering of industry and population over the countryside. The Association, as a result of its experience in industrial and community settlement, would strongly stress the importance in general of the regrouping of decentralized industry and population in town-units of reasonable size. This is desirable, both for reasons of industrial efficiency and for social reasons. While there are many industries, now or formerly located in congested and over-large cities, which could be efficiently served and profitably carried on in towns of 15,000 to 60,000, there are comparatively few that could be so carried on in very small villages or in isolated country situations, for the reasons stated in paragraph 7. Satisfactory social, educational, and cultural conditions for industrial workers also require the grouping of population in towns of moderate size, for reasons amplified in paragraph 8.

7. TOWN REQUIREMENTS OF INDUSTRY

Typical modern industry normally requires a full complement of public services, including electricity, gas, water, and main drainage. It is sometimes possible to provide these in fairly small urban units, but they are likely to reach maximum efficiency and cheapness where

TOWN REQUIREMENTS OF INDUSTRY

a number of industries and a moderately large population are gathered together. Industry needs some elasticity in the supply of workers; and a reasonably diverse group provides for some dovetailing and seasonal interchange. The 'linkages' between industries, chiefly in the matter of supplies of manufactured parts and materials, do not usually require close proximity; they involve inter-works visits, but these are possible without undue cost up to distances of 20, 30, or even 40 miles. Transport costs on materials are often a matter of relative unimportance as between a number of situations within the same region. So also are transport costs on finished goods where (as is often the case) the market is a national one or spread over a fairly wide area of the country, and where the value of the produce is fairly high in relation to bulk. There are many other minor factors which make an urban situation advantageous as against a rural or isolated one; including a good shopping centre, a well-equipped railway depot, road transport services, restaurants, hotels, 'head-office' postal facilities, garages, and mechanical repair services. These are rarely adequate in a unit of less than 15,000 to 20,000, and probably improve in convenience up to 40,000 or even a somewhat higher population.

The term 'town' is necessarily here used rather loosely. Where there are a number of villages within a few miles, the populations stated might be regarded as including the neighbouring villages and farms which use the town as a centre.

8. SOCIAL NEEDS OF AN INDUSTRIAL POPULATION

Industrial workers are accustomed to services and institutions that demand an urban unit of a fair size. Their public service requirements are analogous to those of industry. They require a 'main' shopping centre within 15 to 20 minutes' walk of their houses, with some choice of entertainments, cinemas, clubs, restaurants, public-houses, concert-halls, and many meeting-places for voluntary organizations of all kinds. The population should preferably be large enough to support churches for all the chief denominations, and groups for numerous pursuits, sports, hobbies, and leisure occupations. The sense that sufficient kindred spirits can be found by those of almost any special interest is of great importance, and this is one of the tests which some small centres fail to pass in the minds of people coming from larger centres. A secondary school requires a population of the

order of 15,000 and a technical school even a larger population—though either may serve more than one small town. A fairly good public library is possible, in a well-organized county, in quite small places, but it increases in interest and value rapidly when the population served rises to 15,000 or 20,000. A town of 20,000 should be able to sustain two good cinemas, and a town of 25,000 or 30,000 three. Health and hospital services can be reasonably adequate in a town of 15,000; the more specialized hospitals would be located in somewhat larger towns, but can serve a wider area, for example, a small county. In general it may be said that an urban unit of 15,000, if it were imaginatively endowed with community buildings and services, if it possessed a representative mixture of people (including those capable of social and cultural initiative), and if it were prosperous and well run, could be for the majority of workers of the urban type a very attractive place to live in. A high balance of social cohesion and group diversity is attainable in a place of about that size. But anything much smaller would be starved of some essentials from the urban point of view. And unless there were a full proportion of people with energy and initiative, even a town of 15,000 would be, as an industrial centre, unsatisfactory to many townsmen, though not to all.

The recent rapid spread of cultural education, and the rise in the standard of life, have undoubtedly *lowered* the size of the urban unit which is socially attractive; because an increasing proportion of people take part in activities of all kinds—there is a diminishing proportion of 'dead-heads' who do nothing and take no apparent interest in anything. But at the present time, and in the present stage of social development and general culture, it does appear that a population of 40,000 or so will produce a town and town services more acceptable to the majority of typical workers in industry. It is certain, too, that on the whole these larger numbers would be more satisfactory from the point of view of most industrialists. It is not, however, possible to be precise about these matters from the industrial or the social point of view. Some diversity of size is desirable in order that towns may not be standardized. It is also necessary because of the widely differing scale of industrial establishments. What can be said, in summing up, is that in a country in which there are many towns of 100,000 and upwards, and many which are admittedly far too large, the accent of national policy should be on the creation or

VILLAGES AND SMALL COMMUNITIES

development of towns of 50,000 or less, and that for a town which is primarily industrial, anything less than 15,000 is not usually likely to be adequate both technically and socially for most industries. Nevertheless, there are some firms, and some urban workers, who could be satisfied in still smaller towns, especially those which are the shopping and business centres for larger populations surrounding them.

9. VILLAGES AND SMALL COMMUNITIES

While the Association, from its experience of the demands and wishes of most industrialists and the great majority of urban workers and their families, stresses the advantages of towns of 15,000 to 50,000, it is of the opinion that much could be done to make the still smaller towns and rural villages better places to live in. Even in the large cities and industrial towns there is a substantial minority of people who do not greatly value the characteristic 'urban' amenities, or who value still more highly a more 'rural' way of life. Notably, there is the 'allotment-holder' or 'smallholder' type who definitely wants a piece of land, preferably adjoining his house, and would be prepared to do a normal day's work in a factory or warehouse and to spend many additional hours cultivating his plot and producing eggs, bacon, fruit, or market-garden produce. This may be an extreme type, but there are very many who feel a strong urge to be 'closer to the land' in some way, though capable of holding their own in industry also. To them a wide range of entertainments and urban social opportunities matters relatively little; yet they would not consider becoming full-time farm employees. Most of them have a strong desire for independence, which they wish to satisfy, or partially satisfy, by working, abnormally hard, in two occupations. It is a productive type and worth encouraging, and very difficult to provide for in a large town. It could be provided for by groups of homesteads either in the 15,000 to 50,000 town, or in smaller towns and villages if suitable types of industries could also be settled there.

Experience in the development of Letchworth and Welwyn proved that for many people, though perhaps not for most, there are great attractions in a very small urban unit. In some ways the social life of these two towns was particularly united and vigorous during the 5,000 to 10,000 stage. In a place of that size 'everybody knows everybody', and certainly in the two garden cities there was less class

segregation and income-snobbery, and more spontaneous amateur cultural activity, than commonly exists either in large towns or their suburbs or in long-settled rural communities. But it must be remembered that in both towns at that stage some capital expenditure had been incurred on advance development (services, churches, public halls, shops, etc.) that could only have been justified by an expected further growth. Further, the people formed a new group, of very diverse origins, with a pioneering and forward-looking interest that gave a special zest to social and public life. There was a good mixture of types of people, and of abilities, because in addition to the original rural population (some of whom took an active part in social and public life), there were also building trade workers, industrial workers, industrial managers and executives, and a sprinkling of prosperous residents who were useful in cultural leadership. Moreover, the average age of the population was low. While, therefore, the experience of the two garden cities undoubtedly shows the social attractiveness of small units, it does not invalidate the view that units of 15,000 to 50,000 would, over a long period, be more acceptable to the majority of urban people, and would be necessary for the provision of adequate services for industries and of normal urban amenities.

If, however, there are industries which could find their appropriate technical conditions and could be prosperously carried on in villages and very small towns, and if by imaginative planning and the provision of certain inexpensive capital equipment the same sense of forward-looking and local enthusiasm could be induced, there is little doubt that many workers, who now have a very mean and socially dull life in cities, would find greater social scope, as well as a better home environment, in quite small communities. It would probably be wrong, however, to conclude that towns of less than, say, 15,000 to 20,000 would satisfy the habits and needs of the average industrial worker and his family. In considering the merits of small country towns as centres for industry, an important factor is that many such towns have, as the result of past local efforts and bequests, a rich capital equipment of institutions, public buildings, places of worship, and so on, as compared with many recent settlements. Another is that an extension of the school age, a rise in the standard of living, and the general spread of education and culture, tend to enable smaller local populations than formerly to carry a complete set of cultural institutions,

UPWARD LIMIT OF SIZE

10. UPWARD LIMIT OF SIZE

There are definite social and planning advantages in keeping a town within a certain population and area limit where it can be done, and a population limit of about 50,000 has special validity. Experience in the requirements of the average family in this country shows that something substantial is lost in residential amenity if the density of any large dwelling-house area exceeds about forty-five to fifty persons per acre, including roads, though small areas may exceed this density. The very great majority (something of the order of 90 per cent) of the 'family' population prefer the one-family house—that is, the house with rooms on the ground floor, a separate entrance from the public road, and some private garden space. The amount of garden space required varies, but no class of the population can really be provided with what they regard as a sufficient amount of space at a higher density than about fifty persons per acre, while at least 40 per cent of the population require considerably more than this and in most towns can afford it. Where the houses are grouped at the maximum density stated, the need for public playgrounds and recreation grounds tends to be in excess of the accepted standard of seven acres per 1,000 people, but that standard may be taken as a reasonable rough guide. Adding a due allowance of space for factories, shops, offices, public buildings, main roads, and railways, it is not practicable, without cramping some essential function, to plan for an over-all town density of more than twenty-five persons per acre, and something between twenty and twenty-five meets the total requirements more acceptably. A population of 50,000 at twenty-five persons per acre can thus be accommodated in an urban area of not less than 2,000 acres, which corresponds to the area of a circle of one mile in radius. All the residents in such a town are within possible reach, by walking or cycling, of the workplaces, main shopping centre, amusement centre, secondary and technical schools, churches, etc., and of the surrounding countryside, while the minor centres (shops, churches, halls, elementary schools, playing facilities, etc.) are also within reach from any part of the town. If a town exceeds about 50,000 population, there not only arises a need of internal transport services for routine travel, but as a result some of the principal centres of the town would have to be duplicated, and the unity of the town is sufficiently depreciated to raise the question as

RELATION OF TOWNS TO AGRICULTURAL LAND

to whether the creation of a separate unit would not have a balance of advantages.

Admittedly these are very rough criteria. Much depends on the scale of the industrial units, a matter which may or may not prove in the long run governable by public policy. Under present conditions, the case for not designedly developing further towns to a population in excess of 50,000 each, rests on the fact that most of the 'mobile' industries could be well accommodated in towns up to that size, that such towns would be superior from the planning point of view to larger towns, and that for large-scale industries and very specialized urban requirements there is already an ample supply of suitable towns.

II. RELATION OF TOWNS TO AGRICULTURAL LAND

The Association support the view put forward by Dr. Dudley Stamp and others that, so far as possible, land of the highest fertility should be specifically reserved for agriculture. It is within their own experience that, in a housing area developed at about forty-five persons per acre, the produce from private gardens can be, and in war-time certainly is, greater in value than the produce from ordinary arable or grass farming of the same area including the sites of buildings and roads; while the freshness of the food so produced, and the recreational interest of producing it, are further very great advantages. But they are advised that the productiveness of these gardens would not be as high as that of market-gardening land intensively cultivated; and it would seem therefore that such land should preferably be reserved from building development. On the other hand, the building of a town *adjoining or near* land of good farming quality leads to more productive farming of that land, especially for milk and market-garden and other produce which can be sent direct to the local population.

The experience of the garden cities is that the surrounding farm lands have, on the whole, been more productively farmed since the towns were built. There has been a stimulus to housing and other developments in the neighbouring villages, and to the more rapid creation of new rural bus services. Many members of families living in the villages have found work in the new towns, and this has increased village income and prosperity. The farmers say that the higher wages in towns near their farms have made it even more diffi-

NEW TOWNS OR EXTENSION OF SMALL TOWNS

cult to retain their farm workers, but no land appears to have gone out of cultivation on this account.

A proportion of the town schoolchildren become interested in agriculture, and though few pursue this interest the main reason has been the excessive difference in wage-standards; moreover, preference in agricultural scholarships is given to students of 'agricultural origin', and there has been so far little encouragement to town children who are drawn to agricultural pursuits. The presence of a population, many of whom are uneducated in country ways, has produced some temporary difficulties (trespassing, dogs, etc.) for the farmers nearest to the new towns; but by a gradual process of education this has been largely overcome. The fact remains that the difference between urban and rural wages is a genuine difficulty, but it is partially, though not altogether, compensated for by the new market for farm produce near at hand. If the difference between the two levels of wages in the future approximates to no more than the difference in costs of living in town and country, there can be no doubt of the economic advantage of a new small town to the surrounding countryside. Its social and cultural advantage is overwhelmingly evident in the case of Letchworth and Welwyn, where the contact and interchange between town and country has been developed to the benefit of both.

12. NEW TOWNS OR EXTENSION OF SMALL TOWNS

The Association has advocated both the extension of small towns and villages capable of industrial development, and the creation of new towns. The latter policy is the one which has been exemplified at Letchworth and Welwyn, where there were only extremely small villages on parts of the estates, and the centres created were entirely new ones. The practical advantages of this method are very great. In each case large areas (3,000 to 6,000 acres) of land were acquired at rural value, and the whole of the site, including a substantial surrounding area reserved for farming, is owned by the developing company. This is of the utmost importance in planning and development. Not only is the developing company able under its leases to define the permitted use of each piece of land, for whatever purpose, in accordance with the plan, but it has complete control over architectural design and building lines both for the original building and any future extensions. Moreover, it has the necessary measure of

economic control. It can secure for the enterprise any increases of value within the whole area of its estate due to its development work and the growth of population. Planning is at its best, and development most remunerative and under maximum control, in these conditions. The developing company can be single-minded in its policy of attracting industry, and can spend money in advance on services and amenities without making an involuntary gift of betterment to properties under different ownerships.

There would be considerable practical difficulties, in the absence of new legislation, in applying the same degree of planning to the extension of existing settlements; and full economic control would be even more difficult. But if the whole of the properties in an existing small town or village could be acquired by a publicly promoted body, or one working on a limited profit basis, similar principles of development might be applied. It would be desirable that all properties in the existing town should be taken into hand as opportunity offers and leased afresh with covenants similar to those in the garden-city leases. Thus, on redevelopment, as properties reached their allotted term, any necessary revision of the old plan could be applied with full effect, while increments of value due to new developments would, at least partially, come to the scheme as a whole. If no more than the area for further development were acquired for the extension of an existing town, that development would not reach maximum effectiveness unless it were coupled with very firm statutory planning control of the old centre. There would be great possibilities, and great interest, in the planning of the extension of an existing town or village, to meet modern industrial requirements while respecting historic and architectural character. But there would be many obstacles which do not exist in the case of an entirely new settlement.

In the case of the addition of small-scale industries to villages which are expected, and intended, to remain essentially rural and predominantly related to agriculture and its ancillary pursuits, the capital expenditure on local development may not be large enough to make important the recovery for the developing agency of consequential increases of value. If such developments, by private initiative or otherwise, are to be encouraged by the State, it is most important, for the protection of agricultural interests, that statutory planning control shall be strengthened. In particular, the power of the planning administration to concentrate such extensions, and the

'MOBILE' INDUSTRIES AND ANCILLARY BUSINESSES

housing related thereto, in defined areas, and to preserve from building development large areas of farm land which might otherwise acquire building value, must be made fully effective. Such proper claims for compensation as may arise as a result of that policy ought not to fall on the local authority. Given adequate safeguards, industrial developments of this type would be beneficial to the rural community, and would provide a small proportion of industrial workers with conditions which selected types of workers would find very acceptable, though no such large proportion of mobile industry, or of urban workers, could be acceptably provided for by this kind of development as could be catered for in towns of 15,000 to 50,000.

13. 'MOBILE' INDUSTRIES AND ANCILLARY BUSINESSES

It is very difficult to determine, by survey or otherwise, what proportion of industries are 'mobile'—that is, capable of being carried on economically in a variety of different situations. All the factors in industrial location have a degree of elasticity, and many are incommensurable. Thus, for example, no exact evaluation can be made of the relative economic advantage to an industrial establishment of (a) lower average cost of transport on supplies and products, (b) the working benefits of more spacious and better-served premises, and (c) better living conditions for the workers, and consequent improved health and increased contentment or enthusiasm. In the long run the differential expenses of workers in rent and travel should reflect themselves in differential wage rates; but this factor operates very uncertainly, and there are many cases where a firm has chosen a site to save business transport costs at a much greater expense in transport or rental costs to its workers. Location is not an exact science, but a matter of broad judgement, in which for some firms sociological and humanitarian conditions take a high place, while for others they do not exist. It is the business of the planning administration to relate sociological considerations to business necessities and advantages, and this can only be done by consideration of each case on its merits in full consultation with the men responsible for the business success of the proposed establishment. The extensive researches recently made are of value in showing that there is a great deal of elasticity in the possible siting of many establishments. They cannot do more than this. They cannot, for example, be carried to the point of determining an optimum theoretical distribution of the industry and

POLICY FOR GUIDANCE OF BUSINESS SITING

business of the country as a whole. Nor is it necessary for effective planning to find such a theoretical distribution.

Roughly, it may be said that half the employed urban population are at present engaged in work which serves a wider area than the town in which they are actually working; while the other half are engaged in work that essentially serves the local population. Over a period, the distribution of the population depends mainly on the grouping of the first half. Within the first half there are all gradations of mobility, over a long period, from completely fixed or 'anchored' industries like coal-mining or clay-getting, to light industries producing for the national market. All existing establishments have a considerable 'inertia' owing to the difficulty of removing fixed plant and of transferring workers from places where their families live and where they have ties of habit and interest. Yet vast movements go on all the time as establishments are started, expire, extend or contract. The continuing redistribution is already subject to aspirations, ideas, and fashions in the minds both of industrialists and the general body of workers. No collection of statistical data can determine in detail the best distribution of industry and business even as it functions at a given moment. Still less can it foresee future developments in industry and consequent changes in the ideal distribution. But it can bring into the consideration of siting many vitally important public and social factors, not normally considered by those who must look at the matter primarily from the standpoint of business advantage alone. Without doubt a substantial proportion of industry and business has a wide choice of possible situations. The exercise of some public restriction and positive encouragement on the location of that proportion could greatly improve the homes and social conditions of a large section of the population now badly accommodated. The fact that to predict a complete and tidy pattern for all the national industry is beyond the capacity of science and calculation is no reason for refraining from the degree of empirical guidance of location that is clearly possible.

14. POLICY FOR GUIDANCE OF BUSINESS SITING

The Association do not propose the replacing by public planning of the primary responsibility of industrialists and business managements, or in the case of public enterprises, the appropriate departments, for the siting of new establishments. They propose, on the one

REDEVELOPMENT OF CONGESTED CITIES

hand, that restrictions should be placed on the siting of establishments (a) where there is already some congestion of population or buildings and (b) where urban developments would be detrimental to agriculture or nationally important amenities. This is an extension of the 'zoning' principle already applied locally. On the other hand, they propose that positive encouragement should be given to businesses to settle in areas where there is or is likely to be shortly, under-employment of a population, and good planning, housing, and social conditions are attainable, (d) in existing small towns and villages capable of satisfactory extension, and (e) in new garden cities and satellite towns where a fresh and better start can be made. This general policy was set out in the Association's Evidence to the Barlow Royal Commission. A few points are now amplified.

15. (a) REDEVELOPMENT OF CONGESTED CITIES

It is proposed that the Ministry dealing with Physical (that is, Town and Country) Planning (hereinafter, for brevity, referred to as 'The Planning Ministry') with the advice of its Regional offices, should schedule as 'restricted areas' for new industrial and business establishments those urban areas in which the concentration of industry and business is such that the population is either housed at excessive density or has to travel excessive distances to work. The standards of density and distance for this purpose require careful consideration; prevalent densities in excess of 75 persons per residential acre, or prevalent journey-times in excess of twenty minutes each way are suggested as indicating a *prima facie* case for restriction of additional workplaces in a business concentration. Even in such cases there should be no automatic prohibition of new workplaces in the restricted area. But any person or firm desiring to set up a new establishment for employment in a restricted area, whether in old or new premises, should be required to satisfy a suitably constituted board that the business could not without serious prejudice to its success, or inconvenience to public interests, be set up in a non-restricted area; and that the balance of advantages, private and public, would be served by its being allowed to set up in the restricted area. The boards for this purpose should be regional ones appointed by the Planning Ministry after consultation with the Board of Trade, Ministry of Labour, and other departments vitally concerned with industrial and business location, and should act under policy direc-

CHECK TO UNDESIRABLE RURAL DEVELOPMENT

tions and working rules laid down by the Planning Ministry. The boards should also be informed of the long-term planning policy for the region, and of alternative industrial and business areas available. Appeal from the regional siting board, at the instance of the firm or of the local planning authority, should lie to the Ministry, who would be advised on this matter by a central siting board similarly appointed. It is submitted that a machinery of this kind would safeguard the economic interests of individual enterprises and ensure that their case for choosing particular sites would receive full consideration, while firms would benefit by expert advice on the suitability of the suggested site, with knowledge of prospective changes in the area, and thus many mistakes disadvantageous both to the firms and the public interests could be avoided.

16. (b) CHECK TO UNDESIRABLE RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Rural lands of high farming potentiality, 'national park' areas and coastal strips, and districts of special landscape beauty, should also be scheduled as restricted areas. In such cases, as in the case of urban restricted areas, the prohibition would not be automatic. But any proposed new establishment would have to be argued before the regional siting board. The criteria for decision in this class of cases also would include the possibility of economic success elsewhere, while the rules laid down by the Ministry would provide for full weight being given to the possible detriment to agriculture, and to public and private amenities, and the consequential costs of public services, which would result from the proposed siting. Similar appeals would lie.

17. (c) POSITIVE ENCOURAGEMENT: UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

At the other end of the spectrum there should be scheduled 'favoured areas' where, owing to the existence of an under-employed settled population, either well housed or capable of being well housed over a reasonable period, in satisfactory social conditions, new business establishments are desired as a matter of national policy. In such areas, the Planning Ministry should have powers analogous to those of the Commissioners for the Special Areas; to promote trading estates or authorize the local authority to do so, to provide, sell, and lease factories and commercial buildings and sites, to advertise and make known industrial advantages, to pay the removal

EXTENSIONS OF SMALL TOWNS AND VILLAGES

expenses of firms and their employees, and to arrange with local authorities, housing corporations, and social service agencies, for all desirable accompanying developments and redevelopments.

18. (d) EXTENSIONS OF SMALL TOWNS AND VILLAGES

Similar methods of encouragement should be available for promoting the settlement of industry in small towns and villages to be specifically scheduled in planning schemes for extension.

19. (e) NEW TOWNS

In the case of new towns there might be no existing local authority to promote, or take the initiative in, development. In such cases there is a need of a new machinery of quasi-public corporations and of new powers for the larger authorities (municipal corporations and county councils) who could be responsible for development. Powers already exist under Section 35 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1932 for the acquisition of sites for garden cities on behalf of local authorities and profit-limited corporations. To these powers should now be added new powers, to the Planning Ministry and to the larger local authorities, to promote and finance public corporations for building new towns, and also to make advances on favourable terms to profit-limited bodies privately initiated. The new towns should be scheduled as favoured areas for industrial and business settlement, and the same encouragement given to establishments set up in them as to those set up under paragraphs 16 and 17 above. In cases where the financial responsibility is taken by a Ministry or local authority it should appoint the Board of Management of the town-building corporation. In cases where financial risk is taken by private enterprise and the profit is limited, the Ministry or local authority should be represented by a minority on the Board of Management.

20. CHOICE OF AREAS AND SITES

The choice of areas of restriction and encouragement, of small towns and villages suitable for industrial extension, and of sites for entirely new settlements, is a matter in which both the Planning Ministry and the regional and local planning administration, should take part. It is assumed that the Planning Ministry will have charge of the administration of Town and Country Planning legislation, that this Ministry will devolve as much as possible of its administration

to Regional Planning Offices, and that detailed planning will be in the hands of Planning Authorities covering suitable groups of local authorities. The initiative for defining restricted areas will normally come from the Regional Planning Offices, acting on principles to be laid down by the Ministry, after considering opposition and modifications submitted by Planning Authorities; the decision resting with the Ministry. For important agricultural areas, national parks, and the like, the initiative for restriction will normally come from County Councils, Regional Planning Offices, and Planning Authorities through the Regional Offices; the Ministry deciding, after consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture. The initiative in defining favoured areas will normally come from town and village authorities desiring or welcoming expansion, and will be sifted by the Regional Offices before final decision by the Ministry. The initiative for the creation of new towns will normally come from (a) municipal corporations expecting a 'spill-over' of industry and population as a consequence of the policy of reducing congestion; (b) county councils able to suggest suitable sites, whether or not they wish to take part in actual promotion and finance; (c) Regional Offices taking a wide view of the future development of their regions; (d) industrialists who would like to establish businesses with first-class technical and social facilities; and (e) private-enterprise corporations willing to establish new towns with the aid of State loans and inducements. It will probably be found that some of the factories set up in rural areas during the war could form the nuclei of such developments. From the proposals thus made, which would reflect local aspirations and economic requirements, the Ministry would select for promotion or encouragement those schemes which in its view best met the public and industrial needs of the nation, looking ahead as far as it could see. Its surveys and researches would enable it to judge practically the relative merits of the various proposals which came before it. Planning in the sense of dictating a tidy pattern of future distribution of industry and population is not only undesirable, but entirely impracticable, so long as a substantial element of private initiative in industry remains. In the sense of giving guidance, giving the benefit of the expert knowledge available, imposing rules and restrictions which avoid congestion or over-concentration, securing greater local diversification of industry, protecting the best farmlands, and promoting specific developments generally felt to be desirable in the

SECURITY FOR AGRICULTURE

national interests, planning is not only eminently practicable, but imperatively and urgently necessary. The Association thinks it desirable to emphasize these limited but important objectives of planning as they conceive it, because misunderstandings of these objectives exist both in quarters that expect too much of planning, and in quarters that do not realize its practical advantages and the grave social evils that will continue until it is applied under a national policy.

21. SECURITY FOR AGRICULTURE

The Association places high among the advantages of a national planning and development policy the increased security it would give to the farming industry over the greater part of the country. The nation has twice in twenty-five years had a demonstration of the importance of farming to the national existence in time of war. While it is improbable, in view of international trading and other considerations, that the war-time degree of intensiveness of home cultivation will be fully maintained in times of peace, it is to be expected, as well as hoped, that the pendulum will not in future swing so far towards the neglect of home food-production as in the past. The maintenance of a prosperous agriculture, as one of the aims of national policy, is likely now to appeal to the urban as well as the rural electorate; while the value of a pleasant and undegraded countryside, as part of the amenities of life for the whole population, realized more and more in recent decades, has been accentuated by the experiences of war-time. Consciousness of the delights of the countryside, and the growing appreciation of rural ways of life, however, will not reconcile the urban masses to the overcrowded and ungracious conditions of the towns; they have the opposite effect; and in the absence of planning and the control of new urban developments the enthusiasm for more open surroundings threatens the very amenities which the townsfolk seek to share. Decentralization of industry, the revival of the smaller towns, and the establishment of new towns, can bring new prosperity and vitality to the countryside and give a better and healthier life to some of the industrial millions. They are also the prior conditions of the redevelopment of the congested cities in a more satisfactory way. It should and could be the aim of national policy to secure that decentralization is coupled with a more definite reservation from development of the greater part of the farming areas

EXTENT OF POSSIBLE FURTHER URBAN DEVELOPMENT

of this country, and in particular to prevent further building on the farmlands surrounding the greater cities, in order that access to the countryside from these cities is not made even more difficult than it now is. Such definite reservation will facilitate a more long-term farming policy, and capital expenditure upon agricultural development, which is at present in many areas checked by uncertainty as to whether the land will be sold for suburban or ribbon or week-end housing purposes.

22. EXTENT OF POSSIBLE FURTHER URBAN DEVELOPMENT

It may be assumed that for many years to come the total population of Great Britain will show little natural increase. On the other hand, it is almost certain that it will be among the most important objectives of policy to check the coming decrease. The accent will, therefore, be on the encouragement of family idealism by fostering appropriate living conditions and economic circumstances. The policy adopted after the last war of giving everybody who wants it the opportunity of living in a one-family house should be adhered to. The overgrowth of a few cities was making this impracticable. Planned decentralization will restore its practicability. This will involve some expansion of the total area now devoted to houses and other urban purposes, but the maximum area required for new towns and town extensions is, on the most generous estimate, very small in relation to the total area of Great Britain or of the area now devoted to farming and grazing.

No reliable estimate exists of the population, in town and country, now housed at excessive densities per acre. About a third of the population of Great Britain have been rehoused since 1919 at fifty or less per acre. Of the 30 millions or so still living in pre-1914 houses it is unlikely that more than half are living at a substantially greater density than this; and it may be guessed that if, in the next twenty-five years, five million of these were rehoused elsewhere than in their present situations, the remainder could ultimately be rehoused on or near their present sites at a tolerable density and without any essential departure from the good housing standard set up in 1919.

The amount of land required for reaccommodating in new towns, town extensions, and village extensions, a decentralized population of five millions, including factories, workplaces, shops, roads, public buildings, and public open spaces, and allowing for extra large

ARCHITECTURE AND RURAL AMENITY

gardens and allotments for those who want them, would not exceed 250,000 acres. This is a very small percentage of the 30,000,000 acres of land now devoted to agricultural purposes, and only a fraction of the area that is now virtually waste and could be reclaimed or improved for agriculture. Most of the 250,000 acres would in fact remain open and under cultivation as private gardens, on which the food production in peace-time would be comparable with the previous agricultural production, while in war-time it would be more. It is practically certain that suburban extensions of a much larger area will take place in the absence of a considered policy of guided development. But even if the 250,000 acres were regarded as a subtraction from the total area of agricultural land, it would be a small price to pay for securing decent conditions for the whole of the urban population, and for the security and stimulus which could be given to rural life by the general policy proposed.

23. ARCHITECTURE AND RURAL AMENITY

While for the vast majority of the people good homes and gardens, employment, and a high standard of purchasing power (dependent on the all-round efficiency of national production), and a lively and varied community life, are the important things, and must receive first attention in national policy, there is nothing in those aims inconsistent with a civic regard for good design of buildings, and good architectural grouping. In the two garden cities it has been from the first a condition of all disposals of land for building that the external design and materials used are subject to approval by a Consulting Architect. In Town and Country Planning Schemes it is now common to have clauses providing for such control, but the degree of control exercised generally falls far short of that applied in the two garden cities and in certain private estates. The Association is, as a result of its experience, well aware of the difficulty of a general application of control of external design, of the individual resentment of limitation on freedom of choice and of the varying (and predominantly low) standard of taste prevailing. It is a troublesome fact that the poor taste and uneducated desire for individual diversity are incorporated in the plans submitted by architects, and result in a heavy pressure to reduce the aesthetic standard aimed at by any control. The local authorities and their advisers, whether they are full-time official architects or members of panels, find it difficult to go far

AGRICULTURAL POLICY

ahead of the public standard of taste in design; nor is it easy for them to contend against a strong desire for architectural diversity in neighbouring groups of buildings. The Association considers that progress in the standards of design and group-harmony will require parallel efforts along several lines, among which are:

(a) The adoption in all areas of clauses giving power to control external appearance and siting.

(b) An obligation on Planning Authorities to obtain competent architectural advice when they are considering plans submitted for their approval.

(c) A more general employment of qualified architects in the preparation of building designs.

(d) The strengthening of the panel system on a regional basis and the selection, for every panel, of architects and other persons of taste specially qualified for this very difficult work.

(e) Educational propaganda among local authorities, builders, and the general public, as to the meaning and value of good design and group harmony, and as to the give-and-take of personal interests that reasonable control involves.

(f) A definite policy of education in the appreciation of architecture and design in the elementary and secondary schools.

24. AGRICULTURAL POLICY

The Association can at present express no view on the great controversial questions of the size of farms, methods of agricultural organization, and types of farming which should be encouraged. These it considers are matters primarily within the sphere of agriculture rather than that of Town and Country Planning. While the Association considers that a final determination as between rival claims for the use of any land should rest with the Planning Ministry, subject to any policy decisions of the Cabinet, that Ministry should be guided by the Ministry of Agriculture as to the particular areas of agricultural land for which it is most important in the national interests to secure immunity from other forms of development, and no claim except one of greater and long-term or urgent national importance should be allowed to override the claims of agriculture.

25. GOVERNMENT USES OF LAND

The Association is strongly of opinion that public uses of land, and

LAND OWNERSHIP

claims thereto, should be subject to the same planning control as other uses, and that even in the case of land claimed by Defence Departments for military or other purposes, the view of the Planning Ministry, formed after consultation with the Defence Department concerned, should only be overridden by a decision of the Cabinet or of an appropriate Committee of the Cabinet.

26. LAND OWNERSHIP

The Association is aware of the arguments adduced by responsible experts for the State acquisition of development rights, and has submitted its observations on this proposal to Mr. Justice Uthwatt's Committee on Compensation and Betterment. It is also cognizant of the powerful arguments recently put forward for the acquisition by the State of the freehold of all agricultural land. It does not feel at this stage able to support or reject that proposal, or to enter into the arguments so far as they affect the economic or organizational aspects of agriculture. From its own experience, however, it can testify to the advantages of single ownership, whether by a public authority or by a public utility corporation, or by a private company or person, of the whole area required for a town or urban unit in course of development. And it desires to reiterate the point made in its evidence to the Uthwatt Committee, that, in the absence of nationalization of development rights or of the freehold, a national compensation-pool (or alternatively a grant from the Exchequer) is essential to secure the aims of planning, and in particular to permit of the reservation from development of large areas of agricultural land on the borders of towns without hardship or injustice to the existing owners of land with potential building value.

27. CONTROL OF DETAILED DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS

The Town and Country Planning Acts need to be greatly strengthened. It is essential that there should be a suitably defined right of appeal against the decision of an interim development authority to permit a building or the exceptional use of a building, as well as the existing right of appeal against refusal to do so; and sporadic and ribbon development must be effectively prevented.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

28. The main views and recommendations put forward relating to the terms of reference of the Committee may be summarized as follows:

(1) Agricultural and industrial productivity should be a main objective of town and country planning, but should subserve, and not have priority over, good living conditions for all, which is the greatest of objectives. (Para. 2.)

(2) Eighty per cent of the people of Great Britain are living in towns, and many of them in dwellings too densely crowded on their sites. More space is needed by these people for their houses and for recreation, and some decentralization of industry is therefore imperatively necessary. Properly guided decentralization will safeguard agriculture against the disorderly spontaneous dispersal that the reaction against bad town conditions tends to produce. The essence of the policy advocated by the Association is the grouping of decentralized industry and population in moderate-sized towns suited to industry and urban workers, and surrounded by wide country belts where farming will have security of tenure. (Paras. 3 and 4.)

(3) The immediate practicability of this policy has been increased by the changes brought about by the war. (Para. 5.)

(4) The Association supports the general policy recommended by the Report of the Barlow Royal Commission. (Para. 6.)

(5) Most industries of the urban type, suitable for decentralization, require conditions only obtainable in population-groups of 15,000 or more, and many are even better suited by towns of 40,000 or so. (Para. 7.)

(6) The social needs of most workers accustomed to urban life can be met in towns of 15,000 to 40,000 inhabitants, but are not so well met, as a rule, in towns of under 15,000. A rise in educational and cultural standards, however, and the provision of the right facilities, tend to make the smaller places more acceptable. (Para. 8.)

(7) Villages and small towns have special social attractions for many people, including some now in larger towns, and industries of selected character might be induced to settle in these smaller rural communities. The number of industries which they would suit, however, should not be over-estimated. (Para. 9.)

(8) Existing small towns, and new towns, should not be planned for extension beyond about 50 000. (Para. 10.)

(9) The industrial extension of small towns, and the creation of new towns, would bring many benefits to the surrounding agricultural countryside, which in turn would benefit the inhabitants of the towns. (Para. 11.)

(10) There are great planning advantages if the whole site of a new town is owned by the developing body. There are considerably greater practical difficulties, but interesting possibilities, in the planned extension of existing small towns. (Para. 12.)

(11) The control of the siting of new and migrating industrial and business establishments is the key to the 'planned' distribution of the population, including the safeguarding of agriculture. Overcrowded cities, and good farmlands, should be scheduled as 'restricted areas', and new establishments only admitted to them when no other situations are suitable.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Selected small towns, villages, areas of unemployment, and new towns, should be scheduled as 'favoured areas', and industries and businesses encouraged to choose them as sites. (Paras. 13-20.)

(12) The scheduling of areas should be done by a Planning Ministry, operating through a regional administration after discussion with local planning authorities. Suggestions are made as to the initiation of proposals for scheduling. (Para. 20.) The decision on individual cases of siting should be made by Regional Siting Boards under the same Ministry, with an appeal to a Central Board. (Paras. 15 and 16a.) Positive development should be undertaken by Special Commissioners, by local authorities, by public utility bodies, and by private enterprise. (Paras. 16-19.)

(13) The remaining farmland around the greater cities should be reserved as far as possible from building development. (Para. 21.)

(14) In view of the cessation of the increase in population, it is not likely that more than 250,000 acres of rural land would be required for the policy of decentralization recommended. (Para. 22.)

(15) The control of external appearance of buildings should be greatly strengthened, and should be coupled with general propaganda for good design, and the teaching in all schools of the appreciation of architecture and design. (Para. 23.)

(16) No recommendations are made as to the economic and organizational problems of agriculture. But it is recommended that the Planning Ministry should, after consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture, decide which areas of land should be specifically allocated to agriculture as against all other uses. (Para. 24.)

(17) Government uses of land should come under Planning control. (Para. 25.)

(18) Observations are made on the proposals for the State Acquisition of Development Rights and the Public Acquisition of Agricultural Land. In the absence of one of these, a national compensation-pool (or alternatively an Exchequer grant) is essential to protect large areas of farmland from development and to secure the general aims of Planning. (Para. 26.)

(19) The Town and Country Planning Acts must be greatly strengthened. (Para. 27.)

January 1942

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ASSOCIATION,
13 SUFFOLK STREET, S.W.1

II

NATIONAL PLANNING BASIS

1. A Ministry, advised by a National Planning Council, should be set up to guide future development and re-development, and the future grouping of industry and population, in order to secure the best use of the land and to conserve the national resources in the general interests.

2. The distinction between Town and Country should be maintained in all development, and sporadic building in rural areas discouraged. In particular, good food-growing land, places of special landscape beauty, and areas suitable for national parks or coastal reservations, should be protected from ordinary building development.

3. Good design and layout of buildings and roads should be an object of policy equally with sound construction. Outdoor advertising should be limited to certain approved situations.

4. In the rebuilding of urban areas, the density of residential districts should be limited so as to provide a sufficiency of open space for all necessary purposes, including reasonable garden-space for family houses. Wide country belts should be reserved around and between all cities and towns, so that town-dwellers may have access to the countryside.

5. New developments required by industrial changes, by decentralization from congested areas, or by the growth of towns to their planned limits, should be directed to other existing towns, or to new towns carefully sited to meet the needs of industry, agriculture, and social amenity. New towns and extending towns should be planned as compact units, scattered or ribbon building being prevented. All developments and re-developments should be planned and equipped for the encouragement of local community activities.

6. As a means to promoting a better national distribution and balance of industry in the regions of Great Britain, the Ministry charged with National Planning should have power (*a*) to prevent, except under licence, the settlement of new industrial undertakings

NATIONAL PLANNING BASIS

in overgrown or congested towns and in undeveloped rural areas, and (b) to offer inducements to industry to settle in suitably selected places. Business firms should retain full freedom of choice among areas where such restriction is not imposed.

7. In order that the rebuilding of overcrowded parts of towns on better plans or at reduced densities, and the provision of country belts and open spaces, shall not be hindered by difficulties of compensation and the number of ownerships, new legislation is needed to replace the inadequate provisions for compensation and betterment under the Town and Country Planning Act. This vital issue should be referred for expert consideration and report before the conclusion of the present war.

(The above Basis, adopted by the Town and Country Planning Association in 1941, was subsequently approved in principle by the Royal Institute of British Architects, the National Council of Social Service, and the National Playing Fields Association.)

III

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON SPEAKERS AND CHAIRMAN

- PROFESSOR L. PATRICK ABERCROMBIE, F.R.I.B.A. Member of Consultative Panel, Ministry of Works and Planning; Professor of Town Planning, London University, since 1935; Vice-President of the Town and Country Planning Association; member of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population, 1938; Consultant to L.C.C. on rebuilding London; author of *Town and Country Planning Preservation of Rural England*, etc.
- PROFESSOR A. W. ASHBY. Professor of Agricultural Economics, University College of Wales, since 1929; member of Council of Agriculture for Wales since 1927; President of Agricultural Economics Society, 1934-5.
- THE RT. HON. SIR MONTAGUE BARLOW, Bt., K.B.E. Chairman of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population, 1938; member of the Consultative Panel, Ministry of Works and Planning; Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour, 1920-2; member of Council of the Town and Country Planning Association.
- LORD BROCKET, J.P. Chairman of the Land Union; Member of Hertfordshire County Council; M.P. for Wavertree (Liverpool) 1931-34.
- L. F. EASTERBROOK. Agricultural correspondent, *News Chronicle*. Public Relations Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, 1940-1; representative on Agriculture attached to the British Embassy at Washington, 1941.
- PROFESSOR SARGANT FLORENCE, M.A., PH.D. Professor of Commerce, Birmingham University since 1929; President, Economics Section, British Association; consultant, U.S. National Resources Planning Board, 1940-1; author of *Economics and Human Behaviour*, *Consumers' Co-operation in Great Britain*, etc.
- SIR A. DANIEL HALL, K.C.B., F.R.S. (died 1942.) Member of Economic Advisory Council; Vice-President Horticultural Society; formerly Chief Scientific Advisor, Ministry of Agriculture; author of *The Soil, Our Daily Bread, Reconstruction and the Land*, etc.
- ALDERMAN E. L. D. LAKE, J.P. Mayor of Bury St. Edmunds.
- ERIC MACFADYEN, M.A., J.P. Chairman, First Garden City, Ltd. Chairman of Governing Body, Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture.
- R. H. MATTOCKS, DIP. C.D., M.T.P.I. President, Town Planning Institute, 1941-2.
- DR. C. S. ORWIN, M.A. Director of Research in Agricultural Economics, Oxford. Fellow and Estate Bursar, Balliol; author of *The Future of Farming*, etc.
- F. J. OSBORN. Member of Consultative Panel, Ministry of Works and Planning; Honorary Secretary, Town and Country Planning Association; author of *New Towns After the War*, *Overture to Planning*, *The Land and Planning*, etc.
- J. D. RITCHIE. Secretary, First Garden City, Ltd.
- THOMAS SHARP, M.A., M.T.P.I. Former Lecturer in Architecture and Town Planning, King's College, Durham; author of *English Panorama*, *Town Planning*, etc.
- DR. W. K. SLATER, Director of Agricultural Research, Dartington Hall.
- SIR P. MALCOLM STEWART, Bt., O.B.E. Commissioner for Special Areas, 1934-6; member of Council of the Town and Country Planning Association.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

- MAJOR W. HARDING THOMPSON, F.R.I.B.A. Chartered Architect and Town Planning Consultant, 1920-40; president, Town Planning Institute, 1939-40; Technical Consultant to Regional Planning Committees in Herts, Oxfordshire and Dorset; member of Council of the Town and Country Planning Association.
- PROFESSOR G. M. TREVELYAN, O.M., C.B.E. Master of Trinity College; Regius Professor, Modern History, Cambridge 1927-40; author of *History of England, Must England's Beauty Perish?* etc.
- C. P. WELLER, M.A. Bursar of Gonville and Caius College.

IV

LIST OF DELEGATES ATTENDING TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE AT CAMBRIDGE

27TH-29TH MARCH 1942

(Representatives appointed by Local Authorities are shown under the names of their Authorities; other Councillors and Officials not so shown attended in their personal capacity.)

Abbot, Mrs. G.
Women's Gas Council
Abercrombie, Professor Patrick,
F.R.I.B.A., P.P.T.P.I.
Adams, James W. R., M.T.P.I.,
Kent County Council
Adburgham, Miss J. F., L.R.I.B.A.,
A.M.T.P.I.
Alexander, Miss C. M.
Allen, J. E.
Anderson, Mrs. E. Mackenzie
Appelbe, Ambrose, M.A., LL.B.
Appelbe, Mrs. Ann
Ashby, Professor A. W.,
University College of Wales
Association for Planning and Regional
Reconstruction:
Forester, Lord
Entwistle, Clive
Resenberg, Gerhard
Tyrwhitt, Jaqueline
Baldwin, Miss E.,
Asst. Secretary, Town & Country
Planning Association
Barlow, Sir Montague, Bt., K.B.E.
Barnes, E. C.
Barnes, Mrs. E. C.
Barnes, P. A.,
Lancashire Branch, Council for the
Preservation of Rural England
Basingstoke, Borough of:
G. F. Paget, M.INST.M. & CY.E.

Benson, Miss Betty C., Coventry
Blaby Rural District Council:
Councillor H. A. Seville
Councillor A. F. Shoults
Blackpool, County Borough:
Councillor P. Round
Councillor J. B. Singleton
R. Brooksbank
Bliss, Miss B.,
Paddington Housing Association
Borthwick, R. D., Port Sunlight
Brashier, Michael
Brashier, Miss J.
Bristol Corporation:
Alderman J. F. Bicker, J.P.
Councillor H. Crook
B. F. Bructon, A.R.I.B.A., M.T.P.I.
Geoffrey Knowles, LL.B.
British Commercial Gas Association:
J. Hunter Rioch
British Electrical Development Association:
J. I. Bernard
P. Honey
Brocket, Lord
Brown, Councillor Mrs. H.
City of Oxford
Brown, R., F.I.A.A.,
National Federation of Housing
Societies
Bruce-Glasier, Mrs. Katharine
Burke, Miss Helen

LIST OF DELEGATES

- Button, H. V., Nottingham
 Byford, Miss J. T., B.A.R.C.H., A.R.I.B.A.,
 Coventry
 Cadbury, George,
 West Midland Group on Post-War
 Reconstruction and Planning
 Cadbury, G. W.,
 Stepney Reconstruction Group
 Cadbury, Paul S.,
 West Midland Group on Post-War
 Reconstruction and Planning
 Cambridgeshire Rural Community
 Council:
 Miss D. M. Darrington
 Chesterman, A. de M., F.L.A.S.
 Chesterton, Miss E., A.R.I.B.A., A.A.
 DIP.L., Woodbridge
 Clarke, E. J., F.S.I., F.A.I., Bristol
 Cleminson, H.M.,
 Vice-President, Institute of Trans-
 port
 Cleminson, Mrs. H. M.
 Cobb, A.R.,
 Secretary, Architectural Science
 Group of Research Board, R.I.B.A.
 Connell, B. R.,
 Farnborough and Hartley Wintney
 Joint Planning Committee
 Craven, C. G., M.T.P.I., M.INST.
 M. & C.V.E., City of Sheffield
 Dale, T. Lawrence, F.R.I.B.A., Oxford
 Dalley, F. W.,
 Railway Clerks Association
 Denby, Miss Elizabeth
 Doncaster, Miss A.
 Dorset County Council:
 Major F. Holland Swann
 B. C. Roe
 G. Geoffrey Clark, L.R.I.B.A.
 Mrs. Geoffrey Clark
 Dussault, L. L., F.R.I.B.A.,
 Stratford-on-Avon
 Easington Rural District Council:
 Councillor Mrs. F. M. Peart
 Councillor T. Laing
 East, F. A. H.
 Easterbrook, L.F.,
 News Chronicle Agriculture Corre-
 spondent
 Easterbrook, Mrs. L. F.
 Eden, W. A.
 Edwards, J. Ralph, A.R.W.A., F.R.I.B.A.,
 Bristol Society of Architects
 Edwards, S. Brassey, B.ENG.
 Engholm, T., Ministry of Agriculture
 Florence, Professor Sargent, M.A., PH.D.,
 University of Birmingham
 Ford, E. H., M.INST.C.E.,
 City Engineer and Surveyor,
 Coventry
 Forman, R. S., London Press Exchange
 Friedman, Leopold
 Gardiner, H. Rolf,
 Springhead Estate, Shaftesbury
 Gaunt, Percy
 Gibson, D. E. E., M.A., A.R.I.B.A.,
 City of Coventry
 Gibson, Mrs. W. M., B.A.
 Goldfinger, E., D.P.L.G.
 Goldfinger, Mrs. E.
 Great Yarmouth County Borough:
 Councillor H. Sutton
 K. K. Parker
 Griffiths, Miss J., A.A.DIP., A.R.I.B.A.
 Habershon, M. E., M.ENG.,
 Borough Engineer & Surveyor,
 Walsall
 Hall, Sir Daniel, K.C.B., F.R.S.
 Halliday, F. L., F.R.I.B.A., A.M.T.P.I.,
 University of Manchester
 Halton, Miss E.
 Hamilton, Miss Esther
 Hamilton, Miss M. M.
 Hardern, L. H.
 Harris, Miss M.
 Harrogate County Borough:
 Councillor Ernest Schofield, J.P.,
 M.C.W.A., A.T.P.I. (Mayor)
 J. M. Dodds
 L. H. Clarke
 D. W. Riley
 Hardy, Mrs. Saxmundham
 Hart, G. W.
 Haverhill Urban District Council:
 Alderman J. B. Coster, J.P.
 B. L. Radford
 J. H. Clarke
 Haythornthwaite, Mrs. E. B.,
 Council for the Preservation of Rural
 England, Sheffield Branch

LIST OF DELEGATES

Heck, H. W. J., DIP.T.P. (LOND.),
Northamptonshire County Council
Holland, J. L.
Homer, W. D., Cambridge
Homer, Mrs. W. D., B.SC., Cambridge
Hornby, Miss
Horton, Edmund N., M.I., STRUCT.E.,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 3
Horton, Mrs. E. N.
Houghton, T., A.M.T.P.I.,
Fylde & Garstang Joint Planning
Committee
Howard, D. G., Kingswood
Howard, Mrs. D.
Hughes, Roy V.,
Engineers' Dept., L.M. & S. Railway
Hulley, W. L., Coventry
Jellicoe, G. A., F.R.I.B.A.
Johnson, B. H.
Keene, Councillor C. R.,
City of Leicester
Keene, Mrs. C. R.
Kelting, Miss J. L.
Kingston, E. R., Nottingham
Kirkcaldy, Royal Burgh:
Councillor Andrew Dall
D. S. Wishart, A.M.INST.C.E., A.M.T.P.I.
Lake, Alderman E. L. D.,
Mayor of Bury St. Edmunds
Leicester, City:
John L. Beckett, M.INST.C.E.
Ledeboer, Miss J. G., A.R.I.B.A.
Leigh-Breese, P. L.,
Secretary, The Guinness Trust
Liepmann, Miss K.
Lock, Max, Hull School of Architecture
Lupton, Miss A. M.,
Vice-Chairman, The Housing
Centre
Macfadyen, Eric,
Chairman, First Garden City Ltd.
Macfadyen, Dr. N., M.B., D.P.H.,
Chairman of Executive, Town and
Country Planning Association
Macfarlane, P. W., P.A.S.I.
Maidenhead, Borough:
Alderman L. R. F. Oldershaw, J.P.
Malessa, S.,
Director of Planning Office, Polish
Ministry of Labour

Manchester and District Regional
Planning Committee:
A. Fellows
Manchester Corporation:
Councillor H. Lomax
Councillor T. Nally
Councillor G. C. Roberts, F.I.A.A.
Councillor W. H. Scholfield,
F.S.I., F.A.I.
R. Nicholas, B.SC., M.INST.C.E., M.T.P.I.
Manktelow, A. R.,
Ministry of Agriculture
Mann, ex-Bailie Jean, J.P.,
Secretary of Scottish Branch, Town
and Country Planning Association
Marriage, Mrs. G., Saxmundham
Marshall, Lt. P. J., Coventry
Mattocks, R. H., DIP.C.D., M.T.P.I.,
F.I.L.A., Leeds
McAllister, Gilbert, M.A.
McAllister, Mrs. E., M.A.,
Organizing Secretary, Town and
Country Planning Association
Miall, Mrs. L., Ministry of Agriculture
Middlesex County Council:
Mr. R. Grant
Monypenney, Miss J.,
British Commercial Gas Association
Morris, Arnold, Ministry of Health
Nantyglo & Blaina Urban District
Council:
Councillor John Jones
National Council of Social Service:
Mr. John Smeal
Needham, C., A.M.INST.C.E.,
Borough Engineer, New Malden
Needham, Major C. W. C., F.R.I.B.A.,
York
Needham, Mrs. C. W. C.
Newbold, H. Bryant, F.R.I.B.A.
Editor, *Official Architect*
New Forest Rural District Council:
Captain H. E. R. Widnell
Mr. A. E. N. Ashford
Newcastle-under-Lyme, Borough:
Alderman A. Moran, J.P.
J. Griffiths
Newman, H. Edward,
Editor, *Ideal Home*

LIST OF DELEGATES

- N.E. Lancs. Joint Planning Committee:
P. L. Hughes, A.M.T.P.I.
- Old Fletton Urban District Council:
S. Haigh
- Oldacre, Alfred L.,
The Peak Joint Planning Committee
- Orwin, C. S., M.A., D.LITT.,
Agricultural Economics Research
Institute, Oxford
- Osborn, F. J.,
Hon. Secretary, Town and Country
Planning Association
- Osborn, Mrs., M.P., M.A., J.P.
- Osborn, Miss Lesley M.
- Oxenbury, T. B.,
East Suffolk County Council
- Parker, Barry, F.R.I.B.A., F.P.T.P.I.
- Parkes, C. B., Bournville Village Trust
- Penrose, A. P. D.
- Peterborough City:
Alderman R. C. Howard
F. J. Smith
- Pidgeon, Raymond V., A.I.A.A.
- Pidgeon, Mrs. Monica,
Architectural Design and Construction
- Plumridge, E. N., Bury St. Edmunds
- Pott, Anthony
- Price, Miss B. M.
- Priestley, Dr. R.,
Chairman, West Midland Group on
Post-War Reconstruction and Plan-
ning
- Radmore, Victor C.
- Richards, Miss M.
- Ritchie, J. D.,
First Garden City Ltd., Letchworth
- Roberts, R. J. S.
- Rochford Rural District Council:
Councillor E. O. Hocking
S. C. Harris
- Rosenthal, H.
- Rosevear, Major J. A., F.S.I., DIP.T.P.
(LOND.)
Director, First Garden City Ltd.
- Ruislip-Northwood Urban District
Council:
Councillor Mrs. B. G. Reid
- Sanderson, Lady,
Chairman, Women's Advisory
Housing Council
- Sayner, J. H., F.R.I.B.A., M.T.P.I.,
South Bucks Joint Planning Com-
mittee
- Scott, Peter, Wales Survey Board
- Scott, Mrs. Peter
- Seaham Urban District Council:
Councillor J. Pigg
- Sharp, Thomas, M.A., M.T.P.I.
- Slater, Dr. W. K., Dartington Hall
- Smith-Saville, J. R.
- Society of Women Housing Managers:
Miss I. E. Hort
- Solomon, Miss M. C.,
Acting Secretary, Housing Centre
- Spence, Kenneth,
Council for the Preservation of Rural
England
- Stamp, Dr. L. Dudley, D.Sc.,
Land Utilisation Survey
- Stevenson, Councillor Mrs. P. M.,
City of Oxford
- Stewart, Sir P. Malcolm, Bt., O.B.E.
- Steed, F. Streeton,
Co-operative Permanent Building
Society
- Swancott, Miss F. M.
- Tabor, Miss W. R., Housing Manager
- Taylor, M. E., A.R.I.B.A.,
Monmouthshire County Council
- Tennant, Mrs. Peter
- Tetlow, Max, B.A., A.R.I.B.A.,
Borough Architect, Macclesfield
- Thompson, Major W. Harding,
F.R.I.B.A., F.P.T.P.I.
- Thurrock Urban District Council:
Councillor J. Waterson
G. F. Andrassy
A. E. Poole
- Towndrow, F. E., A.R.I.B.A.
- Trevelyan, Professor G. M., O.M., C.B.E.,
University of Cambridge
- Trevelyan, Lady
- Urmston Urban District Council:
E. L. Leeming
- Waide, W. Leathly, D.T.P.(LOND.),
A.M.T.P.I.,
Farnborough and Hartley Wintney
Joint Planning Committee
- Walkinshaw, C. C.,
Mary Ward Settlement

LIST OF DELEGATES

Watford Borough: G. Salter Davies	Williams, Alderman Edward, J.P., Borough of Wrexham
Watts, G. Goddard	Wilson, Captain R. G. M.
Weller, E. P., M.A., University of Cambridge	Wrexham, Borough: John England
Wilkinson, Miss M. L., A.R.I.B.A., Coventry	Wynants, M., Technical Adviser, Belgian Com- mission for the Study of Post-War Problems
Williamson, D. B., Institution of Electrical Engineers	Wynants, Mrs. M.
Witney, M. A., Watford	York, City: Minter, Chas. J., M.I.M & C.Y.E.
Wolters, L. F. I., L.R.I.B.A., Wandsworth Borough Council	Young, J. Clayton

V

A SHORT BOOK LIST

on the subjects of the conference

I. AGRICULTURAL POLICY AND PLANNING

- Hall, Sir A. D., *Reconstruction and the Land* (Macmillan, 1941), 12s. 6d.
Stamp, L. Dudley, *Fertility, Productivity and Classification of Land in England and Wales: Land Utilisation Survey* (1942), 3s.
Stapledon, Sir R. G., *The Land and To-morrow* (Faber and Faber, 1941), 12s. 6d.
Orwin, C. S., *Speed the Plough* (Penguin Books, 1942), 9d.
The Future of Farming (Oxford Press, 1930), 5s.
Northbourne, Lord, *Look to the Land* (Dent, 1940), 7s. 6d.
Committee on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas: Report (H.M. Stationery Office, 1942), 2s.

II. REQUIREMENTS OF DECENTRALIZED INDUSTRY

- Commissioner for Special Areas: Sir P. Malcolm Stewart, *Third Report. Royal Commission on Distribution of Industrial Population: Report* (1940) (H.M. Stationery Office), 5s.
Pumphrey, Roland, *Industry and Town Planning* (Faber and Faber, 1941), 1s.
P.E.P. Report on Location of Industry: (1939), 13s.

III. SOCIAL LIFE IN VILLAGES AND SMALL TOWNS

- Ashby, Prof. A. W., *Rural Education* (Oxford Press, 1923), 2s. 6d.
Thomas, F. G., *The Changing Village* (Nelson, 1939), 2s. 6d.

IV. ARCHITECTURE AND AMENITIES

- Williams-Ellis, Clough, *Plan for Living* (Faber and Faber, 1941), 1s.
(Ed.) *Britain and the Beast* (Dent, 1937), 10s. 6d.
Sharp, Thos., *English Panorama* (Dent, 1936), 7s. 6d.

V. RURAL LAND-OWNERSHIP AND PLANNING

- Land Union: *Evidence to Lord Justice Scott's Committee* (Nov.—Dec. issue of *Land Union Journal*), 1s.

BOOK LIST

Royal Commission on Distribution of Industrial Population, Paras. 247-269 of Report (1940). See above.

Osborn, F. J., (Ed.), *The Land and Planning* (Faber and Faber, 1942.), 1s.
Expert Committee on Compensation and Betterment: Final Report (H.M. Stationery Office, 1942), 2s. 6d.

VI. DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TOWNS

Osborn, F. J., *New Towns After the War* (Dent, 1942), 4s. 6d.

Simon, Sir E. D., *The Rebuilding of Manchester* (Longmans Green, 1935), 5s.

Purdom, C. B., *The Building of Satellite Towns* (Dent, 1925), 25s.

National Resources Committee (U.S.A.), *Urban Planning and Land Policies*, (1939), 1 dollar.

Howard, Ebenezer, *Garden Cities of Tomorrow* (1898). Out of print.

VII. TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING GENERALLY

Abercrombie, Prof. P., *Town and Country Planning* (Thornton Butterworth [Home University Library] 1933), 3s.

Mumford, Lewis, *The Culture of Cities* (Secker and Warburg, 1940), 15s.

National Resources Committee (U.S.A.), *Our Cities* (1938).

McAllister, G. and E. G., *Town and Country Planning* (Faber and Faber, 1941), 12s. 6d.

Unwin, Sir Raymond, *Town Planning* (Dent, 1932), 42s.

Adams, Thos., *Recent Advances in Town Planning* (Churchill, 1932), 25s.

Osborn, F. J., *Overture to Planning* (Faber and Faber, 1941), 1s.

Sharp, Thos., *Town Planning* (Penguin Books, 1941), 9d.

Towndrow, F. E. (Ed.), *Replanning Britain: The Oxford Conference Report* (Faber and Faber, 1941), 7s. 6d.

