A BILL

Make further provision for the protection and improvement of buildings of architectural or historic interest and of the character of areas of such interest; for the preservation and planting of trees; and for the orderly disposal of disused vehicles and equipment and other rubbish.

BE IT ENACTED by the Queen’s most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

PART I

Preservation of Areas and Buildings of Architectural or Historic Interest

1.—(1) Every local planning authority shall, from time to time, determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest, being areas which contain a building or group of buildings or land of special architectural or historic interest and other buildings or land adjacent thereto, the character or appearance of the whole of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance; and where they determine that any part is such an area they shall publish notice of their determination, with sufficient particulars to identify the area, in the London Gazette (or in Scotland the Edinburgh Gazette) and in at least one newspaper circulating in that area.

(2) Where such a notice has been published with respect to any such area, regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance in the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in that area, of any powers—

(a) in England and Wales, under Part I of the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1953 and the Planning Act;

CONSERVATION AREAS

Preserving the architectural and historic scene

A Civic Trust survey with contributions from:
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Message from Rt Hon Anthony Greenwood MP
Minister of Housing and Local Government

I am glad that The Architects' Journal and the Civic Trust are devoting this special supplement to conservation areas. Everybody accepts that the English countryside is beautiful, but it is now being increasingly realised that many English towns and cities too are not only beautiful but also unique. The texture of development, uninterrupted in scale from the fourteenth to the late nineteenth century, is now threatened by the vast explosion of new building, materials and techniques, as well as by the ubiquitous motor car.

If we are to preserve anything of the old scale and the old architecture, we can only do it as a part of urban planning. So it was fitting that my predecessors, the ministers responsible for planning, should have been given the task of drawing up 'the List', that list of buildings of special architectural and historical interest on which all our preservation efforts have rested.

Being 'listed', I fear, means only that a building is not inadvertently destroyed; it does not ensure that any use can be found for it. We are planning now for a much more active system of positive preservation, for a combination of legal, administrative and financial measures that will enable us to keep all that is worth keeping, and to dovelo
tail new building into it in a way which looks good and is good to use.

Local authorities now play a leading part in this work and they will have to continue to do so. Their record is highly uneven. The best are very good; they are fully equal to the responsibility, and devote care and resources to it which accord with its importance, but within the last year there have been really deplorable cases of listed buildings owned by local authorities being allowed by intentional neglect to fall into a state of dilapidation which makes demolition the only possible end.

We are now studying the whole approach to preservation. We began with the conference at Churchill College, Cambridge, held by my predecessor on the problems affecting historic town centres. We continued with the decision to appoint consultants to examine the problems of preservation and change in some typical towns. And we have set up the Preservation Policy Group to co-ordinate the studies and review the legal, financial and administrative arrangements for preservation.

The transfer last summer (on the advice of the Historic Buildings Council) of responsibility for the payment of grants for historic buildings from the Ministry of Public Building and Works to our Department was another important step. All functions concerned with historic buildings and planning are now under one head.

At last we are beginning to gear the machine to the task it has to perform. But let there be no illusion about the difficulties, or any assumption that legislative and administrative action by themselves are enough to preserve the more worthwhile parts of our architectural heritage. A climate of opinion will have to be created, among both architects and planners and in the public at large, and I particularly welcome the part which journals like yours can play in creating this climate.

Anthony Greenwood

Message from Rt Hon Duncan Sandys MP
President of Civic Trust

The advance of science and technology, the spread of industry and the growth of the population are changing the face of Britain at an ever increasing rate. As a result, we have to meet needs and demands of a totally new kind. This often involves replanning the street pattern of our towns and altering well-known urban scenes.

In the process of reconciling the old with the new, we usually have to make some sort of compromise. But it is not always a happy one. For we have not yet learnt how to marry preservation with progress.

I was therefore particularly glad to have had the opportunity last summer to introduce a Bill in Parliament which may do something to improve the quality of our surroundings. The Civic Amenities Bill, which has the full support of the Government, deals with three main problems—conservation, tree-planting and the disposal of derelict cars and other bulky rubbish.

The Bill requires local authorities to designate areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character and appearance of the whole of which deserve to be preserved. In giving statutory recognition for the first time to the concept of preserving areas of special interest, as distinct from individual buildings, the Bill extends the duties of Local Planning Authorities in an important respect.

To meet these new responsibilities, new thinking, new techniques and new methods of collaboration will be required.

I welcome therefore the decision of The Architects' Journal to devote its New Year issue to this subject. I am glad of the opportunity this gives to the Civic Trust to put forward some thoughts and suggestions. I hope they may be found helpful.

Duncan Sandys
WHAT WENT WRONG?

This was part of the historic core of a town of about 70,000 population. Twenty years ago, when the Town and Country Planning Act of 1947 became law, the town possessed 130 buildings in the old, central area of sufficient historic and architectural interest to qualify for inclusion in the lists to be drawn up under that Act.

At two points in particular these buildings formed groups large enough to create the sense of particular places. One is shown here. It consisted of fifty of the listed buildings forming two complete sides of a square round a rather fine church and churchyard, with some side streets and a big house on the third side of the square.

The County Development Plan, submitted to the minister in the early 'fifties and approved in 1955, stated: 'Every endeavour will be made to preserve buildings and places of archaeological, architectural, historic and scientific interest.'

At the end of 1966, only twenty-five of the original 130 listed buildings remained in the historic central part of the town. Every single one of the fifty in the area illustrated had gone. What happened here is not unique. It has happened all over Britain. The 1947 Act, which was intended to give a measure of protection to such pleasant corners of our towns, has failed to do so. In a mere twenty years irreparable harm has been done to character, dignity and urban values built up laboriously over the centuries. Unless the double process of conservation and renewal is brought quickly under more effective control, we shall, within the foreseeable future, have damaged our heritage beyond repair.

That is what this issue is about.
It is no light sin to destroy anything that is old . . .
RUSKIN, Modern painters

... a masterpiece must be burnt with the corpse of its author... against the conception of the immortal and imperishable we set up the art of becoming, the perishable, the transitory and the expendable ...
MARINETTI, Le futurisme

There is a great deal at stake: it is not a question of retaining a few old buildings but of conserving, in the face of the onslaught of motor traffic, a major part of the heritage of the English-speaking world, of which this country is the guardian.
PROFESSOR COLIN BUCHANAN, Traffic in towns

Modernisation is not a comfortable process. If it were, we should not have fallen behind as we have. We have resisted change for the sake of present comfort. Now, if we are to catch up, we have to change much faster than before and accept the disturbances that will bring. So it is not an easy process. There are two things we have to recognise. One is that modernisation does not depend only upon the growth of new things—it also means that old things have to die away . . . Only when that is recognised and accepted by us all shall we really begin to move.
DR R. BEECHING at British Jewellers' Association banquet, 1965

The question which has never been faced in this country is who is to pay the costs involved in preferring preservation to redevelopment.
RICHARD CROSSMAN, Minister of Housing and Local Government, 1966

I don't want to live there now, hemmed in by the ring road, the trading estate and the industrial estate, with hardly a word of 'Glavister' heard in the streets. No sheep in the park, no gipsies with wild daffodils, no eels cried in the street, no horses, no cattle investing the city, no identity, no living individual separate unique Gloucester-ness any more, just mid-twentieth-century England, brash, shoddy, restless, anonymous, without style, petrol-fumy, ear-choked.
R. C. BAYLEY, 'Where is Gloucester now?'
The Listener, 7 July 1966

Britain's international tourist trade (£500 million by 1970) is dependent on our unique attractions; on culture, tradition, pageantry and history. These are our 'hard sells' which no other country can offer. Yet all the time our basic raw material is being eroded by piecemeal and unplanned development. Our carelessness is becoming, to say the least, economically ill-adviced.
L. J. LICKORSHA, general manager, British Travel Association, 1966
Change is part of life itself: to deny change is to deny life. Why then do we seek to preserve old things? As a nation, do we not suffer the debilitating effects of living too much in the past, of unthinking acceptance of traditional patterns—in politics, in industrial relations, in business affairs and professional activities? The rate of Britain’s economic growth over the last quarter-century has been not much more than half that of France or Italy. If we are to maintain our position in the world, we have to learn to accept a much greater degree of change in many of our habits than heretofore.

Economic, demographic and social changes require to be reflected in the environment. Failure to adapt our physical surroundings quickly to new needs imposes a burden upon the individual no less than the nation. Here too, it may be thought, we have so far failed to match the scale of the problem with the requisite energy. Our stock of slum property grows as fast at one end as it is diminished at the other. On the other hand, enough has happened during the past twenty years to make clear the nature of the effects of rapid change upon the environment, more particularly upon the historic cores of our towns. Time and again, apparently unthinkingly, we have destroyed whole areas as single-mindedly as our enemies sought to do in wartime, only to find that what we have put in their place lacks every quality that was there before. In consequence the concept of preservation has taken on a new urgency.

Progress and preservation: the resolution, in the widest sense, of the conflict between them might with truth be said to be the issue that overrides all others in Britain today. Somehow these two ideas have to be reconciled. Specifically in town planning we are currently feeling our way towards new concepts and new policies in this direction. In particular the Civic Amenities Bill promises the first major extension of the duties and responsibilities of local planning authorities regarding the making of plans and planning policies since the passing of the 1947 Act. It is with the issues flowing from this long overdue piece of legislation that this Civic Trust survey is concerned.

Why preserve at all? The desire to do so is a comparatively modern phenomenon, the broad concept of which has, however, gained lip service if not acceptance throughout the western world. As a habit of mind it has its dangers. Conditioned reflex can too easily come to inhibit judgment, sentiment take the place of reason. What is the general justification for seeking to retain structures and spaces from the past?

In the preservation of individual buildings the Civic Trust proposed some years ago the following criteria:

First, the building is commonly agreed to be a work of art in itself: its very existence so enriches the environment as to constitute high claim for preservation.

Second, it is a notable example of a particular style or period: the fact that public taste, at any given moment, may not wholly endorse the value of that style does not invalidate the building’s claim to survival as representative of its time.

Third, the building holds an historic place in the community: few would deny the right of a parish church to be preserved, even though its value lies only in the accretions of time.

Fourth, the building has particular historic associations with great men or great events.

A fifth and more general reason for retaining old buildings, it was suggested, is that by their presence they lend to their surroundings a sense of the sequence of time. A town without old buildings is a town without apparent past and resembles, it has been said, a man suffering from loss of memory.

These thoughts have been associated increasingly with individual buildings. It is now seen that the
urban road pattern and the volumes and spaces associated with it can themselves constitute a work of art, even though the buildings may be of relatively minor architectural or historic importance. Such a view is readily accepted in relation to a unified scheme—a terrace, a crescent or a square: it requires perhaps a more sensitive eye to accept it in relation to an area that has grown organically through the centuries. Nonetheless, one of the great glories of English towns lies in the way that streets and squares and groups of buildings of many periods fit casually together with grace and harmony. Unless, within the context of progress and desirable change, we can protect the quintessential character of such areas, we shall have destroyed for ever an important part of the 'meaning' of Britain. This is not necessarily to seek perpetuation of the full status quo. There will be cases where we shall wish to define 'museum' areas. Sometimes it will be necessary to size up an area and say, 'We can probably keep this intact for another thirty, twenty, ten years. Let us resist the pressures as best we can for that period and then we will look at it again.' There will be other areas—and they will be more numerous—where what is needed is a dynamic policy for progress and preservation, the marriage of old and new into a coherent pattern or the building of new alongside old so that the two emphasise each other's character. This will involve new, mature and sophisticated approaches to those despised arts of piecemeal redevelopment and urban estate management on the town scale. What is required now is to establish planning policies within which these tasks can be carried out. Three main steps can be isolated in formulating such policies. They are: 1 identification of the areas having important urban, architectural or historic qualities; 2 the study of their characteristics and the spelling out of policies designed to provide for their continuity; 3 the administrative, financial and technical processes by which the defined goals can be achieved. The second and third of these are vital but cannot now be undertaken because the first step is lacking in present planning procedures. It is from the declaration of policy that actions flow: that we establish areas of outstanding landscape value:
areas of special control for advertisements; green belts; areas for comprehensive development or the zoning of areas for residential, industrial or other uses. So also we must designate conservation areas so that day-to-day decisions (on preserving, rebuilding, altering, adapting, changing use, regulating traffic; financing for preservation; provision of good street furniture) can all be taken in the light of declared public policy. The duty to establish such areas, as proposed in the Civic Amenities Bill, is the step forward that is needed. How then do we recognise them? Since the decision is clearly a qualitative one, any precise definition would be foolish. Nor is there need to define any standard size of area: it might be a whole village or a whole town centre, a series of residential squares, or some charming and inconsequential arrangement of a terrace of houses, a churchyard and its surrounds. Group value might arise from a pervading unity of style, as in an eighteenth century square, or from the extreme variety of period, style and historic evolution so often to be found in our high streets and market places. The number and concentration of listed buildings will be a clear guide, but by no means a conclusive one, since earlier listing was done ostensibly on individual rather than group architectural quality. The value of some places might be gauged from the degree of their attraction to tourists and visitors. Many of our cities, towns and villages rank high in the European heritage. Below this category there are the places sought for their urban quality by the British holidaymaker, the weekender and the day visitor. At a more intimate level there are those areas known mainly to the local residents, valued for their distinguished and familiar grouping of buildings; for their civic importance to the community; for their historic association.

The location of areas should not be intrinsically difficult. It will be the task of the 231 planning authorities in England, Scotland and Wales. Some 2,500 towns and villages, with populations ranging from one thousand upwards, can be identified in these islands and there might well be half as many conservation areas, large and small, to be defined. Brief general descriptions of the areas or districts might first be established by
each planning authority. Definition of boundaries could follow after consultation with local, informed opinion. It should be noted that the Civic Amenities Bill (in line with the thinking of the Planning Advisory Group) avoids long procedural routines, such as reference to the minister for approval and the need for long public inquiries. It places responsibility and initiative fairly and squarely on the local planning authority.

Matters which should be covered in surveys of potential conservation areas are set out more fully in later pages. They should include an appreciation of the history and historical development of the area; quality of buildings and groupings of them; nature of streets, squares, closes, lanes, open spaces, walls, monuments, gates, trees and all other features which go to make up the character of the area; condition of buildings; effects of traffic and economic pressures on the area.

It is from this type of survey that basic policies can be laid down as to the essential characteristics which should be retained, and the value and costs to the community of so doing.

While the primary responsibility will rest upon local planning authorities, they will need to draw upon advice and assistance from central government and professional consultants, and call for co-operation from municipal boroughs, district councils, civic societies, chambers of commerce, owners and other individuals.

Specific suggestions are made later for alterations to the existing administrative framework, stretching from the central government (where powers and functions relating to conservation have, happily, at last been centralised in one ministry) through regional directorates for conservation areas, under the regional economic councils; through subcommittees for conservation areas at county level, to joint committees at local level which would have a direct concern for specific areas.

We face the greatest era of building the world has ever known. Only effort on a comparable scale can ensure that irredeemable assets are not lost in the process. The most valuable areas of our historic heritage must be staked out before they disappear or are altered beyond recognition. Our policies must be to protect and to enhance them, and, where rebuilding and modernisation are needed, to strive for a modern quality that is equal to the best of the past.
Restoration in European countries is often painstaking and elaborate. Areas totally obliterated by war—St Malo (above right) perhaps provides the nearest example—have been rebuilt to their original form. Towns retained for their essential character are often 'frozen' at a certain date—later accretions being removed, original façades restored and so on. Czechoslovakia is one country that has a systematic conservation programme: above, the reconstruction of Cheb (two upper photos), the Square in Telč and, right, Český Krumlov.
In 1765 some 40,000 English were said to have passed through Calais during the two years since the peace of Paris. These adventurous milords and dilettanti were but outriders to the vast international army of tourists created by twentieth-century affluence and mobility. Today, an annual tide of humanity sweeps across Europe, washing the Mediterranean littoral, the ruins of antiquity, cities and villages old and new. In its wake it brings fresh problems and pressures, but also a sharpened sense of values. If the staging points of the Grand Tour may be presumed to have had greater charm before they were packaged for mass consumption, nonetheless a proprietorial personal sense of the European heritage is now more widely shared than ever before. For it is to Venice rather than Rotterdam, to Mont St Michel rather than to Vaux-le-Vicomte, that the hundreds of thousands make their way. When every allowance has been made for sun and food, ski slopes and skin diving, it is the historic towns and monuments of Europe which lie at the heart of the European tourist industry.

Tourism, indeed, is now the largest single item in international trade. It is not fortuitous, therefore, that support for conservation policies is apparent in new quarters. There may be detected, both in individual countries and in the various agencies for political and cultural co-operation, a quickening of interest in the problems of preserving not only individual monuments of historic and architectural importance but sites, districts and whole towns of character and beauty. By no means all European countries are as yet active in this direction and, in relation to the scale of the total problem, such efforts as are being made may seem pitifully small. The fact remains that, in many cases for the first time, the existence of a problem is increasingly recognised and this in itself is significant.

It is not necessarily rewarding to compare legislation in different countries. The nature of the problem can vary widely between agricultural and industrial economies, between regions of high and low economic pressure. A different distribution of powers between central and local government, too, may often make a particular solution inapplicable in another country: France has a century-long tradition of governmental concern with conservation; in Germany the subject is wholly the responsibility of the Länder. Nonetheless, a brief glance at those countries which are feeling their way towards broader based concepts of preservation may be of interest.

Poland has undertaken miracles of loving restoration to make good the savage destruction she suffered in the war, notably in Warsaw itself. Czechoslovakia, though she escaped major war damage, has mounted a systematic programme of conservation and urban renewal for some forty historic towns which, at the end of the war, were neglected. This programme of analysis, restoration, removal of accretions and essential rebuilding is perhaps half-way to completion. Hungary is of interest for the use she has made of local committees of architects and others, working in an honorary capacity, to maintain and clean up historic sites and monuments.

In Western Europe, the importance of area conservation has been recognised in the legislation of three countries. A Dutch law of 1961 makes special provision for listing town and village views—embracing not only buildings but also groups of other immovable objects. For twenty years Portugal has been applying central government effort to cleaning up and preserving two areas of Lisbon, part of Oporto and a number of small medieval hillside towns: Almeida, Marvão, Mões, Obidos and Valencia de Minho.

France, first of the nations to concern herself with conservation and having the most extensive

* See Architectural Review, August 1965 and October 1966 for a valuable résumé of legislation in twenty countries by Anthony Dale.
legislation on the subject in Europe, in 1962 passed the 'Malraux law' for 'the protection of the historical and aesthetic heritage of France'. This created a Commission Nationale des Secteurs Sauvegardés, under the Ministry of Cultural Affairs, with the purpose of maintaining the character of particular urban areas—where appropriate, whole towns and villages. It is hoped eventually to bring some thousand places within the scheme: to date about fifty have been brought in, and fourteen have been made the subject of pilot projects: the Marais sector of Paris, Aix-en-Provence, Avignon, Besançon, Bourges, Chartres, Clermont-Ferrand, Lyon, Pézenas, Rouen, Sarlat, Saumur, Troyes and Uzés. Areas are designated by the Ministers of Cultural Affairs and of Construction, on the advice of the commission.

Thereafter the ministries have two years in which to prepare a plan for the area, during which period no changes of any kind are permitted without their express consent. There are special financial provisions for making up to 30 per cent of the cost of restoration available to owners: if necessary, buildings are expropriated and restored by mixed economy groups, for eventual sale to the original owner or elsewhere. Tenants unable to afford increased rentals after restoration are found permanent alternative accommodation.

It is as yet too soon to study the results of this scheme, which is costing over £3m a year, but its outcome could have widespread implications.

In recent years, leads by international agencies have multiplied. The International congress of architects and technicians concerned with ancient monuments, held in Venice in 1964, drew up a new International Charter for the Preservation and Restoration of Monuments (the 'Venice Charter') which replaces the 'Athens Charter' framed in 1931.

Article 1 states: 'The concept of an historic monument comprises both the isolated architectural creation and the urban or rural site which provides evidence of a particular civilisation, a significant trend, or an historic event. It extends not only to major creations but also to minor works which in time have acquired a cultural significance.' That is to say, the charter extends the concept of classification to entire groups, whether or not in contact with particular monuments.

Article 6 states: 'The preservation of a monument implies that of a setting suitable for it. If the traditional setting survives, it will be preserved, and any new building, demolition or developments which might change relationships of size and colour will be prohibited.'

A Unesco Recommendation of 1963 called for preservation and, where possible, restoration of natural, rural and urban landscapes and sites; in detail, it called for areas and buildings surrounding outstanding monuments to be scheduled as well as the monuments themselves. On Unesco initiative, after the Venice congress referred to above, it was decided to set up a non-governmental co-ordinating body in this field. The International Council of Monuments and Sites (comos) was modelled on the very successful International Council of Museums and aims to cover the whole field of preservation in the widest possible way. Each country adhering has been asked to establish a committee of fifteen mem-

bers; that for Britain was formed by, and is under the chairmanship of, the Earl of Elton. At the first constituent assembly in Warsaw in 1966, twenty-eight countries were represented.

It may be of interest to note part of a document prepared for a Congress at Levoca in the same year by the Scandinavian Committee of icomos:

Paragraph 3 states: '... conservation which has due respect for the fundamental values of old towns, which have preserved the integrity and coherence of their urban structure in the heart of the landscape, entails the need to limit their growth. The beauty of an urban landscape consists as much in views of the town as in the beauty of its squares, streets and quarters. It is essential to preserve both. This means that no solution for the protection of historic urban centres can be conceived except in the framework of a regional development plan which aims at satisfying the general requirements of a region and at the same time observing the requirements set out above.'

In 1963 the Council of Europe began to seek means whereby to impress upon its member governments the urgent need to safeguard the historical and architectural heritage of Europe. Several Recommendations and Orders resulted. Acting on one of these, the Council prepared a programme of five symposia, or 'meetings of experts', each to consider certain aspects of conservation. Three have now been held— in Barcelona/Paris, Vienna, and in October 1966, at the invitation of the Government, in Bath. The latter, attended by nearly fifty representatives from thirteen nations, dealt specifically with the 'Principles and practice of active preservation and rehabilitation of groups and areas of buildings of historical or artistic interest'. The 'Bath Recommendation' there adopted calls for the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, among other things:

(a) 'to recommend to member governments that they take urgent steps to adopt special legislation or to adapt existing legislation with a view to preserving the character and general atmosphere of historic areas and the monuments they contain, and to provide special funds for this purpose';

(b) 'to call the attention of member governments to the need to prepare their development plans in terms of a genuine revival of such areas which will constitute an economic investment from
The European heritage provides a wider reference for judging standards of value: above, Avila in Spain, perhaps most perfect of walled towns; below, the Grand Place in Brussels, a museum choked with cars.

both the human and the financial viewpoint’. The Recommendation further calls for the support of the members of the European Conference of Local Authorities, and for those responsible for town and country planning: 'to provide for permanent liaison between preservationists, town planners and economic planners so that, when the need for preserving an historic or artistic town or village is recognised, it should be an essential and fundamental consideration in the preparation and execution of all development plans'.

The two further symposia to be held in Holland and France will deal with area preservation in the
context of regional planning, and with 'ways and means'. The work will then be consolidated for final action. In the meantime, the Council of Ministers in Strasbourg, showing an unexpected sense of urgency, has already adopted the Palma and Vienna Recommendations.

Out of another Council of Europe initiative has come a European federation of national amenity bodies—Europa Nostra. At present some twenty-three organisations, from thirteen nations adhere to Europa Nostra—the National Trust and the Civic Trust from this country having been founder members. Thus far the federation has suffered from the same weakness as its constituent members—shortage of funds. Nonetheless it does provide machinery whereby policies can be concerted and public pressure brought to bear when necessary.

Support for Bath

During the past year, for example, protests from Europa Nostra's constituent societies helped to stay a threat of development on either side of the Apian Way—the only place where the Campagna still approaches the city walls of Rome. Five thousand acres were subsequently declared a green belt in which development would be prohibited (a decision possibly to be challenged in the Italian Supreme Court). During 1966, too, Europa Nostra announced that it recognised Bath as one of the most important small towns in Europe and would lend its support to any moves required for conservation there. During 1966 it was granted 'consultative status' by the Council of Europe.

These are small things—derisory in relation to the scale of the overall problem—but they are straws in the wind. The peoples of Europe are groping their way towards a new awareness of their architectural heritage and a new determination to halt its steady erosion. In relation to the centuries over which that heritage was built up, these moves towards new patterns of collaboration have been speedy indeed.

Implicit in all these initiatives is the eventual emergence of a wider scale of values than the purely national. It would be artificial to attempt definitively to place national treasures in an international hierarchy—after all, we know Turner to be of international stature as surely as the French know him to be a provincial romantic. Yet, this having been said, it can be a salutary exercise from time to time to set local problems of preservation against the wider European background. It can help us to get our values in truer perspective.

Things visitors come to see

It may bring into sharper focus, too, the quintessential qualities which differentiate settlements in Britain from those elsewhere. In art, as in other respects, it is dangerous to speak of national characteristics. Yet as successive generations sift out the true from the merely fashionable, what remains seems not only to partake of universality but, at the same time, of certain recurrent national traits. These are the distinguishing marks of our country which foreigners come to Britain specifically to see.

Informality, a distaste for pomposity and absolutism, a poetic apprehension of nature—these are apparent in English building no less than in English painting. The reticence of the eighteenth century conversation piece is matched by the good manners of the Georgian square; a desire to work with nature and not against her is evident in the English park no less than in the landscapes of Constable.

Foreigners come to see the Highlands of Scotland, the Lakes, the Welsh mountains, the coastline of Devon and Cornwall, the Mendips, the Vale of Evesham, the wide skies of East Anglia. But also they come to see the castles of Wales and the north—the finest fortified buildings of their period in Europe; the great cathedrals—lacking the formal grandeur of their Continental equivalents but possessing a delicacy and intricacy of their own; our medieval town and village building—sometimes only a street or two, Mercery Lane in Canterbury or Elm Hill in Norwich, more grandly an Oxford, a Lavenham or a Rye. They come to see our country houses, set in gently rolling parkland—enduring monuments to a solid civilised way of life that showed the world how social excess could be avoided; to see too their urban equivalents—the crescents of Bath, the interlocking spaces of Stamford, the more intimate charm of villages such as Lacock and Blanchland. Such as these belong, not only to Britain, but also to Europe and the world. It is our responsibility to identify them with precision, guard them with care. Should we fail to do so, mankind as a whole will be the poorer.
When the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act was passed, its provision for listing buildings of architectural and historic interest, and so giving them some measure of protection, seemed to represent a great step forward. Now, after twenty years, we can see the inadequacy of this provision. It is not merely that the machinery sometimes fails to work, although that is serious enough; it is that we did not set our sights high enough. The target we now realise, must be to keep, not just individual buildings scattered here and there about our towns, but whole town centres, or substantial parts of them.

Every ancient city has a street pattern or form which was designed, or which grew organically, to serve the needs of the age in which it was developed. The recording and analysis of these street patterns is not just an academic exercise. The Council for British Archaeology feels that such plans merit preservation. They will become much more precious as time goes on, because some will inevitably be destroyed. Furthermore, these historic streets and open spaces tend to possess the very qualities which are now recognised to be the basis of good environment. Nearly always they make good townscape. Their visual and psychological effects depend on subtle elements of scale, proportion and the like which, however, can easily be ruined by injudicious road-widening, or even removal of a single building.

The quality of each town is unique. Nevertheless, it is essential to devise a practicable way, within the framework of legislation, of setting standards and providing guidelines for local policy. The task of demonstrating how to move forward from the piecemeal approach of listing individual buildings to listing towns, and analysing their character, has been undertaken by the Council for British Archaeology. The classification which follows, and the analysis on which it is based, has been taken from the memoranda published by the council.

A comprehensive list of historic towns in England, Scotland and Wales would include more than 660 places. Even then, it would omit some villages which possess urban qualities. A ruthless scrutiny of the list can reduce it to fewer than 325 places—at the price of cutting out places like Dover, Pontefract, Poole which certainly are ancient settlements, but which have lost many or most of their historic buildings and much of the visual quality of an historic town. The list is still a long one, and it reflects the facts of Britain’s history. Largely free from invasion and from wars fought on our own territory, this country is richer than most in Western Europe in the quality and variety of its historic towns. Most of the damage we have done ourselves.

To be meaningful, listing must be based on recognisable criteria. We need a yardstick with which to measure the value of one town centre and compare it with another. Assessment is an essential part of the process of planning for preservation. The cba list was based on the criteria given below (other lists, clearly, could be drawn up according to other criteria):

1 Town plan well preserved Nearly every place on the list possesses this particular quality: a complex of streets and open spaces, unchanged for centuries in their form and scale. Sometimes the historic area is enclosed by the line of medieval walls and gates; even if the walls have vanished, the streets which ran round them still remain. The Ring in Vienna and the boulevards which take the motorist round many French cities were constructed round the line of ancient defensive systems. Hereford will soon have an inner relief road following just that line.

We ought not to be content merely to say that a street plan is old. Exactly how old is it? Some-
times the question can be answered fairly precisely. We have learned since 1960, thanks to large scale excavation, that Roman Winchester was re-planned, with a largely new street system, in the time of King Alfred the Great or soon after. Wallingford is entirely of that age—a street plan one thousand years old, with its defences largely intact. Ludlow and Bury St Edmunds are Norman planned towns. The list naturally includes towns such as Bath, Tunbridge Wells or Whitehaven planned in the eighteenth century, and Victorian examples—Barrow-in-Furness and Llandudno. In some cases the exact age of a town and its street plan is not known. Documents may not have survived or, if they have, they may not tell us. In such cases the answer will be found only if archaeologists are given a chance to excavate areas about to be redeveloped.

Not all our ancient towns had walls and gates. Many market towns consist of a complex of streets round a market place. Woodbridge, Suffolk, is a case in point: a fine town, already well surveyed by the East Suffolk County Planning Department, and its historic and scenic qualities carefully assessed. Many towns had more than one market place. Boston, for example, as well as the central market place dominated by the magnificent church (Boston Stump), also has a great triangular cattle market just outside the town gate. These open spaces are now very precious—certainly too precious to be filled up with traffic roundabouts or multi-storey car parks.

2 Town with historic bridge crossing and approaches
In some cases the plan, and the essential visual quality of a town, springs from the siting. The most obvious cases are towns at a bridge crossing. Bewdley in Worcestershire consists essentially of a bridge over the Severn, with houses lining the river banks and the market place stretching away from the bridge. This tells us why Bewdley is precious, and exactly what we must strive to keep. It also tells us that in places such as Bridgewater or Inverary there may be a second element, distinct from the plan of the town centre.

3 Towns with a waterfront
Seaside resorts with an old waterfront or harbour, such as Whitby or Lyme Regis, will spring to mind in this class. They are usually under considerable pressure, which, if allowed to operate, can only sacrifice the character of such places. There are many inland towns, however, with a river frontage of great historic interest and potentially of great amenity value. Very often the river or canal which created this part of a town is now in economic decline; in these cases conservation raises the problems of changing use and obsolete industrial buildings. Nevertheless, some of our towns will be the poorer if this element in their historic make-up is neglected. Boston has recently lost some of the old warehouses which lined the river bank and the visual effect is disastrous.

4 Town wall, ditch or gate well preserved
Apart from those cases where old walls and gates serve to define the historic core of a town, there are many places where these monuments remain and are of great interest in their own right. Preservation of a small length of town wall may offer a difficult problem of planning, either in respect of traffic or in visual terms. Worse still, a length

Digging for knowledge

Our present knowledge of urban history is derived in the first place from local traditions. Research often shows that tradition can be wrong, especially about the dates of buildings. Surveys of the kind described elsewhere in these pages will certainly add to our knowledge of buildings in our towns. They will also reveal instances of buildings needing examination by experts in medieval building techniques if their precise historical importance is to be determined. A case in point is the old Deanery at Salisbury. The building appeared to be of no special interest and was going to be replaced in the development of the Training College. Survey by the Royal Commission on Historical Monuments in 1959 showed that it had a unique type of medieval timber roof. The building has now been restored as an assembly hall for the Training College.

Much knowledge of our historic buildings is masked by later additions and alterations. The machinery for recording this knowledge, as revealed while buildings are still in being, needs to be greatly improved. Every planning officer knows how difficult it is, at a few hours' notice, to get an expert to look at a building or a site.

Much information about our historic towns is buried underground. Comprehensive plans for historic town centres, with clear distinctions between areas which are to remain unchanged and those which should be redeveloped, will pinpoint opportunities for excavation. In the past twenty years archaeologists have told us a great deal about some of our Roman towns: the great garrison towns of York, Lincoln and Chester: provincial capitals such as Leicester and Cirencester, the ancestors of our county towns. This knowledge could not have come to us in any other way. It is ironic that in many cases we know much less about the later story of our towns.

It would be possible to make up a list of about forty towns in which something has recently been learned, by excavation, of the origin and development of settlement. This is trifling, however, compared with the opportunities missed, and the rather random accumulation of knowledge does not add up to a comprehensive story of ancient towns in Britain. There are now at least three towns with a long term programme of research by excavation. Winchester, King's Lynn and Stamford. When those programmes have been completed (and their practical difficulties and shortcomings are considerable) the sample will still be too small to represent medieval towns at large.

If official agencies and the body of archaeologists were able to seize all opportunities presented (a large if, but let it pass!), practical difficulties still remain. They include, first, the problem of site for excavation between clearance of a site and redevelopment. The local authority and the
of wall may be discovered in the course of redevelopment. Nottingham has recently buried a great length of medieval town wall, standing lift high, under a new inner ring road. Such disasters are to be avoided only by proper consideration of a town's history and by consultation between planners and historians or archaeologists at a sufficiently early stage. Sometimes the defensive system has a special historic interest. The frontier town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, originally fortified in the fourteenth century, had its defences brought up to date in Elizabeth II's time and the resulting works are unique in Britain. No amount of traffic pressure ought to be allowed to damage them.

5 Castle site or precinct well preserved Some of our towns grew up round the shelter of castle walls, like Richmond, Yorkshire. Others had a castle planted within an existing settlement, as in York itself, or Lincoln. The two forms are not always easy to distinguish, but there is no doubt how greatly either can add to the visual quality of a town. The problem usually is to enhance that quality, and to prevent it being masked by unsuitable new development.

6 Major ecclesiastical site or precinct (eg cathedral, abbey) well preserved A cathedral close or an abbey precinct often forms a well-recognised area of historic buildings. No case needs to be made for the Close at Wells or Salisbury, but it is worth while recalling that the setting of Worcester Cathedral has been violated in the past five years. There are other less well known and distinctive examples which could still be spoliated—what is to happen at Peterborough?—or which could be improved and made still more valuable.

7 Towns characterised by the number of buildings worthy of preservation This is no new element in the consideration of historic towns. But the familiar grading system needs to be more comprehensively and imaginatively applied. There are startling examples elsewhere in these pages of historic buildings ruined by unsuitable development near them. The greatest need is for a more imaginative grasp of the contribution made by particular buildings to the street scene. Once after time it will be found that a building which, rightly or wrongly, does not appear on the list occupies a key place. Many historic towns, if they lost their grade II buildings, would be ruined. The case for preserving Victorian buildings, which do not appear in lists as often as their character and importance would justify, ought to be pressed.

The Council for British Archaeology's list of historic towns based on this classification is printed in full on p.143—146. Making a list was a risky step: it could be taken to imply that towns omitted are not worth a second thought. The list, however, is in no way to be regarded as final. Another list might well include such places as Alresford, Beccles, Chippenham, Debenham, Framlingham, Guildford, Hatfield, Henley-in-Arden, Highworth, Newbury, Petworth, Woodstock and Yarm. After studying the CBA list, Staffordshire County Council agreed that Lichfield, Tamworth and Tivbury were of national quality

developer are commonly at one in disliking such delay. A still greater difficulty (on both urban and rural sites) is that excavation may increase the cost of redevelopment, and the developer can usually refuse permission if he chooses. Archaeologists are usually modest—indeed diffident—in their expectations, because the whole cost of excavation, and of compensation if appropriate, comes from their resources. If, as in Scandinavia, part of the cost of excavation fell on the developer, we should learn a great deal more about our past. But in this context, the main point is that planning officers and developers should understand that their proposals may imply an opportunity, which will never recur, to rescue information about the past: that their minds should be open to the possibility of excavation. A current example may be quoted. The scheme for an inner relief road for Derby will involve demolition of the church of St Alkmund, a Victorian structure of no architectural value and no longer required for services. There is good ground for thinking that this is the oldest church site in Derby, and that it may date back to the ninth century. Before construction of the ring road, which will involve lowering the site by some 20 ft, so destroying any surviving traces of an older church or churches below the present one, the site ought to be excavated. If no excavation were to take place, the chance of learning about the earliest stage of the growth of Derby would be lost forever.

Happily, in this case, 'all reasonable facilities' have now been promised. It may be noted that it was standard practice for the London County Council, in giving planning approval, to require provision of such facilities whenever there was reason to believe that this was appropriate. As already indicated, some towns, especially those of Roman ancestry, are already being investigated systematically. At Colchester and Leicester for instance there are full-time archaeologists employed by the local authority, excavating sites made available by redevelopment. In the context of its limited resources, the Corporation of Stamford has been remarkably enterprising. The income from a farthing rate has been set aside for a period of five years and, with the support of the Mowbray, a full time archaeologist has been appointed. The ultimate solution to such problems, however, will be the establishment of regional teams of experts who can be called to any town at short notice.

They should be able to give advice on the historic and archaeological implications of planning proposals, to carry out surveys of buildings both before and during demolition, and also to undertake excavation as opportunity arises. Our towns must change, but our heritage will be richest if we insist on learning as much as possible about their past while the changes are being made.

MAURICE BARLEY
but felt that twelve more places in the county warranted inclusion. In fact, the county council has so far agreed with the views expressed that Abbot’s Bromley, Betley, Cheadle, Eccleshall, Kinver, Leek, Stone and Uttoxeter all contain historic town centres. There can never be absolutes in such a matter as this—every town has something of value which should be preserved: it is our duty to identify this something and to cherish it wherever it may be found.

What the CBA list is intended to do is facilitate judgments and comparisons. If, nationally, resources are limited, let us at least make sure that they are devoted to the most important sector of our heritage. Lists will help us to clarify our thoughts on this. But just as the statutory list of buildings of historic importance—itself intended only as a guide for planning decision—is revised from time to time, so any list of towns should be.

It is no more final than a nurseryman’s current list of plants he has in stock in one season. If our stock of historic towns can be shown to be larger than was thought, let the list be extended. But let us not run down our stock without realising what we are losing.    MAURICE BARLEY
CBA list of historic towns

In 1964 the Council for British Archaeology published a memorandum drawing attention to the implications of the Buchanan report, *Traffic in towns*, for preserving historic town plans and buildings. The memorandum also promised a list of towns in Britain, the historic quality of which particularly required careful treatment in any planning or redevelopment proposals. This list of historic towns was subsequently published in July 1965.

The council's list contains 334 towns (England 232, Scotland 57 and Wales 35), of which fifty-one, marked in orange on the map on p143, were considered to be of special importance.

The inclusion of any town in the list was regarded by the council as 'an argument for preparing for it a comprehensive survey of the historic environment, illustrating its layout, its historic buildings, its urban quality and any other special characteristics. This 'heritage plan' should, with the 'transportation plan' suggested in the Buchanan report, form an obligatory part of the development plan process and should make specific provision for conservation of the features emphasised by the survey. The short-listed fifty-one towns were regarded as 'so splendid and so precious that ultimate responsibility for them should be a national concern'.

The criteria by which the list was prepared, from an initial list of over 660 places, were:

1. Town plan well preserved (eg street plan, market place)
   a. Ancient
   b. Georgian
   c. Victorian
2. Bridge crossing and approaches
   a. Ancient
   b. Georgian
3. Water front
4. Town wall, ditch or gates well preserved
5. Castle site or precinct well preserved
6. Major ecclesiastical site or precinct well preserved (eg cathedral, abbey, etc)
7. Towns characterised by a number of buildings worthy of preservation
   a. Medieval—seventeenth century
   b. Georgian and Regency
   c. Victorian

### TOWNS WITH HISTORIC CENTRES MERITING PRESERVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphil</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woburn</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingford</td>
<td>1a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amersham</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banbury</td>
<td>1a, 2, 3, 6, 7a, 7b (college), 7b, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Marlow</td>
<td>1a, 2b, 3, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ely</td>
<td>1a, 3, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limon</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 5a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisbech</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 3, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 2a, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congleton</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nantwich</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarporley</td>
<td>1b, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falmouth</td>
<td>1a, 3, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>1a, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>1a, 3, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Ives</td>
<td>1a, 3, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alston</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 4, 5, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>1a, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>1a, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtown</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belper</td>
<td>1b, 7b, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton</td>
<td>1b, 7b, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington</td>
<td>1a, 3, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildenborough</td>
<td>1a, 3, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dursley Kingswells</td>
<td>1a, 3, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>1a, 3, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>1a, 1b, 2a, 3, 5, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidmouth</td>
<td>7b, 7c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teignstow</td>
<td>1a, 6, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totnes</td>
<td>3, 7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blandford</td>
<td>1a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridport</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droxford</td>
<td>1a, 2a, 3, 4, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyme Regis</td>
<td>1a, 3, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaftesbury</td>
<td>1a, 7b, 7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheddar</td>
<td>1a, 5, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wareham</td>
<td>1a, 2, 3, 4, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winborne</td>
<td>1a, 7a, 7b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Durham
- Bernard Castle
- Castle Hadleigh
- Colchester
- Durham
- Dunmow
- Great Coggeshall
- Harwich (old core)
- Melton
- Manningtree with Mistley
- Newmarket
- Chipping Ongar
- Ipswich
- Saffron Walden
- Thaxted
- Wivenhoe
- Wanstead
- Cheltenham
- Chipping Campden
- Chipping Norton

### Gloucestershire
- Cirencester
- Chippenham
- Stroud
- Gloucester
- Lechlade
- Painswick
- Stow on the Wold
- Tetbury
- Tewkesbury
- Winchcombe
- Lyddington
- Royal
- Northampton
- Winchester
- Brackley
- Herford
- Hinching
- St Albans
- Ware
- Hereford
- Ludlow
- Leominster
- Penrith
- Peterborough
- St Ives
- St Neots
- Hyde

### Isle of Wight
- Carisbrooke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Status¹</th>
<th>Population 1801</th>
<th>Population 1891</th>
<th>Ratable value £000s</th>
<th>Listed buildings Grades I &amp; II Grade III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>18 000</td>
<td>183 000</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>CB*</td>
<td>32 000</td>
<td>81 000</td>
<td>3 185</td>
<td>1 756 1 032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>CT*</td>
<td>63 000</td>
<td>488 000</td>
<td>12 379</td>
<td>2 688 1 032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>CB*</td>
<td>7 600</td>
<td>77 000</td>
<td>6 610</td>
<td>137 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne</td>
<td>CB*</td>
<td>28 000</td>
<td>269 000</td>
<td>12 185</td>
<td>470 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>CB*</td>
<td>27 000</td>
<td>120 000</td>
<td>5 125</td>
<td>374 265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>CB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>1 095</td>
<td>2 150</td>
<td>210 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>LB*</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>28 000</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>CB*</td>
<td>16 000</td>
<td>104 000</td>
<td>2 125</td>
<td>1 032 2 088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abingdon</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>14 000</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>164 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverley</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>16 000</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>161 141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blantyre</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>97 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgnorth</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>117 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>55 000</td>
<td>6 376</td>
<td>259 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>60 000</td>
<td>5 243</td>
<td>197 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>11 000</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>21 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>40 000</td>
<td>2 052</td>
<td>164 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>10 000</td>
<td>28 000</td>
<td>1 483</td>
<td>268 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>14 000</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>181 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>301 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>7 208</td>
<td>71 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>66 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark-on-Trent</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>25 000</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>87 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Yorks</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>179 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selby</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>35 000</td>
<td>3 694</td>
<td>356 298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>131 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>43 000</td>
<td>1 919</td>
<td>326 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>297 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenby</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>75 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tewkesbury</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>8 000</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>276 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynemouth</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>78 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>16 000</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>385 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>280 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>9 000</td>
<td>28 000</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>41 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisbech</td>
<td>MB*</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>18 000</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>97 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromarty</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cullross</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddington</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inveraray</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>SB*</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard Castle</td>
<td>UD*</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>54 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford-on-Avon</td>
<td>UD*</td>
<td>7 000</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>277 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockermouth</td>
<td>UD*</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>28 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddington</td>
<td>UD*</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>3 000</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>148 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymondham</td>
<td>UD*</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>103 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burford</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>185 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping Campden</td>
<td>CP*</td>
<td>1 000</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>112 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavenham</td>
<td>CP*</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>283 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershore</td>
<td>CP*</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>4 000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>133 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td>CP*</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>2 000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 145 500 2 010 000 72 832 13 532 7 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. CC county of city; CB county borough; LB large burgh; MB municipal borough; SB small burgh; UD urban district; CP civil parish.
2. Figures for listed buildings are approximate only—no allowance is made for demolitions, except where official lists have been attended. Some Scottish lists are provisional; there are no supplementary lists for Scotland. Buildings are listed according to ownership, hence the dwelling in a 19th terrace may be listed and an entire Oxford or Cambridge college is entered as one building.
How some recent surveys have plotted values relating to conservation (sections only from larger maps). Above, the landscape setting: from 'Bath. A Planning and Transport Study' by Colin Buchanan & Partners

The town: from 'Stamford town centre historic areas policy', County of Lincoln, Parts of Kesteven

The street: from 'Tewkesbury. An architectural and historical building survey', Gloucestershire County Council
Planning procedures demand many types of survey—land use, traffic analysis and the rest. For the most part these are well established and understood. We are only now, however, beginning to evolve techniques for a new type of survey, that for the conservation area. The reports to be submitted to the minister by the consultants engaged to study the ‘Five Towns’ may be expected to bring new thinking to this problem. Similar surveys already undertaken during the last few years, however, give a lead to the broad lines that planning authorities generally are likely to have to follow when the Civic Amenities Bill becomes law. Because we are here trying to pin down values that have seldom been formally plotted before, we are having in many cases to invent new methods and symbols by which to analyse them and indicate them as we go along. The notes which follow are based on the office check list worked out by Donald Insall & Partners. It has been developed in preparing town, village and area surveys. It is focused sharply on conservation, which is its raison d’être; clearly the findings which result from such a conservation survey have to be integrated with those of all other planning surveys before appropriate policies can be adopted and action taken. Not all conservation areas will require study on this scale—many smaller ones, a residential square for example, may need little more than a careful survey of the fabric of the buildings. Nevertheless, the wider issues illustrated by the following programme cannot be lost sight of if the designation of any area is to be meaningful.

A SURVEY PROGRAMME

1 Research

History: past growth to present form
To understand the present character of a town, we must first know its past. The identity of a place, like that of a person, grows from its whole life and experience. The most likeable and interesting of people and places have been wrought on the anvil of experience.

The antiquities and visible reminders of the historical growth and shape of a town have a high value, and become increasingly rare as cities grow.

For example, the ancient core of Boston, us, is unique in its continent. The successive lines of coastal reclamation are faithfully reflected in the city’s street pattern. The long fingers of the warehouses, reaching down with their wharves to the sea, speak volumes in terms of American Colonial history. In Europe, the walls which were our cities’ earlier bulwarks have first become obstacles, then very soon treasured relics, and champions of their special identity.

Evidence of historical events has strong local significance. Occasionally a site such as a battlefield, however scanty its remaining cannon-balls, may claim disproportionate importance in planning. The Bloody Meadow site, scene of the Battle of Tewkesbury, would be a most serious loss if merely built-up to a uniform suburban pattern.

Often in analysing the identity of a neighbourhood ‘areas of like development’ can usefully be plotted. These again can help to bring out the quality of identity, as precious to a town as to a person.

Regional plans

Regional policies on distribution of population, employment and trade will fundamentally affect the local property market, and the suitability to which older buildings can be put (e.g. there may be plans to decentralise present market functions, as from Covent Garden).

Investigators are invited to question the validity:
and make up their own minds. Will this town expand? What will be the main future demands? For example, where will the supermarkets be—and with them the top land values? Where will new trade go; and where will new people wish to be?

What are the regional transport plans? Will through traffic be by-passed? What type and volume of traffic will remain?

Look ahead to the future—to possible new vehicle types, new life and leisure patterns. Consider the likely effect of taller buildings, increased mobility, and similar trends.

Assumptions
Every survey is prepared from current knowledge. An area plan is not a blueprint, but a living and developing policy. This plan will one day be reassessed—on what assumptions was it based?

For example, will the national and the local land pressures continue to increase; and will they still be governed by present trends and policies (eg by the population drift to the South, and the present pattern of industrial development)? Will the increasing specialisation and wider spacing of major shopping centres continue? Will new transport methods vary the currently acceptable or desirable journey to work? Will present standards of pedestrian accessibility change? Later revision can more readily be assessed if a statement of any arbitrary standards and principles has been included in the plan. Similarly, if the plan is prepared within the wider framework of a given regional survey (eg South-east study), or in the context of other recent studies (eg for a new Humber City—see AJ 19.1.66) this should be noted for future reference and comparison.

Previous surveys
Much wasted labour can be saved by first ‘surveying the surveys’. Very often, valuable material may already be to hand. A chamber of commerce may have surveyed the scope and potentialities of local trade. A local civic or archaeological society may have recorded the history and growth of the town to its present form. The ministry’s lists give valuable factual material on buildings of architectural or historic interest. Earlier traffic counts may provide useful facts on the growth and distribution of traffic and vehicle parking.

In reassessing earlier data, it is important to make allowances for trends then unforeseen. There
may also be some variance (a) in their scope and (b) in their emphasis, for example in the boundaries of the area under survey, or in any apparent bias at the time of the earlier investigation.

Useful data will be available in municipal records; and informed local individuals like the librarian, the archivist, the secretary of the civic society or the parson may have long memories, helpful in locating earlier facts and surveys.

**Base maps**

A first requirement is a carefully and selectively revised base map. Ordnance Survey maps can never be fully up to date. In the case of Chester it proved possible, through the MWWP, to obtain copies of the current draft revision sheets. Known future projects such as sites with new planning consents can usefully be added.

Sometimes a special survey is worthwhile. Air survey is, within its limits, remarkably reliable: it can quickly give accurately plotted levels covering a large area, and the related air photographs will give much information on items such as roof shapes—often a key to the structural identity of buildings.

Not only in road planning but in the accurate analysis of sight-lines, adequate levels are important. Contours at a minimum of 5ft are desirable, since urban use patterns and especially pedestrian routes are vitally concerned with even slight changes in level.

The Ordnance Survey map is a fine and accurate document, but not intended for design or planning analysis. It records reliably the boundaries of land at ground level, at a known date. But it must be supplemented with detail on street surfacing, the exact position and size of trees, walls and like features, and all the weft and warp of architecture and townscape.

Augmented maps must carry a note of their date and purpose, and full information on their degree of accuracy.

**Areas for survey**

Define the areas for each particular degree of study and keep under review during survey:

**Town** At the scale of the whole town, it will be possible to study its major townscape elements and architectural types (e.g., one might identify in Tewkesbury the waterfront, the pedestrian alleys, the enclosing and irregular frontage lines, and certain local timber-framed medieval building types).

**Neighbourhood** At the scale of the central area or neighbourhood, individual patterns can usefully be isolated for study, like those of pedestrian movement, the orientation of streets and the distribution of shopping frontage.

**Architectural groups** Certain groups of buildings may themselves in turn justify a still closer examination. This can include their circulation pattern and interior planning, their detailed history and individual structural condition. Definition may sometimes be difficult—for example, when architectural, townscape or functional units are each indistinct or overlap one another. If areas as at first defined prove inaccurately or unevenly chosen, the surveyor must say so, so that they can be properly revised.

---

**Roofscape basis for a block of interlocked Cambridge properties; from a report prepared for Corpus Christi and Pembroke Colleges, Cambridge, by Donald Insall & Partners**

**2 Survey**

Distinguish what makes the area ‘special’. It is the uniqueness of a place which makes it attractive, which gives to it character and distinction. The first duty of a survey is to distinguish the essence of a place.

**Approach**

Town survey calls for a special attitude of mind and an acute awareness of environment without recourse to preconceived answers. In this, the independent consultant team may have the advantage. The visitor also has no axe to grind. But deep local knowledge can also be of great value if it is behind a pair of ‘olean eyes’.

The specialist in any discipline can easily make mistakes. It may be a nonsense to try to ‘save’, whether listed or not, one surviving angle of what was once a quiet Georgian square, the rest of which has been demolished by new trunk roads. It was surely curious to demolish Euston Arch without a cause, before deciding where the new platforms would be. Such examples are distressing; but they still happen. Closer survey should now begin to make the best management of our urban assets a far less hazardous process than it has often been in the past.
Lavenham

Outlines: Architectural Particulars of Properties

Use: Residential/

Occupancy: Owner/Tenant/Other

Construction: App. date: 1300 1400 1500 1600 1700 1800 1900

Teasdale/Attached No. 67-71/67-73

Original Unit/Subdivided from 67-73/Combined with

Solid: brick/stone/plank

Framed: panels/timber/steel

Facing: brick/rendering/cement

Walls

Oak/Glass/Aluminum

Glazing doors/windows

Pitched: Hipped/Gabled/Tiled/Flat/Cellar

Roofs

Accommodation: Hab. Rooms/Ldr/Bedroom/W.C.

Floors

Ceilings

Condition: General condition: satisfactory - R.B. roof tiling

Joinery & Finishing: High quality/even/paint

Structural Movements: Settlement/thrust, live/expanded

Freedom from Damp: Rising - front wall

Perforated/Outer/downpipes/pipes

Timbers: Day-use/Wet-rot/Beech. Wind? Roof tenon

Daylight: Adequate/Improvable/Insufficient

Planning: Good/Improvable/Combined/Uneconomic

Services: Drains/Septic tank/Available

Mains Water/Hot Water/no

Bath/no

Electric light/power/Gas/no

Special Architectural Features & Assets:

Townscape: Good site/timber/first floor - visible to Bush Street

Ext features: good woodwork/baldwin/roof

Int features: good panel work/baldwin/roof

Hidden features: 50/50/50/50

Detractions:

Prov. Gradings: 4/12/17/17

Unlisted, Confirm/Reconsider

Comments:

The major section of the property has high fine timber

The present house requires an extensive

Further Survey Required? Yes

Insp by: Arch Date 7/6/61

Methods

Property owners should always be notified well in advance of a survey—especially if making a request to view an interior. Appointments in some cases may take much time to arrange—for example where a building is in multi-tenancy.

For the actual collection of data ‘building analysis forms’ have been designed individually for each survey. One is used for each building (irrespective of postal numbering). These forms call for a minimum of writing on site and are completed merely by ticks, crosses or well known abbreviations.

Other survey methods have included the separate mapping of single qualities of a block of property, such as its condition, present use or viability. In planning the survey much depends upon who are to carry out the work, and what are their individual capabilities. New legislation will at first bring difficulties, since town survey cannot be delegated to totally inexperienced people—it is a special skill demanding a careful balance of approach. Virtually all site information may have to be collected by skilled staff, to ensure that the wheat is sifted from the chaff. But much specialist time can be saved by good management and by careful planning throughout.

Architectural character

The architectural groups that go to make up a town each have a special personality. The urban character into which they combine is capable of systematic analysis and dissection, in order to assess their relative importance.

For example, the city of Bath is characterised by its Georgian terraces. Their elements include their uniformity in scale, continuity and repetitiveness, with only subtle variation. A strong unifying element is the particular material of which they are built. The smoothness of texture, the fine jointing and accurate cutting which the local stone makes possible have produced a distinguished and distinct architectural grammar. Even the Georgian sash windows have a vocabulary of its own. Individual panes are within a standard range of sizes, always vertical in proportion, and varied from storey to storey in height rather than in width. It is easy to see that in a narrower context a whole primer of the principles and forms which distinguish a local architectural tradition could easily be arrived at.

In complete contrast, the urban architecture of another area such as Kent or East Anglia is equally individual. The soft red brick and the tile hanging of Kent, and the oak framing and that of East Anglia, are obvious examples. The quintessence of Bath is the Royal Crescent. Of Lavenham it is the Market Place; and of Tunbridge Wells, the Pantiles.

Often a primary area of architectural interest will have within it lesser groups strongly contrasting with one another (examples are the Nash terraces of Regent’s Park, contrasted with the independent villas of Park Village; and the architectural ‘prima donna’ quality of Pall Mall, contrasted with the unity of the adjoining Carlton House Terrace).

Townscape

Buildings of special architectural or historic interest have been ‘listed’—not as is often thought ‘for preservation’, but for guidance of the planning authority in preparing the statutory development plan. The decision on what is to be conserved is the responsibility of the planning authority. The listing at national scale assesses buildings on their individual merits, without formal consideration of their town planning significance in terms of sitting or other importance to a neighbourhood. For example, a building may form an important focus to a long vista, or it may close a street picture. Its silhouette may dominate a particular skyline from a significant viewpoint. Or, even if itself uninteresting, it may be one of a layout of buildings whose importance lies in their collective symmetry. Despite its importance to the group and to the locality, this may qualify it only for the supplementary list, which has of course at present no statutory significance.

The planning authority will be able to consider known planned improvements by which a building may be revealed to view—for example by street widening, when its face and alignment may be of new importance. Again, modern regulations sometimes mean that if a building is destroyed, and despite any obvious advantage of the siting as it was, a ‘replacement’ would have to be set back or forward, exposing ugly scars or blank walls. The building’s merit in terms of town planning, in fact, may be purely that it is just where it is.

Two vital elements in townscape are skyline and prospect.

In Oxford, all new development within a given radius of the centre has now been subjected to special skyline control in favour of the city’s ‘dreaming spires’—proverbial essence of the town. In certain hilly neighbourhoods (e.g. Clifton, Bristol) the whole history of the locality is one of successive prospect-stealing by newer and newer development, beginning with the eighteenth-century terraces which leap-frogged one another for the view, and finishing with university buildings which although sited down the hill, have the unfair advantage of being modern and tall. All these elements can be shown on one or more maps, for comparison with other criteria.

Survey data: Individual buildings

Present structural condition Whatever maps or forms are used, these should allow for detailed analysis of buildings externally, internally and at each floor. They may cover such items as construction, materials, finishes and typical defects (rising damp, dry rot, defective rainwater gutters, and so on). Prevention of incipient defects can be notified, as well as their cure; and urgent repairs are distinguished from those which can wait. Any danger to public safety is of course immediately notified to the building inspector.

Architectural care and condition This has been neglected in some surveys, and is important. Is the building all of one date? Have the original sash windows lost their glazing bars, or been replaced by metal casements? Or have they been blocked, perhaps because of a later window tax? Is the roofing material as originally intended? If not, is it nevertheless appropriate? Are later shopfronts well-designed? Has a house been subdivided to the best advantage? Do its rooms interlook with those of another? And could this easily be rectified?

Potential uses and suitability Maps or forms are used to record present facilities (ceiling heights,
daylighting, rear access, storage, garaging, mains services, and so on) and current uses, noting special loading requirements, lavatory facilities, nuisance, traffic generation and required improvements such as better display or access. The survey can usefully note potential future user-classes, where consent for change would be appropriate (eg domestic to office, or office to shop).

Economic viability; Potential improvement Would better pedestrian access help trade? Is the present rear access adequate or might it be improved—perhaps at the same time as other properties? Are any valuable architectural features unrealised? Do rear additions conceal an original exterior, and make the building dark or damp? They often require more maintenance than they are worth.

Does the circulation pattern make sense? Could future plumbing or service units be grouped more economically? Are there good fire escape routes? Last, and often an important question: what might be the approximate cost of conversion? And would this be met in the potential increase of property value?

3 Analysis and presentation
Plotting the data
Much information has by now been shown up clearly during site survey; but analysis in the office yields valuable new conclusions. The simplest way of collating information is by transparent overlays, on which the main problems and opportunities of the area are mapped for comparison. Visual aids, maps and illustrations are not extras but an essential element in the collected data. Photographs can isolate architectural and townscape features which many a citizen may never have noticed although he passes them daily.

'Assets and debits' map
One convenient way of analysing the survey area is by the 'plus and minus' method. Overall and in detail, this encourages balanced and thorough survey, and presents the facts clearly to the reader. The 'assets' map summarises the main buildings, features and frontages of importance, and in visual form. Examples from recent reports include sketches of 'stopped vistas' and enclosure (at Newark and at Blanchland) a survey of valuable trees (in Lavenham) and paving textures (at Thaxted).

The 'debits' map can note such features as eyesores: untidy sites, spoil heaps, overhead wires, exposed junk yards, and so on (examples are all too apparent). Traffic noise and fumes are a frequent and localised debit. So are air and water pollution, especially in densely-populated areas. Another, although perhaps a less obvious, debit is lack of access (usually behind a barrier such as a railway line, but sometimes to areas themselves marooned by traffic (such as Eros, in Piccadilly). Not least in its impact, however subsidiary in its scale, is the rising tide of street furniture, signs and general flotsam which floods the towns of the world. Its analytical appraisal is a vital element in town survey.

Usually a pictorial survey is the best way to draw attention to the principal problems, which are often caused merely by lack of co-ordination (eg lamps, traffic and parish notices, each on their own poles). The public conscience is often lively, once awoken; and many commercial and shopping areas have been made measurably tidier by Civic Trust street improvement schemes.

'Opportunities map'
The opportunities map has been employed to visualise opportunities, present or future. It is important to keep the survey positive and to hold the public initiative in seeing latent possibilities. Examples from recent surveys have included some of the following:

- Valuable empty sites have been revealed (New York is carrying out a special survey of these alone, inviting their early development), and potential car parking sites (one of the most valuable elements in any community).
- An opportunity for a new building in local authority ownership has been suggested for a rundown 'island' site in a market place.
- The opportunity has been seen for a better 'focus' in a new building at the end of an otherwise undistinguished street.
- The opportunity for new pedestrian access has been made possible by the most limited of land purchases.
- New planting may be a blessing to screen traffic noise.
- New rear access ways are sometimes to be had simply by joining existing rear lanes.

A reclaimed village green has been suggested as the revived focus of a village in Dorset, and elsewhere the opportunity has been grasped of purchasing a large private garden as a future public open space in an expanding town.

Even the provision of good street furniture—such as special lighting—town maps, seats for the elderly, and acceptable advertisement sites—has benefited from positive thinking and from an open eye for opportunity.

New buildings and future development
Assess the effect of proposals already known, and define sites which offer any special opportunity for new building. An obvious case is half-used back land in old urban areas. But how should these be related to present access and frontage? Might consent be given for new development as an extension by one or more existing users? Could properties be improved and opened-up by better pedestrian access at ground level? A cinema in Newark has brilliantly used the inside of a shopping 'island' without disturbing the run of shopfronts. In the event of increased redevelopment pressures, what historic buildings might need special care or consideration, or be at risk? (Ex one might have signalled a warning on the Chequer now containing redevelopment proposals in Salisbury). Are there useful remedies or opportunities?

Should new buildings ever actually copy old ones? Only rarely—for example where part of an original project aimed at an ultimate symmetry never yet achieved. The survey should distinguish any special cases like this. The Grosvenor-Laing precinct development in Chester has successfully related new shopping carefully with the adjoining Rows. Recently in West Halkin Street, Belgravia, the ground floor of an old building set between two streets was developed as a useful new pedestrian shopping arcade. The survey should recommend what broad form of new building, or what architectural...
‘Permalead’ dampcourse

Hastings Grammar School, Sussex
Borough Engineer & Surveyor: E.O. Baxter, M. Eng., AMICE
Chief Education Architect: L.F. Morris, FRIBA
Project Architect: P.J. Kirkham, ARIBA
General Contractors: Messrs. Halse & Sons Ltd.

Situated in an area of 42 acres, which was formerly the school playing fields, the new Hastings Grammar School buildings cater for 570 boys.

Because of the varied nature of the accommodation, three different systems of construction were used. For the gymnasmum, changing rooms, administration block and kitchens, load bearing brick work was employed. For the long-span single and two-storey areas, steel frame construction was used.

Care was taken in the choice of external colours to create the sense of unity necessary to an extensive scheme with such varying volumes. The white opening lights, black panels and grey facias help to achieve this unity—as do the white rendered panels. Stimulating colours were used internally in the communication areas. In the teaching and study areas ‘low stimulus’ colours of suitable reflection values have been used. Colours were chosen from the grey/brown, grey/yellow range.

The damp-proof course selected for this interesting project was “Permalead” one of the range of D.P.C.’s manufactured by Permanite Limited. “Permalead” is a hessian based bitumen damp-proof course, with a lead core to provide an additional barrier to rising damp.

write [PERMANITE] protection into your specification

Further details of Permanite dampcourses can be obtained from the manufacturers:
Permanite Limited, 455 Old Ford Road, London E3. Telephone: ADVance 4477 (26 lines)
FLEXIBILITY WITH FLUES

Conventional methods of providing flues in tall blocks of flats involve either a multiplicity of flues, rising up through the building, or a similar number of wall terminals. Such methods are not normally acceptable due to the space required, the cost and the effect on the appearance of the building. One gas industry solution to this problem is the branched flue—particularly suitable for venting water heaters, fires and air heaters which are not of the balanced flue type. Branched flues comprise a main flue and a subsidiary flue connected to each appliance. The system provides a vertical rise from the appliance to the junction with the main flue stack, usually about 8 feet higher up; thus each appliance is provided with its own individual “pull”. The system may be constructed from asbestos cement flue pipe, or alternatively erected with special two-channel blocks, one for the main flue and one for the “branch”.

Other flues developed by the gas industry as aids to good design and economy in installation are

FAN DILUTED FLUES - BALANCED FLUES - SE-DUCT - U-DUCT

For full information on all flue systems contact the Commercial Manager of your Gas Board.

design for gas heat
expression might be appropriate. More often than not, the important architectural considerations are in such terms as scale—especially in length of shopping frontage (eg Newark) and in materials, rather than in detail alone. Even our Renaissance forebears, in rebuilding medieval Warwick after the great fire of 1694, destroyed something vital of its character, by merely ‘ruling straight’ the new frontage lines. In an area of special architectural or historic interest it is, after all, just this interest which we are setting out to maintain, and not to water down or lose.

Publication and review

Publicity
Experience underlines the importance of widespread publicity. The survey as presented to an authority should always if possible be published; if this is done, every conclusion must be clearly made and graphically illustrated. The public should (a) want to read the survey and (b) understand it. Photographs and perspectives are always clearer than plans to the non-professional reader. Care may be needed in excluding confidential information or material whose general publication might be an embarrassment or might affect land values.

Public exhibitions are of the greatest value in concentrating local interest, and in providing a forum for discussion. In this country we have nothing yet to compare with such elaborate presentations as the Philadelphia Panorama, which includes models of whole areas of the city, designed to change automatically section by section in turn, and thus to show new projects in three dimensions and easily recognisable form. Such a centre makes a wonderful focus too for lectures to schoolchildren, soon to become the citizens of tomorrow.

Films and television are powerful visual media of incalculable effect; it is strange that we take so little account of their potential in public education and explanation. Perhaps this is one of the reasons for the negative attitude of the public to so much planning today.

A conservation area survey will succeed only when it formulates a definite programme for positive action. Everyone's job will, after all, always be one's job. Policy proposals take neat shape only when they are laid at a door, as a responsibility and a duty. The survey must last make specific provisions for periodical future review. As the Planning
Advisory Group has reminded us, all development control is a sensitive, organic process. No area can be artificially held in indecision against all change. The ‘freezing’ of whole urban areas, as is sometimes advocated, can at best be only an emergency stay. It is said that over 70 per cent of the listed buildings in Poole Old Town have already perished, although this was defined as a ‘special precinct’, but without a plan.

The new conservation areas will become, like veteran cars, every year a little rarer and more valuable. The urgent job, whether it is done by authorities or by consultants, is to give skilled energy and time to assess, evaluate and plan them.

DONALD INSALL

Some conservation surveys

CHICHESTER

An explanation of proposals incorporated in the review of the Town Map, with detailed proposals for the town centre which could not be included in the statutory document. The report contains a substantial section in which environmental areas are delineated.

HASTINGS

Commissioned by Hastings Borough Council. Not only considers each building in the old town but also touches on general planning policies in particular, parking. Suggests that the old town be designated as a conservation area and indicates how new developments should be incorporated within its structure.

KING'S LYNN

An appraisal of the historic core of King's Lynn which assesses the quality of its spaces, maps the listed buildings, sets out the relative importance of street frontages (as opposed to the purely historic value of individual buildings), proposes a revised road plan with through traffic excluded. In one area the degree of change compatible with the retention of historic buildings is studied.

LAVENHAM

This study was one of the first of its kind. A meticulous survey of the buildings and townscape of an exceptional medieval town, it offered suggestions to owners, tenants and others, as well as main proposals to the local authorities. It recommended a preservation programme which has since been implemented by the county.

SALISBURY
The town centre plan. Wiltshire County Planning Department, 1965.


The 'plan' is a well illustrated report modelled on Planning Bulletin 1. It incorporates a careful consideration of townscape, traffic and car parking and has been approved by city and county.

The 'appraisal', a twelve-page illustrated booklet, is designed to encourage the co-operation of all concerned with preserving and planning Salisbury. It states some basic principles of urban design and discusses the importance of shop fronts, advertisements and signs.

STAMFORD
Stamford town centre historic areas policy. County of Lincoln, Parts of Kesteven, 1966.

A 1963 report dealt with the town's buildings of architectural and historic interest and expressed the need for special controls in the historic centre. This second report defines historic areas of varying degrees of importance. Among its 'conservation objectives' are proposals for co-ordinating financial aid and for restoration and rehabilitation policies for different grades of area.

STONE

A companion to the town map for Stone. The Civic Trust for the North West contributes a thorough appraisal of the town's physical character and suggestions for short and long term improvements.

TETBURY

Recognising that 'Tewkesbury's townscape is derived not principally from the excellence of design of individual buildings, but from the harmonious appearance of their grouping', this report incorporates a townscape study and a preservation policy. Estimates at least £4 million to be necessary for preserving Tewkesbury's architectural and historic heritage.

THAXTED
An historical and architectural survey. Donald Insall and Associates. Essex County Council 1967. This newly published survey examines in detail all aspects of a town's historical growth, present state and future opportunities; and a social and economic survey was concurrently prepared by the county council. The report concludes with recommendations for an integrated action policy.

WARWICK


The first brief report, produced by the Civic Trust for Warwick Borough Council, led to the setting up of a Central Area Development Team on which the county, the borough and the Civic Trust were represented. Traffic and shopping surveys have been carried out for the team. The 1966 report appraises the planning problems and provides a policy for the future.
'York', says the British Travel folder, "is perhaps, above all cities, a place in which to wander, get lost, and make one's own discoveries. And not only York...
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NEW VEHICLES FOR TOWNS

For too long we have accepted without question the need to adapt our towns to the present family of vehicles. The realisation that we can never satisfactorily alter the tight-knit historic centres of most of our existing towns to take these vehicles in growing numbers is, however, dawning slowly.

The time is ripe for a determined effort to see whether (perhaps only experimentally at first) it is not possible to invent new types of vehicle, tailored to the narrow streets of our existing towns. Such vehicles would need to be small, compact, manoeuvrable, of uniform size, and capable of even (rather than great) speeds. They should be quiet; easy to get into and out of quickly. A variety of services should be offered in fully public, semi-public and private-hire forms. Fare structure should be simple. Some services might be municipally run and free.

We must accept, in this mechanical age, the need to be vehicle-borne for the movement of both people and goods. The ideal of the individual personal vehicle is a magnificent one and should be pursued to the maximum possible extent. But since we are gregarious, since we love to congregate in crowds and converge upon busy centres, then when we do so (whether for business or leisure) we shall have to learn to give up the undisputed right to go absolutely everywhere and anywhere in our own private vehicles. The task of industry, and of government, is to supply a viable and attractive means of transport in crowded places which offers an alternative to the unbridled use of individual vehicles.

In the present state of play, no one is winning in the traffic-in-towns game. The motorist is frustrated and often angry at not being able to penetrate to his target. He is niggled and harried by overworked police and traffic wardens; lectured by an increasing array of signs and symbols. He is paying more and more in meter fees and garaging charges. More often than not, nowadays, he has to get out of his car well away from his actual destination. Even then he is probably committing some parking offence.

Would not the motorist be better off if some areas were denied to him provided that in return he could enjoy a regular, uninterrupted, cheap form of public or semi-public transport and efficient car-hire services?

The lot of the pedestrian in town centres, too, becomes daily more intolerable, more dangerous and more unpleasant: waiting, for longer periods, to dodge across the road; being assaulted by exhaust fumes; battered by an increasing volume of noise and subjected to increasing danger to life and limb. Nor can the bus companies do their job because everyone is getting in everyone's way. The less regular buses are, the less useful they are. The downward spiral of public transport.

'Pretty as a picture'—the old centre of Poole. But step a few yards further back . . .
Existing and prototype electric vehicles and runabouts. The Washington 'mini-train' was first used at New York's World Fair; the lady’s three-wheeler for shopping holds a half-hundredweight of goods and costs £70; the scooters, chargeable at home in eight hours, will travel thirty miles for 14d.

is a well-known modern phenomenon. More and more people generally are becoming involved in coping with the increasingly impossible task of controlling one of the greatest inventions of modern times—the privately-owned, privately driven, mass-produced vehicle. But, while more and more people are thus involved, solutions are getting more and more remote. Efficiency is diminishing and the benefits which the private vehicle ought to give are dwindling away—at any rate in towns.

The appearance of our towns too is suffering, just as much as the nerves of its people. The proliferation of white lines, yellow lines, red lines, yellow boxes and white triangles painted on street surfaces is becoming more and more bewildering to motorist and walker. Traffic lights, directional signs and notices of increasing complexity and size are defacing beautiful buildings and dominating street scenes. In addition it is rapidly becoming impossible to look at the town-scape because of the overwhelming mass of moving and parked vehicles.

The idea put forward here is that there are certain parts of towns (notably the central core of towns and areas of great historic and architectural value and character) which should no longer be made available to conventional, privately owned vehicles—whether motor cars or commercial vehicles. Such areas throughout the country should be declared to be controlled vehicle zones, provided that, before they are so designated, adequate and attractive alternative arrangements have been made for moving people and goods in public, semi-public or private hire vehicles.

... to see the effect of recent road proposals
The range of petrol or diesel vehicles for popular mass use is limited. The types are: the all-purpose motor car (whether Mini or Rolls), the taxi, the bus, the coach, the van, the lorry, the motorcycle, and the scooter.

These eight types, whatever their size, are expected to go everywhere and do everything, without let or hindrance, in town and countryside, for business or pleasure.

But none of them functions efficiently on the restricted roads in centres of cities, particularly of historic cities. Nor does it seem remotely possible that we shall be able to rebuild all our hundreds of centres to suit the demands of this limited range of present day vehicles. Even if it were possible, it would be highly undesirable in most cases, since the town centres would be so altered that their character would be totally destroyed.

In some spheres vehicles have been specially designed to perform specific tasks and adapted to operate in certain physical surroundings. For instance, the army has developed specialised vehicles for different purposes: the tank and amphibian vehicle are good examples. Milk companies use specially designed electric vehicles for their roundsmen. There are whole ranges of electric trucks in use at railway stations, in warehouses and in factories for moving, loading and stacking goods.

We ought to develop a new series of vehicles to suit the conditions in restricted town centres. Vehicle manufacturers and designers are quite remote from those who design and plan towns, buildings and roads. Planners, architects, and civil engineers blindly accept the vehicles being
currently produced and design their towns, buildings, bridges and roads to suit those vehicles' requirements. There is a fatal lack of communication here—the more so because cars have a short life and buildings or towns have a long one. The difference is startling. Modern cars last about five years, whereas buildings last from 100 to 1,000 years. Should the relative permanence of towns or buildings not take precedence over vehicle design? The built environment and vehicle manufacture are not two subjects: they are one and indivisible.

Electric battery-driven vehicles seem most promising for development in town centres. Quietness is one of their greatest attributes. They do not emit fumes. The electric motor needs little attention. Fuel costs are low. Vehicles have a long life (ten years may be taken as a minimum). Maintenance is minimal. Operation is simple. Excessive size and speed are not characteristic of these vehicles, but neither are these attributes required for town work. A steady speed of three or four times that of walking (nine to twelve miles an hour) is all that is needed. Such a service as this, operated by a fleet of purpose-built vehicles of uniform size, would go a long way towards eliminating accidents and making towns more peaceful and pleasant places to live in.

The basic list of vehicles to be evolved specifically for town-centre work, would include single-decker and mini-buses, designed to accommodate seated or standing passengers for short 'hop-on, hop-off' journeys. Short trains of platform trucks for passengers, towed by a powered tug, could be evolved. They would trundle at frequent intervals around central areas with set stopping places. Such vehicles are already to be found at airports and in large factories. With the elimination of private motor cars and commercial vehicles, they could operate in our streets with regularity, efficiency and frequency. With further experiment and the application of technical inventiveness they could be made to run as un-manned vehicles over defined routes, controlled from a central master-computer—as is now being done with phased traffic lights.

In addition there would be taxis for two or more people. More versatile, more individual and therefore more expensive, these would be either conventional or coin operated and self-driven. The third type of machine would be the tiny-scale pedestrian aids, such as dodgem cars, scooters and 'supermarket' trolleys.

To achieve this controlled vehicle zone, a way round it would have to be made for through traffic. Interchange points would also have to be provided between one form of transport and another. Cars would have to be left at car-parks on the periphery.

Use of the area by vans and lorries would have to be cut to a minimum. Goods depots should therefore be established on the periphery of the traffic-controlled zone. Shopkeepers would be allocated space in these warehouses to which their goods
Rye, perhaps most beautiful of the Cinque Ports, rises compactly from the surrounding marshland within the line of its ancient wall (white line below). It is a town of fewer than 4 600 inhabitants, considerably swollen in summer by visitors.

Zermatt, high in the Swiss Alps, is a holiday resort of 2 000 permanent residents and 13 000 visitors at the height of the season. Zermatt relies completely upon battery electric transport for all deliveries. During 1965 to supply sixty shops, seventy-five hotels and restaurants, and 1 200 flats and houses 5 300 tons of consumable goods were delivered in individual packs. Zermatt's transport fleet is made up of eighteen 1 ton utility vehicles for passengers and goods, and twenty-two 3 ton to 4 ton goods vehicles.

Could Rye do likewise and exclude conventional vehicles from the historic area within the wall? The plan shows a possible route arrangement for an electric vehicle system, with a suggested location for transport interchange.

Would be delivered in bulk. Merchandise would be fetched to the retail counter by an electric vehicle delivery service, in the form of small trucks or hand-carts. The type of vehicle needed is already in commercial production. These vehicles could be owned and operated municipally or privately. Delivery of bulky or perishable goods direct to shops would still be needed in certain cases, but these would be permitted only at off-peak times. There is already a substantial range of electric vehicles for public utility services, ambulances, refuse collection and even fire engines. There would remain some special problems such as entry for vehicles in connection with building works and so on, for which exemptions from control would have to be allowed by regulations. Thus a new form of movement would be created in vehicles tailored to specific needs and built to suit the circumstances of existing towns. We are on the verge of a breakthrough in the development of battery driven vehicles. The range in use, even now, in commercial activities is impressive. Intensive research is going on to overcome the power-weight duration-charge disadvantages of present electric batteries. It seems likely that success will be achieved soon. The lightweight
fuel cell that can be 'fed' with fuel as easily as the petrol engine is bound to come sooner or later. Many other types of fixed equipment can aid the movement of people in thickly populated areas. They include moving pavements, and miniature monorails. The whole idea would be to approach the design problem of central areas in the way that international fairs are planned. These have to cater for thousands and tens of thousands of people daily. Wembley 1921, Lausanne 1965 and now the Montreal 1967 Expo are all fruitful examples of novel ideas in mass transport movement.

What we need is a new approach—the kind of revolutionary look that Henry Ford had when he inadvertently ushered in mass-production and the mystique of the individual vehicle. We ought to concentrate our vision upon experiments designed to provide acceptable prototypes whereby static town structure and moving equipment fit one to another, rather than destroy one another.

Four places are suggested which might be studied in greater depth for such experiments. They are Rye, Canterbury, Cambridge and York. The structure of roads they possess at their centres is favourable to the kind of suggestion made here. They are all historic towns. Above all it is important to remember that travel can be fun. Sharing journeys with other people is often as exhilarating as driving oneself. On holiday 'going for rides' is one of the great pleasures. Boat trips round the harbour; miniature railways along the seafront or up the mountain; Dodgems, scenic railways, roundabouts at the fair: all these are 'perilous' journeys we take for enjoyment with other people. Given a good service by novel purpose-built vehicles in the restricted areas of historic town centres, people would soon accept the need to get out of their car and ride with others. And the towns would again be worth walking and riding in.
The effects of high economic pressure and low economic pressure: above, the City of London; below, left, King's Lynn; below right, the Brontë village of Haworth.
Few buildings are demolished by reason of sheer physical decay that could not be put right given the money. The reason for demolition can more usually be found in social and economic considerations. A policy for preserving our historic buildings, which depends mainly on prevention through ministerial orders, is bound to be a rearguard action with the retentionist always arguing from weakness.

Our aim must always be to make our worthwhile historic buildings part of the contemporary, social and economic pattern of town, village and countryside; they will then become part of the visual scene naturally. There will always be the need to retain the building of outstanding architectural and historic worth which cannot be fitted into this pattern, but such a building becomes a museum piece and must be recognised as such.

To achieve this aim requires first an understanding of the social and economic factors which destroy and change our historic buildings; then to see how far we can influence these factors by planning to avoid the threat at its source.

The problem
From the particular standpoint with which we are here concerned the threat to historic buildings arises in two ways:

1. There is insufficient demand for the building in its present form, which results in lack of upkeep and decay;
2. There is too much demand for the site. This results in pressures either to pull down the building on it and put up a new one which fully exploits the site potential, or to change the building radically to fit it for a new purpose which destroys its historic character.

Examples of the first situation can be seen in such places as the Old Town of Hastings. The second occurs more generally in the commercial centres of towns. Insufficient demand for buildings, leading to neglect and decay, arises from a variety of circumstances. The primary cause is absence of any demand for the building because its accommodation does not meet a contemporary need. Even when a building is itself suited to a contemporary use, its location may be such that it is remote from the demand. There are Georgian buildings rotting in the country which would be quickly taken if they were within easy reach of Central London. Even where accommodation and location are right, demand can be killed by poor environment. The house may suit a particular social class which will not accept its environment.

Apart from suitability of accommodation, location and environment, there is also the question of cost—on the one hand the cost of upkeep and running, and on the other of restoration. Both maintenance and restoration costs must be within the resources of the person willing to accept the accommodation and environment of the building.

These considerations apply mainly to residential buildings; where all the criteria referred to are satisfied, historic buildings are in much demand and can fetch very high prices. However, almost by definition, historic buildings tend to be on main traffic roads and in older quarters of towns, and they frequently suffer from low environmental standards because of traffic and noise from unsatisfactory neighbours in the form of industry and commerce. Because of this, historic buildings tend to be occupied by those who find the pleasure of living in them outweighs the inconvenience they have to tolerate and the additional cost of upkeep they usually have to bear. Taken together, these factors limit the demand for historic buildings for housing; they are, however, frequently capable of being changed.

Somewhat different criteria arise in the case of buildings used for commerce and shopping; here the accommodation may have to fulfil the much
The impact of commerce can sadly destroy the integrity of a building, even though the building itself remains; in an old street the erosion of character most commonly begins with a new shop building.

more exacting requirements of efficiency. While environment can become less important, location and demand can assume much greater importance. Location can be vital in the case of some undertakings.

The need for efficiency in the layout of accommodation for commercial concerns can vary enormously. Many firms have fitted offices and research departments reasonably satisfactorily into historic buildings designed for quite a different purpose, and seem to accept fairly high levels of inconvenience. This is usually offset by lower costs and very good working conditions for their staff—for example, in a large country house.

Many converted houses on the fringe of town centres are being used by professional and other firms as offices and inconvenience is usually offset by lower costs. As the demand for office space increases in these locations, the site value of the older buildings also rises and this leads to demand for rebuilding to put the site to greater use.

Where the need for commercial undertakings can be matched with the accommodation in historic buildings, the cost of restoration and maintenance usually presents far less difficulty than it does in the case of residential buildings. This is partly because commercial use increases the value of the buildings, justifying repairs, and partly because maintenance is allowed against tax.

Shopping can raise much more difficult problems.
A building without a use is—eventually—doomed. Two buildings which no longer fulfil their original purpose are (above) the railway station at Newmarket and (below) Albert Dock in Liverpool, to find a use for which strenuous efforts are currently being made.

While many traders can and do use converted buildings as shops, modern trading is rapidly becoming very much more competitive and efficient.

This has resulted in a much greater need for efficiently laid out sales space with stockrooms and staff quarters. There is also the trend towards much bigger shops—for example the variety store, the clothing store and the supermarket, with their large open sales space free of columns and laid out to very precise trading requirements. These requirements often make it very difficult, if not impossible, to fit the traders into historic buildings.

This leads us to the other threat to historic buildings from too much economic activity. The locational requirements of the efficient trader today are perhaps more exacting and precise than in the case of any other land use: combined with accommodation requirements they allow little compromise to fit into the framework of existing historic buildings or an historic centre if the traders are to remain competitive. These precise trading requirements themselves give rise to very high site values and the consequent need to rebuild to ensure that the value of the site is developed. Any conflict with primary trading of this kind is bound to make it difficult to retain historic buildings or to prevent their true character being lost. The location of the primary shopping posi-
tions is determined not so much by the traders themselves as by the planning authority. We cannot escape from the simple economic fact that the higher the site value, the greater is the need for the building on the site to be of maximum efficiency. This must result in rebuilding, and alteration of buildings which is a potential threat to their historic character. Increase in site value usually follows from a population increase, although in relation to shopping other factors are at play.

The effect of site value on rebuilding can be seen in the decoration of the historic character of the centres of the market towns on the periphery of the London conurbation. As the population has spread out, so it has brought with it increased economic prosperity in the shopping centres. Watford and Chelmsford are two old market towns where this has happened over recent years.

The converse of this can be seen in the agricultural market centres of East Anglia which have been isolated for many hundreds of years from the industrial population growth in the country. As a result of the static population and low economic rate of growth there has been little or no demand to redevelop and these towns have retained their old buildings and character—at any rate until now.

In looking at the alternatives of decay from low little demand and redevelopment, and change from too much, we must not lose sight of the fact that these are extremes. Between them are many provincial towns with an equilibrium where historic buildings are still maintained and used and there is little or no need for redevelopment. Perhaps the greatest future threat to historic centres will come from the big planned population movements in the country over the next ten to twenty years. These are bound to change the present level of economic activity in many historic towns and form a potential threat to their character. If properly handled, however, these population movements might well be used to advantage towards the preservation of historic buildings, as will be suggested later.

Towards a solution
This then is the bare outline of some of the economic and social aspects of the threat to historic buildings and the problems ranged against us in trying to retain them as part of the urban and rural pattern. If we are to overcome this threat in a positive way a solution must be sought on the broadest possible basis and as an integral part of the planning process.

Planning provides an instrument by which we can control and influence demand so as to avoid clashes between the need for change and the need to preserve. We can also use planning to stimulate economic growth in areas of decay where an increased demand for space would provide an occupier for historic buildings. This requires an approach to conservation of historic buildings which is believed not to have been practised yet on any considerable scale. It requires very careful measuring of economic activity to achieve a nice balance in demand and also a demand of the right kind. To those concerned with preserving historic character and buildings it will provide an active planning role, rather than the only too frequent negative retentionist one. The present system has tended to give rise to two opposed camps—preservationists and developers—both sides continued on p172
Three buildings—all recipients of a Civic Trust Award or Commendation—which have been adapted to new uses. Above left: an old malthouse in Oxford, converted to office use by the University Surveyor’s Department. Above right: Menstrie Castle.

Clackmannan, converted to flats and incorporated in a new housing layout. Below: the fourteenth century Wool House, Southampton, recently adapted for use as a maritime museum.

receive and deal with inquiries and offer advice to both sellers and purchasers. It would undoubtedly work in close co-operation with planning authorities. The essential requirement, however, would be that its existence and role would be known to estate agents and the public throughout the country. Its activities and views would be highly relevant to planning decisions, appeals or preservation orders.

The Government should call professional bodies and amenity organisations together in order to decide what the most effective form for such a new organisation might be. The Location of Offices Bureau sets a good pattern of the kind of agency which might be set up. Alternatively, the larger estate agents or their professional organisations might sponsor a clearing house which could be given official recognition. It may be noted that a computerised national property register has recently been proposed by a working party set up by the profession’s institute and that the NRC’s is investigating the same possibility.
probably seeing more clearly the other’s point of view than at times seems apparent. By more careful planning at an earlier stage it ought to be possible to decrease the area of conflict. As to the solution, it is possible here to set out the approach only very broadly. The first need perhaps is to analyse the composition of our stock of 100,000 or so statutorily listed buildings. We need to know what proportions are in town, village or countryside. Also the numbers at present used for residential or commercial purposes and how far they are in groups and in commercial and shopping centres of towns. More detailed information should also be provided for counties and towns on a similar basis, but including also information on how far the buildings are affected by bad environment or are used for a purpose that does not conform with existing zoning proposals. An analysis of this kind on a national basis would tell us the kind of problem we have to face and the extent of the threat; the more comprehensive analysis in counties and towns would become an essential factor in regional, town and detailed planning.

The main responsibility for decreasing the conflicts between preservation and change must lie with the planning authorities, national, regional and local—regionally, in deciding the location of new population and employment, when account should be taken of the effect on historic centres and buildings. As has been pointed out, the effect can be both beneficial and adverse—beneficial, by stimulating demand that can be fitted into historic buildings to arrest decay; adverse, by overstimulating commercial activity in an historic centre which will thereby suffer. This is not to say that towns with historic centres should not receive increases in population: the adverse effect of increased commercial activity can be overcome by local planning. For example, at Bury St Edmunds, which is taking overspill from London, the council has prepared a scheme to divert the demand for increased shopping space away from the historic Cornhill area. Provision of alternative commercial space elsewhere enables the planning authority to be much tougher about preventing changes that will destroy the present character of the historic centre.

Advice and environmental planning
So long as local authorities are properly advised on the quality and worth of their historic buildings and are convinced of the need to preserve their character, a great deal can be done in town and action area planning to avoid threats to groups of historic buildings and indeed to improve their chances of retention. The existence of historic buildings must be taken into account in preparing zoning proposals to avoid conflict between the use to which such buildings can be put and the primary use zoning. Even more perhaps can be done to ensure their retention through environmental planning. As was shown earlier, environment is one of the more important factors in influencing private individuals’ demand for historic buildings. Removal of traffic and non-conforming uses which make bad neighbours will all improve an old building’s chance of being taken over by a private individual who will care for and spend money on it. We have seen that historic buildings are often situated on the older highways on which traffic has usually increased, or in neighbourhoods which have declined. Bold environmental planning to improve the neighbourhood of historic buildings on a fairly big scale, so that it can be identified with a social class able and willing to spend money on restoration and maintenance, will rapidly improve the condition of the area. The planning authority and the highway authority hold the key to this solution.

Public investment
Although planning can stimulate the use of historic buildings by private agencies, including restoration and maintenance with private capital, there is a limit to what can be achieved in this way. In the end there will be a residue of buildings to which the community, through central or local government funds, will have to make some contribution towards the cost of retention. The need to spend public money arises mainly for buildings which have decayed through lack of demand rather than for those threatened by redevelopment and alteration. The purpose of this subsidy will be to bridge the gap between the cost of restoring a building after years of decay, or of fitting it for a new purpose, and its value when the work is completed. Many local authorities are already providing a measure of financial assistance for restoration through grants and loans and central Government is also doing this for outstanding buildings through the Historic Buildings Council.

There are several advantages in local authorities investing more money in their historic buildings. The bridging of the difference between cost and value, if it can be done, increases considerably the number of people able and willing to occupy these houses. At present many historic buildings are occupied and maintained by a small and somewhat specialised section of the community. This arises partly from environment, as has been mentioned, but is more particularly a matter of cost. Retention of historic buildings is always likely to be easier if the demand can be increased by reducing the cost.

Another advantage in investment of public money in historic buildings is that local authorities would be much keener on retaining them where they have a financial interest, and also on taking steps to improve their environment. Too often the preservation issues are centred around a dilapidated building in which only an enthusiast can see merit. A well maintained building in which the authority has some financial stake argues much more convincingly for itself.

Retention of our historic building tradition is a one-way traffic since a building lost can never be replaced. The 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, which produced the concept of the Building Preservation Order, forcing authorities to stop and think before they pull a building down, was an important step in arresting the loss of important buildings. In its eighteen years of operation the Act has had a fair measure of success in arresting the rot, but future policy seems to lie in positive action to make these buildings a more important and useful part of the fabric of the town, so that we want to keep them for their usefulness, rather than in waiting until the demolition contractor’s hammer is about to fall.

HADLEY BUCK
Until the nineteenth century, small spans kept buildings tiny, the street pattern intricate. A cathedral or minster was exceptional, achieved only by gargantuan effort and cost. The engineering skills of the Victorians enabled them to implant the occasional building of comparable scale—railway stations, hotels, gas holders—fairly easily into the urban fabric. Modern offices and shops, cinemas and garages demand spans of no less size as a matter of course; in older city centres they look like stranded whales. The scale of modern building is the most destructive single element in historic cities. It may often mean not trying to reconcile modern intensity of use with a medieval pattern of living, but creating a new centre of development nearby. We may otherwise get the worst of all possible worlds.

Above, Canterbury; below, York

There have been times when an expanding economy has led to great outbursts of development so rapidly planned and executed that the result has been informed by a singular unity of style—for example Wood’s Bath, the Bloomsbury Squares, Edinburgh New Town. These are exceptional. For the most part, in the past, towns grew slowly, organically. The requirements of successive generations did not change markedly: the scale of buildings increased but slowly; the materials of which they were constructed differed hardly at all. Change on this time scale was no more to be feared than the passing of the seasons.

Today, the restlessness with which we tear down and remake our environment is such that the process differs in kind rather than in degree. The maximum use of economic resources combines with the staggering opportunities offered by modern engineering and constructional techniques to produce building to a totally different order of scale from anything in the traditional city. New materials, often having no true colour, texture or form of their own, face these buildings. In the result, the confrontation of new and old, which was an inevitable and unself-conscious part of urban building in the past, now poses problems of a kind never previously faced by architects.

Risk of destruction
Such is the volume of redevelopment inevitably to be undertaken between now and the end of the century that the character and urban values of our towns, so laboriously created over many hundreds of years, will disappear unless we can learn a fresh design into existing settings in such a way that we contribute to them rather than destroy them.

Faced by disintegration of the historic urban core, it is tempting to press for comprehensive
redevelopment or comprehensive preservation. Either course would have saved us from the squarrows of, say, Berkeley Square in London. Where the original fabric was planned as a unity, any other solution is unthinkable: there are yet examples where unity could be restored by judicious demolition of one or two infill buildings and reconstruction of the original façades. The argument for a comprehensive approach is neatly put by Eastbourne and Westbourne Terraces in Paddington. The two streets back on to one another. The former has been totally rebuilt; the latter with its original nineteenth century façades has been retained, although interiors of one block were gutted and basements torn out to provide parking space. Both streets gain, it may be thought, from the contrast.

More commonly, however, the design problem consists of marrying new and old in more intimate juxtaposition—insertion of a new building in a predominantly old setting, or retention of one or two old buildings in an otherwise totally new setting. This is a challenge, primarily to the architect but not to him alone. To be successful in townscape terms, this confrontation must be designed at three design levels, failure at any one of which will invalidate whatever may have been achieved at the other two.

Town map
First: design begins at the level of the town map. If industry is zoned right up to an important monument, it must destroy the integrity of that monument however brilliant the architecture of the works. Once a plot ratio has been agreed which, on a particular site, will result in a bulk that must change the skyline and greatly overshadow smaller historic buildings in the foreground, the architectural expression of the shell becomes almost irrelevant. If a main traffic artery is made to skirt Worcester Cathedral, or the Westgate at Canterbury (whether or not it remains at ground level), is its design detail significant in relation to the cathedral or tower? If town planning is not sensitive to the quintessential character of conservation areas and to the underlying purposes of conservation, harmony between new and old building will remain impossible.

Architecture
Second: the successful confrontation of new and old demands skill and sensitivity on the part of the architect. Without resorting to pastiche he must contrive to reproduce in his design the grain and scale of his setting, whether or not he follows its predominating colours and textures. This may in turn call for open-mindedness on the part of his client. A building—let us say a new supermarket in a small historic town—may conform scrupulously to the height and string courses of its two-storey neighbours (on which conditions it received planning consent), yet utterly disrupt the scale and rhythm of the street by reason of its vast area of window glass at street level, its unaccented elevation above. As a design problem this is not particularly hard to overcome, provided that the client is prepared to question the myths and shibboleths of mass trading. Is there any hard evidence that a hundred square yards of glass, the seedy view through which is anyway obscured by a proliferation of stickers that it would take ten minutes to read, actually attracts more customers than a more traditional pattern of solid and void?

There are areas, heaven knows, where it is desirable and admirable to establish a new scale, to spark off a tired street with an uncompromising accent (what a lift the Jesmond Library in Newcastle gave to the entire block). Where the setting is of acknowledged quality, however, new building calls for a measure of humility in the designer. That it is not impossible to design into existing settings without a display of bad manners on the one hand, without undue diffidence on the other, is evidenced by the handful of examples in these pages. These are mostly single buildings—additions, adaptations and replacements—but the rehabilitated terraces of the LCC's Brandon Estate provide a useful example of older groups successfully incorporated into large scale redevelopment.

Area of concern
Third: the marriage of old and new can be rendered invalid by the treatment of the surrounding spaces, ground surfaces, street furniture and trim generally. The radius of what may be termed 'the area of concern' will vary enormously, according to whether it is related to a single building or monument, a group of buildings, a street or square, a sector of a town or the town itself.

In the particular case of Bath, for example, as is recognised in Professor Buchanan's report, it would have to embrace the whole setting of green hills in which the town is set. Within this radius, exceptional thought must be given to every small detail of the street scene—to such things as outdoor-advertising; to overhead wires (Bradford-on-Avon, the subject of one of the Historic Buildings Council's 'town schemes', is festooned with unsightly wire); to retention of sets and cobbles; to the design and scale of street lamps, bus shelters, litter bins and signs.

Viscount Esher, in his presidential address to the RSA in November 1968, had this to say:
'I think it is now widely recognised that we have got to stop messing about with our good old environments, whether urban or rural, so many of which are so much better than we can hope to do for ourselves. We have got to put a ring round our conservation areas and accept nothing within them below the standard of the Civic Trust awards. If we can get it right in a few cases, we must get it right in all—by employing the winners if necessary.'

Sensitivity to visual characteristics is not a gloss to be applied at one stage of redevelopment alone. Conservation must be seen not as an isolated concept but as part of the normal, continuing, everyday process of urban renewal and change. In this process many specialised skills and professions are nowadays involved: many administrative procedures have to be gone through. Too seldom are all those concerned aware of and responsive to the sources of character in town design. Yet, unless all members of the team—and indeed the client on the one hand and public opinion on the other—he brought to fuller awareness of the issues involved, the architect alone cannot be expected to achieve a sense of place, of quality, of new and old in harmony.
Confrontation of new and old

The design problem of marrying new and old is reduced to a minimum by comprehensive redevelopment or comprehensive preservation. Eastbourne Terrace, Paddington 1 backs onto Westbourne Terrace 2, 3; here interiors were gutted and basements used for car parking but the façades retained. More usually, urban growth is piecemeal, leading to a confrontation of periods and styles. Such confrontations have in the past been taken for granted—for example the Senate House in Cambridge backed by Waterhouse's Gonville and Caius College 4. They can provide the drama and stimulus of contrast (New Zealand House 5; Durham University 6); they can sometimes positively spark off an existing setting and give it a new meaning (Jesmond Library, Newcastle 7.

At the planning level

To warrant retention, a monument or a group of buildings must form a meaningful unit. Around it there will be a 'radius of concern'—varying according to the scale of the unit, the levels and the sight lines, from a street (as in the LCC's Brandon Estate 9, 10) to the landscape setting of a whole town (Bradford-on-Avon 8). Within this 'area of concern' conservation, to be valid, requires sensitivity at three levels—planning, architecture and trim. Failure at any one can make the mere act of retention absurd. What is to be made of Southampton's Bargate 1, stranded amid its traffic, its ring of commonplace building and a mass of street clutter? Once the decision was taken to permit the BBC extension 2, the factory at Brislington 4, the gas holder at Amersham 6, the multi-storey blocks and underground car park in Manchester 5, the flats at Great Baddow 7, the design of these things, in relation to the object retained, became irrelevant: the essential point of conservation had already gone. Will it really matter, in relation to the Westgate and the vanished city wall, whether Canterbury puts its inner ring road traffic below ground or not 3?
At the architectural level I

Cathedral city and historic town, medieval enclave large and small—these demand of modern additions, and of infill in particular, a sympathetic rhythm, now intricate and lively (St John’s and Brasenose Colleges, Oxford 1, 3), now very simple as a foil to greater splendours (for example the corner building to the left of Chichester Cross 4).
Traditional materials will often help to bind new to old (Ripon Hall extension, Oxford 2), or new materials may be used to echo traditional effects (Stratford-upon-Avon 8). Scale, above all, is of vital importance in the street scene (Winchester 4, 6, 7). Five of these buildings received Civic Trust Awards for the contribution they make to their settings.

Architects: 1 Architects Co-Partnership; 2 Myles and Deirdre Dove; 3 Powell & Moya; 4 Cruickshank & Seward; 5, 6 Casson, Conder & Partners, 7 Bridgewater, Shepheard & Epstein; 8 Frederick Gibberd & Partners.
At the architectural level

Eighteenth-century urbanity calls for an equivalent reticence on the part of new neighbours (restoration and addition in Dorset Square, London 1, 2). Matching of string courses assumes great importance; treatment of links and junctions can be crucial (St Anne's School, Southampton. 7). Nineteenth-century building often permits a more florid and exuberant treatment of adjoining elevations (St Katherine Dock House, 5 Tamar Terrace, Plymouth. 3); though the extension to Oriel Chambers in Liverpool 6 deliberately takes second place to its magnificent parent. In the diminishing scale of town, village and hamlet—even to the individual group of farm buildings—scale and materials assume paramount importance.

8 Salisbury; 4 Chester; 9 Epping; 10 Kelvedon, Essex; 11 Norfolk. Seven of these buildings, received Civic Trust Awards or Commendations.

Architects: 1, 2 C. H. Elsom & Partners; 3 John Taylor; 5 Andrew Renton & Associates; 6 James & Bywaters; 7 Richard Sheppard, Robson & Partners; 8 Potter & Hare; 9 Erdi & Rabson; 10 Dennis E. Pugh; 11 W. A. J. Spear
Detail and trim

Conservation implies respect for the thing conserved; respect implies care for its integrity at all levels. Failure to give attention to all the manifold details of design within the 'area of concern' can render the act of preservation meaningless. Were those little municipal-garden walls the best we could do for the Torr, Bradford-on-Avon? They took away the big gilt letters from the sign facing the Assembly Rooms in Bath but forgot the rest of the structure (they took away the glazing bars from the windows too). In how many streets have setts and cobbles been removed in the name of economy, yet the treatment of ground surfaces is a major factor in the street scene (Rye). Respect surely demands distinguished street furniture, and thought as to its scale and siting? It demands a firmer grip upon the mounting clutter of outdoor advertising and overhead wires. Wires and television aerials have been re-routed or otherwise disposed of by the National Trust in Lacock; why can we not do so everywhere?

Attention to detail of this kind is evident in the schemes at Liverpool and West Cromwell Road, London; on a town scale in the landscaping of the main approach to Kelso. Finally, if something is beautiful—and it need not be a master work—why should we not see it by night as well as by day as at Windsor?
And if the worst comes to the worst...

Buildings can be moved bodily, as in Hereford, either to new settings or to temporary sites before return to their original position. So, too, can other structures, like the wall in Rutland, which was rebuilt as part of a road widening scheme. In Stoke Prior a Museum of Buildings is envisaged, starting with the oldest house in Bromsgrove which had to be demolished. Finally, in the event of demolition of a worthwhile building, measured drawings can be made for the record, and valuable elements should be stockpiled for use in restoration schemes elsewhere.
Monk and Parking

What have Kingston-upon-Hull Corporation and Multidek Parking (G.B.) Ltd. got in common? Great pride in this spectacular Monk built Multi-Storey Car Park Complex 400 ft. long, 125 ft. wide, and 60 ft. or five floors high. Every facet of this impressive town-within-a-town is Monk made, every feature is built upon Monk's wide experience of ambitious projects. Facts and figures: 500 balustrade components, 4" thick with exposed aggregate facing, pre-cast in concrete at Monk's own casting factory; driver parking for 715 cars on two-way helical ramp (max. gradient 1:27) with a run-off giving additional level parking areas at each circuit; police garage and workshops; petrol filling station, service bay and showroom; two-storey shop development.

Monk

constructionwise

The Building, Civil Engineering & Reinforced Concrete Contractor

A. MONK & COMPANY LTD. WARRINGTON & LONDON Offices at Hull, Middlesbrough & Stamford
Consultants' brief

The minister's terms of reference to the consultants for the five town studies, though they vary in detail, are similar in substance. These are the abbreviated terms of one such brief.

The broad object is stated to be the preservation and enhancement of the architectural and historic character of the centre of the town, in order that its life and economic buoyancy may be maintained. Within this area the consultant is requested to:

1. Categorise the condition and quality of buildings which must be preserved, which should if possible be preserved and which are expendable;
2. Define areas worthy of conservation even if they contain few or no listed buildings;
3. Identify in detail the particular features—including street patterns, spaces and other elements—which it is considered should be preserved.

The study, it is stated, should:

(a) Take account of the various practical problems, among others:
   (i) motor traffic and car parking, covering both long term solutions and interim remedial measures;
   (ii) commercial pressures on the area and how they can be met without damaging its character, or alternatively how they can be accommodated elsewhere;

(b) Deal with:
   (i) Preservation of listed buildings in the area, including the economics of restoration and maintenance, or, where necessary, conversion to new uses. This may involve some consideration of existing or proposed land uses within the area and of amounts of accommodation likely to be required for different purposes in future;
   (ii) Measures to be taken for environmental improvement in the area;
   (iii) Control and guidance of any necessary new development to ensure that it is sympathetic to the environment in both design and quality;
   (iv) Generally, the total cost of conservation, including public expenditure required (other than public works which the local authority would normally undertake, apart from the direct needs of a conservation policy) and programming of this expenditure;
   (v) Any possible new sources of revenue which may occur to the consultant or which may be drawn to his attention.

Other points made are that the consultant will need to relate his proposals to the current planning proposals for the town as a whole (if he finds this impossible, he should explain why); he is to be free to suggest any changes in the law; he should take into account any conservation measures already being prepared or carried out by the local authority or other—eg amenity—bodies.
The area of government concern with the national heritage of historic buildings has grown, during the present century, from its first preoccupation with monuments—castles, ruins of monastic settlements, fragments of ancient city walls and so on—through increasing recognition of architectural values and the importance of individual buildings and houses, to present awareness of the value of area character—including even whole towns and villages. This extension of emphasis first became apparent a few years ago in the grants made by the Historic Buildings Council. It has been greatly strengthened by a number of developments in Whitehall during the past eighteen months or so.

The long-standing quirk of administration by which government concern with historic buildings was divided between the Ministry of Housing and Local Government and the Ministry of Public Building and Works has at last been largely resolved. Recommendations to this end go back to the Gowers Report, but it was not until July 1966 that responsibility for making Exchequer grants for the repair of buildings of outstanding historic or architectural interest passed from MoH to MoPB—the latter being already responsible for the official listing of historic buildings and other action taken under the planning Acts. Thus, for the first time, positive and negative preservation functions are in the same hands (though still in four different buildings).

As a consequence of these changes it became possible for the functions of the Historic Buildings Council to be merged with those of the minister’s advisory committee on buildings of special architectural or historic interest. Under the chairmanship of Lord Hilles the new council will advise the minister on:

1. grants towards repair and maintenance of outstanding buildings;
2. acquisition, acceptance as gifts, and disposal of such buildings;
3. grants towards the acquisition of buildings by local authorities and of outstanding buildings by the National Trust;
4. ways of finding new uses for historic buildings;
5. the general state of preservation of outstanding buildings;

A second committee, the Preservation Policy Group, consisting of senior officers of the department (and the Ministry of Transport) and outside experts has been set up under the chairmanship of Lord Kennet, parliamentary secretary to MoPB, to review the whole of present legislative, administrative and financial arrangements for preserving historic buildings and areas. This group is supervising the five special studies (announced by Richard Crossman while he was minister) for Bath, Chester, Chichester, King’s Lynn and York. These studies are intended to show how positive conservation policies for historic towns can be worked out and implemented, and how progress and preservation can be reconciled in practical terms. The projects are being jointly financed by the Government and the local authorities (in York with an additional grant of £5,000 from the York Civic Trust). The consultants’ reports should be available towards the end of 1967 and the Preservation Policy Group expects also to report during this year.

In addition to these welcome initiatives, new legislation—in the form of the Civic Amenities Bill—is likely to reach the Statute Book during 1967. Before examining the particular gaps and weaknesses that the Bill is designed to meet, it is necessary to glance at the essential effects of existing legislation in this field.

Listing
Present legislation on historic buildings stems, effectively, from the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, later supplanted by the 1962 Act of
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are expected to give due weight to the claims of listed buildings to preservation. Their normal powers to control development do not, however, extend to works of demolition, alterations to the interior of a building or to works to the exterior, except where these would materially alter the external appearance of a building. To protect buildings listed under section 32 of the 1962 Act from demolition or serious alteration at will, section 33 therefore requires two months’ notice to be given before works are put in hand. Penalties for non-compliance are so minimal as more than once to have been proved ineffective.

Building Preservation Orders
A building of special architectural or historic interest, whether or not it appears in a statutory list, can be the subject of a Building Preservation Order. A local authority is empowered by section 30 of the 1962 Act to make such an order; section 207 of the Act gives the minister power to do so in the name of a local planning authority (a power he has used on only thirty-three occasions) or to direct the authority to make an order. The effect of an order—of which some 380 are operative on fewer than 1,400 buildings—is to prohibit the demolition or serious alteration of a building without the express consent of the order-making authority. An order is of no effect until confirmed by the minister. The minister must consider objections before finally confirming an order but he can bring an order quickly into operation by confirming it provisionally without first hearing objections. A provisionally confirmed order remains effective for two months.

Orders confer a right of appeal to the minister against refusal of consent or grant of consent subject to conditions. They also provide for payment of compensation in certain circumstances, though compensation is not payable where consent for demolition is refused. An
owner can however call upon the local council to buy his interest if, following a refusal of consent to demolish a building, he serves a purchase notice claiming that the building is incapable of reasonably beneficial use in its existing state. Again, penalties for contravention of an order have been minimal and generally ineffective. It is rare for the minister to make an order himself in default of action by a local authority. As, however, copies of all notices of intention to demolish or seriously alter listed buildings are sent to him by the local planning authority, there is opportunity to intervene where the local planning authority has failed to take action to safeguard a building which, in the minister's view, has strong claims to preservation.

**Powers of acquisition**

A Building Preservation Order confers no power to require the owner to carry out repairs and maintenance. The only sanction against neglect is compulsory purchase. Section 69 of the 1962 Act empowers a local authority, with the minister's authorisation, to acquire compulsorily a building which is the subject of an operative Building Preservation Order and which is endangered by neglect. The minister also has powers in these circumstances to acquire a building compulsorily. Buildings of special architectural or historic interest can be acquired by local authorities by agreement (section 71) where the aim is to secure their preservation. Purchase by agreement is not uncommon but compulsory purchase of a neglected building is rare.

**Grants and loans**

There are two sources of grant-aid. Local authorities are authorised by the Local Authorities (Historic Buildings) Act 1962 to make grants or loans, at their discretion, for repair and maintenance of buildings of architectural or historic interest. The minister's consent is required only if the building is not included in a statutory list issued under section 32 of the Act. Some figures indicating the use so far made of these powers appear on a later page. The second source is the fund from which the minister can make grants for repair and maintenance of buildings of outstanding historic or architectural interest. The enabling Act is the Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act 1884. The Historic Buildings Council advises the minister on administration of the funds available. Grants have so far been given to 1,100 buildings in England, to a total value over thirteen years of £4 million. Some years ago the council devised what have come to be known as 'town schemes'. In these, the central Government and the local authorities concerned commit themselves jointly to spend a given amount annually, the individual grants being in fixed proportion (usually 50 per cent) to the cost of repairs. Currently, the Historic Buildings Council spends a total of £33,000 a year on eight such 'town schemes' (see p.21).

**Existing legislation and the Civic Amenities Bill**

If historic buildings are not to be lost or seriously damaged through ignorance of their special interest, they must first be identified and an inventory made. The powers to compile and issue lists are adequate for these purposes. For the wider purpose of safeguarding historic areas, listing of individual buildings is not enough. Mr Duncan Sandys' Civic Amenities Bill will for the first time impose a duty on a local planning authority to determine which parts of their area are of special architectural or historic interest. This is an essential pre-requisite to any future special measures to facilitate the preservation of historic areas. At the time of writing, the Bill is awaiting its turn for consideration in a standing committee of the House of Commons. The final reading in July 1966. Amendments may be made either in committee, or when the Bill reaches the report stage, and it is not easy to forecast the final form of the Act.

Provision is made in an amendment tabled to the Bill for a reserve power for the minister to require a local planning authority to designate a particular area as a conservation area where the need is justified and the local authority has not itself acted. Similarly, if a local authority has designated an area and not drawn the line with sensitivity, the minister may vary or revoke the designation. In each case the minister may exercise his powers only after consultation with the county or county borough concerned.

The procedure for giving advance notice of intention to demolish or alter a building on a statutory list works well enough. There are two weaknesses, however, both of which are dealt with in the Civic Amenities Bill. The first is that the period of notice—two months—is too short a period in which to consider whether a Building Preservation Order would be justified. Very often a report needs to be made by the local authority on the condition of the building and, if it is unoccupied, the possibility of finding a use for it. The Bill proposes that this period should be increased to six months. A useful amendment has been tabled which, if approved, will have the effect of 'restoring' a building if works have not been started two years after the notice of intention has been served on the authority. At the moment, the serving of a notice results in the building automatically losing the protection which section 33 of the Planning Act affords, if no positive steps are taken to preserve the building by the minister or the council.

The other weakness, and a much more serious one, is that the penalty for demolishing or seriously altering a building without giving advance notice is, as has been said, no longer an adequate deterrent. The penalty for non-compliance is a fine of up to £100. The local authority also has power to require reinstatement of a building to its former condition—a reasonably effective penalty where alterations have been carried out but obviously difficult to enforce in the case of a building that has been totally demolished. The Civic Amenities Bill provides for a fine not exceeding £100, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or both, on a summary conviction: on a conviction on indictment, an unlimited fine, and/or imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months. For the first time the Courts will be in a position to ensure that there shall be no profit in flouting the law devised to protect our heritage of buildings. These stronger deterrents are also applied to the Bill to contraventions of Building Preservation Orders, which should in consequence at last provide an effective means of safeguarding buildings.
of special interest.

Another difficulty which the Civic Amenities Bill proposes to meet is that the two-month period for which a Building Preservation Order remains operative after provisional confirmation is all too short for the procedures introduced following the Frankes Report. While the minister is not bound to hold an inquiry into an application for confirmation of an order, it is the practice to do so if an objector asks to be heard. If, however, the procedure is followed it is virtually impossible finally to confirm the order before expiry of the provisional confirmation. The Bill proposes that the period of provisional confirmation should be extended to six months.

Another approach to the same problem is to be found in an amendment set down for consideration by the committee. This amendment would enable a local planning authority (or other authority having power to make a Building Preservation Order), faced with an urgent situation, to make an order which would have instant effect and which would remain fully effective for six months, or until confirmed or rejected by the minister, whichever came sooner.

Two other weaknesses in existing legislation are that there is no real sanction against an owner who wilfully damages a building or simply neglects it until it is beyond hope of restoration. A good many cases of deliberate neglect have occurred—some of them notorious—and local authorities have not been blameless in this respect over buildings in their possession. The Civic Amenities Bill proposes penalties against an owner who causes or permits an act likely to result in damage to a listed building. It also provides for a continuing penalty if, on conviction, steps are not taken to prevent any further damage which may result from the initial act. Where an owner gives no ground for suggesting that he is about to carry out works which could be restricted by making a Building Preservation Order yet fails to take any steps to maintain the building, there has hitherto been no sanction against him. The Bill proposes that in such circumstances the powers of compulsory acquisition already available under section 69 in respect of buildings to which Preservation Orders attach should be extended to listed buildings.

One further provision which will strengthen the powers of local authorities is that enabling them to dispose of a building which they have acquired compulsorily or by agreement under sections 69 and 71 of the 1962 Act. As the law stands, a local authority can only do this in the case of acquisition by agreement, yet cases have been known where the owner, while taking no steps to maintain a building, has refused either to sell it by agreement to the local planning authority or to sell it to a person interested in securing its preservation. In that situation there has so far been no way, short of a local authority acquiring and retaining the building themselves, for it to be passed over to a private owner willing to undertake its restoration and preservation. The proposed new provision, while not likely to be called upon very often, fills a gap and provides a deterrent to any owner who is prepared to hold on to a building in the hope that in course of time there will be no alternative but to allow its demolition and the redevelopment of the site.

The success of the operation of these new powers and duties will depend on local authorities and members of the public being alive to the dangers to which good buildings are exposed. An amendment is going to be considered which will provide for lists of buildings of special architectural or historic interest to be available for public inspection free of charge. There should be no valid excuse for anyone to claim that he was unaware that the building was listed.

---

STOP PRESS

Pilot surveys for Worcestershire

Justifiable publicity has attached to the minister's appointment of consultants to make pilot surveys of five historic towns. Of no less significance at a different level is Worcestershire County Council's decision in recent weeks to initiate pilot surveys for seven towns within the county: Bewdley, Evesham, Malvern, Pershore, Stourport, Tenbury Wells and Upton-upon-Severn. There are upwards of 900 buildings of special architectural interest in the central areas of these towns; their quality and grouping is considered by the County Planning Committee to be such as to justify comprehensive study on an area basis.

As with the national studies, outside consultants are being appointed. These will be architects in private practice—one for each town—and they will receive their first briefing at the end of January 1987. Consultants will team up with county and district council officers, under the general direction of the county planning officer. Teams will be asked to examine and report on:

(a) the historical and present position and role of the area in relation to the town;
(b) elements which contribute to the aesthetic character and quality of the area;
(c) buildings in the area, their date and structural history, present use, condition and appearance. (A photographic survey will be carried out by the County Planning Department);
(d) road traffic and its effect on the area;
(e) the economic role of the area;
(f) discordant and unsatisfactory features;
(g) buildings that justify conservation, having regard to other planning considerations.

The consultant architects will be expected to advise on day-to-day proposals for development before and after the pilot studies have been completed.

The county regards the scheme as an extension of its current work on town centre planning, with the emphasis on the smaller country towns where conservation may often be more appropriate than replacement. The studies, it is hoped, will be of immediate and permanent value in distinguishing between these two needs and providing a guide for the future to local authorities, owners of property and potential developers.
ACTION BY THE LOCAL AUTHORITY

At a time when local government reform is in the air, the energies of many people are bent upon improving the machinery for preserving parts of our historical background. At the other side of the world young Chinese Red Guards are encouraged to destroy systematically all the Buddhist temples and other physical links with and reminders of a past age. It is difficult for us to understand the enthusiasm and beliefs which convert such senseless destruction into a meaningful act. But preservation which does not allow for any change can be in its own way as senseless as what is happening now in China.

Local authorities have a vital role to play in this whole process and it may be opportune to consider briefly, from their point of view, the law on which present practice is based: how it may be changed by the Civic Amenities Bill; and what problems there may be in using the new machinery to ensure that preservation does not degenerate into sterility.

Defects of the present system
The basis of the present system, as indicated in earlier pages, lies in the list of buildings of architectural or historic merit compiled by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. This 'Domesday Book' is an invaluable starting point to the whole question of conservation. We have not, however, yet learned how to use it effectively. There are three main defects in our present approach:
1 Questions of preservation tend to arise for consideration only when the owner of a listed building gives notice (as he is obliged to do) of a proposal to demolish or to carry out works of extension or alteration which would seriously affect the character of the building. We think about preservation when faced with change, but tend to forget about it at other times.
2 Because the list is of individual buildings, the tendency has been to consider only the building itself. Indeed until the recent case of Iveagh v Ministry of Housing and Local Government it was not clear to what extent the planning authority could take into account adjoining buildings. Yet so often it is not the building itself that matters so much as the wider scene of which it forms part and to which it contributes.
3 Because the list is exhaustive (particularly if we include the supplementary list), time and energy can be spent wastefully on considering the future of a building of little merit, merely because it is the subject of notice of proposals by the owner.

The positive approach
The approach emerging today involves a much more positive attitude to the whole problem. It is not enough to wait until an owner is ready to demolish or submits proposals for alteration. It may be possible to save the building in question, but what of the hundreds of others which may be decaying beyond repair? It is too easy for a local planning authority to be bemused by the steady trickle of applications to pull down or alter listed buildings into thinking that this is preservation. What is needed is an overall assessment of what must be preserved, what costs may be involved in doing it, and how these are to be shared between the public and the private purse—a positive, not a negative approach.
This change of attitude is paralleled by similar changes in the planning process itself. Until recently planning remained more negative than positive, with the emphasis on development control. It was the developer who exercised the initiative and the authority who sought to control it. Today we realise increasingly that it is not enough to put a residential notation on a town map and then wait for something to happen, in the
hope that control at that point will produce a
good environment. The planner now is thinking
much more in terms of ‘action areas’ and ‘action
area plans’ designed to give guide lines to de-
developers. Only positive planning—a creative
rather than a negative control process—will
create the sort of environment to which twentieth
century man has a right.

Civic Amenities Bill
The minister’s five Town Studies, coupled with
the setting up of the Preservation Policy Group,
are marked steps forward in this direction in the
field of conservation. The experience gained
should be invaluable in helping all planning
authorities to meet the duties which will be
imposed upon them under section 1 of the Civic
Amenities Bill, namely to determine areas which
need to be conserved as a whole. This will require
just such a positive approach, combining the
aesthetic, the economic—and common sense.
Surveys will not be done overnight, and it would
be disastrous if they were to be done without the
implications having been carefully considered. If
the provisions of the Bill are to be applied
realistically, there should be greater selectivity,
greater discrimination about what needs to be
preserved. In areas chosen for conservation there
will be inevitably less flexibility than now.
Conversely, change should be easier to secure else-
where and should not be bedevilled by the prob-
lems of preservation which so often arise today.
It can be seen at once that the effect will be to
increase the actual field of preservation, because
the powers of planning authorities are being
extended to the surrounds of listed buildings and
to buildings not themselves of special architectural
or historic interest. The aim is to produce a
conservation area—perhaps a street, houses round
a village green, a segment of a town or even a
complete town—where the whole is to be con-
sidered and not just the parts of the whole.
The powers of compulsory acquisition by the
minister and the local authorities, as set out in
section 69 of the Town and Country Planning
Act 1962, are widened by the Civic Amenities Bill
to include listed buildings—whether they are in a
conservation area or not.

Problems posed by the Bill
Everyone is aware that a listed building enjoys
special protection. An owner must give notice
(increased from two to six months by the Bill) of
any proposal to demolish the building or to alter
or extend it so as to ‘seriously affect its character’.
Demolition on its own, and irrespective of a
proposal for redevelopment, needs no planning
consent. Equally there are many minor works
which can be done without the consent of the
planning authority, either because they need no
consent or because ‘blanket’ consent is granted
under the terms of the Town and Country Planning
General Development Order 1962. This is the
Order which permits minor extensions (including
garages), repainting, and erection of gates, fences
and walls and so on.
The main advantage of the notice of intention is
that it gives the planning authority an opportu-
nity to make a Building Preservation Order
under section 30 of the Act of 1962. Usually they
will ask the minister for provisional confirm-
ance which is effective for two months (increased to
six months by the Bill). In this way, they can buy
time (four months maximum at present) within
which to decide their policy, including whether
to contribute financially or not.
However, in the case of non-listed buildings
included in the areas of special character under
section 1 of the Bill, there will be no safeguarding
provision of the sort described. The owners of
these buildings will enjoy the normal freedoms for
minor works under the General Development
Order. Works permitted by the Order are freed
from any liability for levy under the Land
Commission Bill and may assume more value as a
result. Yet, in some circumstances, these minor
works could affect the character of the area and
steps may have to be taken to bring them under
control.
This can be achieved by seeking ministerial con-
firmation of a direction under article 4 of the
Order, making it necessary for owners to apply
for consent to works which elsewhere would need
no application. They would, however, be entitled
to compensation if refused consent (for an ex-
ample see Fry v Essex County Council (1960). Planning and Compensation Reports, p21).

Clutter and street furniture
The planning authority will obviously not want to make an article 4 direction lightly, but clearly there are risks involved in not doing so in an area to be designated under section 1 of the Bill.

Another matter which may require special attention in these conservation areas is that of advertisements. If the conservation area includes a fair number of business premises, it may be desirable to make the area one of special advertisement control. This will prevent indiscriminate display of business advertisements on business premises. In an area of special control there is a restriction on the superficial area that may be occupied by such advertisements—one-twelfth of the frontage up to 12ft from ground level (Town and Country Planning Advertisements Regulations 1960, article 12).

A special control Order will not overnight cure the sort of clutter which can disfigure a conservation area. Boardings and similar displays get varying periods of grace (usually six months) before they must be removed. The worst offenders, existing business advertisements on business premises, are not affected even if they do not comply with the space and height limitations already noticed. They can, however, be challenged by the planning authority in the usual way. It is also worth bearing in mind that the minister can direct, under regulation 13 of the Advertisement Regulations 1960, that all business advertisements shall require express consent in any particular area. This is a drastic form of control for which an exceptional case would have to be made out.

The Civic Amenities Bill talks of 'enhancing' the character of the special areas which it seeks to define. The planning authority will no doubt wish to consider how far an improvement in street furniture will help this objective to be reached. Directional, traffic and other signs, street lighting, litter bins, bus stops all contribute to the street scene. Improvements should normally be possible by co-operation and consultation with the authorities concerned. Legally, of course, it is possible to bring under control all new developments in these fields by making an article 4 direction withdrawing the permissions granted by clauses xii and xvii of the General Development Order 1960.

Delegated authorities
It is obviously desirable that clause 1 of the Civic Amenities Bill should be operated in a uniform way throughout the country. No ministerial consent is required under the clause to the determination of special conservation areas, and uniformity will be achieved only by local planning authorities working to similar standards. In county areas, it would seem that formal determination of these special areas should not be a delegated function. Boroughs, urban and rural districts could nevertheless give useful help in the initial stages by suggesting whether or not they embrace areas of special architectural or historic interest and in co-operating in a positive
policy for preservation and enhancement. The Bill confers no right of appeal against a determination of a conservation area (as indeed there is none against inclusion in the statutory list under the Act of 1962). Planning authorities could nevertheless, if they so desired, hear objections informally before making a formal determination under clause 1 of the Bill. In view of the consequences to owners of any property not in itself of architectural or historic interest, it would seem reasonable to allow objections to be ventilated at an early stage. This could prevent difficulty later on in connection with individual planning applications and appeals, or requests for article 4 directions, special advertisement control orders or the like.

In the end, preservation and enhancement of these 'heritage' areas will only follow public acceptance of the need and the costs likely to be involved. This will best be secured by the planning authority putting its proposals forward as the earliest stage for general discussion by the public, societies, individual users and occupiers. Knowledge and appreciation of buildings of architectural or historic interest is something of a specialists' sphere. This has been recognised by the Town and Country Planning Act 1962, which allows the minister to consult with bodies of persons as appear to him appropriate as having special knowledge of, or interest in, buildings of architectural and historic interest.

Local planning authorities should similarly consider the extent to which they should seek help in surveying their area and determining those parts as conservation areas under the Civic Amenities Bill.

Planning authorities should also consider carefully the economics of preservation before reaching final conclusions. Some areas will present few problems or only light demands upon the public purse. Others can realistically be included only if the cost of preservation has been assessed. Basically, this involves evaluating the economic pressures for change. The approach must be a common-sense one and judgment will need to be based upon architectural, valuation, and planning advice.
Without vigilance the quality of our personal surroundings will assuredly decline. Most individual owners care for their own premises, but they are frequently without interest in properties beyond their boundaries. Today, however, most owners are not individuals but impersonal organisations—large companies, national boards, government departments or local authorities. Their estate management policies are remote and lack local affiliations. A way must be found to reintroduce the concepts of neighbourliness, good manners and civic pride into the obligations of ownership. A collective effort by shopkeepers and others in Civic Trust street improvement schemes has demonstrated the value of combining self-interest and public advantage.

The existing fabric of our towns and buildings is a national asset which should not be squandered. We need, on economic grounds, to make the most of it. To conserve this capital equipment, to extend its useful life, is a worthwhile national aim. If firm policies for conservation are established, guarantees will exist within which owners can operate with confidence. They will the more easily be able to apply an enlightened policy of estate management and building maintenance. Large scale redevelopment will be the exception rather than the rule, but alterations, additions, improvements, changes of use and rebuilding will prevail, thus enabling each owner to play a part. Radical redevelopment will be needed in many towns; numerous uses will have to be housed in massive structures. Property developers are not alone in erecting big glass, steel and concrete buildings in town centres. New town halls, hospitals, technical colleges, police stations, libraries and swimming pools are all much larger than in former times. Just as shops get bigger (because we buy more) so offices grow larger (because more people work in offices). The location and siting of such new development in relation to publicly declared intentions to preserve and enhance

Work in progress on a Civic Trust street improvement scheme. Co-ordinated maintenance is often cheaper
special character will clarify the potentialities open to the developer, whether private or public, as it will clarify the brief to the architect. The very act of designating conservation areas could have a stabilising effect on property values. Such areas will be picked out as being very special. They will have unique characteristics which will be irreplaceable. Frequently they will be areas of great attraction to tourists and visitors. As time goes on they will achieve the additional values associated with scarcity.

Some idea of the value of our heritage areas can be gained by looking at the total ratable value—nearly £73 million—of the fifty-one priority towns listed by the Council of British Archaeology as nationally important. Add to this the public investment in utility services located in them and we begin to see that maintaining them rather than pulling them down might be sound business. The probability is that if owners and occupiers went elsewhere in new development their rents would be much higher.

There is one minority consisting of people who neglect good old buildings and another of people who are genuinely unable to respond to the financial demands or investment needed. Penalties for the former are to be made stiffer under the Civic Amenities Bill. In the case of the latter it is for local authorities and civic societies to assist where to do so is in the public interest. For the most part, however, it is not lack of money but insensitivity, selfishness and apathy that lead to downdraw in existing areas and blight in redevelopment. Here civic societies have a genuine task to perform.

There are now some 600 local civic and amenity societies—compared with perhaps 150 to 200 ten years ago. It is not easy to generalise about them: some have four-figure memberships, some are quite tiny. Broadly, within the field of conservation (which is only one of their concerns), they can fulfil six main functions:

1. Act as a watchdog and create a fuss when they see something going wrong;

2. Watch for town planning applications that will vitally affect conservation areas, and protest or give views on them to the planning authority or at appeals;

3. Use their members' specialist local knowledge to keep records and maintain archives, to survey buildings and areas worthy of conservation;

4. Apply first-aid to buildings themselves through purchase and restoration, or through initiating campaigns which focus public money to the same end;

5. Undertake or sponsor positive schemes of improvement;

6. Influence the wider public by producing guides and handbooks, by exhibitions and lectures, walks, plaques on appropriate buildings and in a multitude of other ways.

The growth of the civic society movement is significant and represents widespread concern for the fate of amenities in town and country, including the fate of our historic and architectural heritage. It is a movement that can easily relapse into negative postures of protest against bureaucracy. It is, however, showing an increasing sense of responsibility and vision. Every year produces an increasing number of examples of initiative of action which has been of great public benefit and has resulted in more civilised decisions.

Just as the local society can canalise local concern, so can the national societies provide a clearing house for information and focus opinion nationally. The work of the Council for British Archaeology has been mentioned. The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, by far the oldest of the preservationist bodies, not only makes representations to the authorities concerned in specific cases; it also undertakes detailed surveys, organises technical courses for architects, and maintains a register of threatened buildings for possible purchasers. Its latest offspring, the Victorian Society, still in the fine fervour of its youth, is particularly active and has done much to change the climate of opinion in relation to Victorian architecture. The National Trust needs no explanation but it will be worth recalling that...
the trust is not concerned with great country houses and stretches of countryside alone; in its possession also are whole villages such as Lacock. The National Trust for Scotland has done notable work over the last ten years in rehabilitating smaller burghs of character. It is rare for any one body to be able to claim all the credit for a success in the field of conservation. Almost inevitably, implementation of any scheme demands co-operation all round. Half a dozen different parties may easily find themselves involved at one stage or another—the local society, one or more of the national societies, the owner, a new tenant, the local authority, the planning authority, the Historic Buildings Council. Nonetheless, cases abound in which one of the voluntary bodies has played an indispensable part—has sparked off action that would otherwise never have been taken, has created new machinery to do the job, has provided the ideas that led to a final solution. A handful of such case-histories follows. These, it must be remembered, were carried out under existing legislation, existing powers, the existing state of the economy. There is no reason why each one of them should not be duplicated, now, wherever there is a need, in every town in Britain.

The designation of conservation areas will offer a new challenge to local societies, as well as to local authorities and the professions concerned. Designation will not, of itself, increase the numbers of expert staff available to plan the protection and appropriate renewal of these areas. Pressures to redevelop will not diminish; planning departments and architect’s departments will be no less hard pressed than in the past; the wider public will remain unaware of the issues at stake until perhaps it is too late. In this situation it will be open to the ever-increasing number of civic societies to make a powerful contribution to the success of the Civic Amenities Bill when it becomes law. It is to be hoped that they will be given all support by local chapters of architects, local groups of planners, designers and landscape architects. Stiffened with such technical expertise, working in harness with their local council, backed by this new legislative authority for the concept of the conservation area, they could embody a new national sense of purpose to protect and improve the urban scene.

What the owner and voluntary society can do:
1 cottages restored by the Cambridgeshire Cottage Improvement Society; 2 a fourteenth century building in Walmgate, York, recently restored by the York Civic Trust; 3, 4 restoration by one of the 'Big Five' in Corsham; 5, 6 commercial premises in Epping, before and after a street improvement scheme.

Four case histories in collaboration →
Case histories in collaboration

Abbey Street, Faversham

Abbey Street in Faversham once linked the centre of the town with its abbey. Today it leads only to the small and busy port. The rehabilitation over the past decade of the street’s most important length has been due to the co-operation effected between private owners, voluntary societies, the borough council and the Historic Buildings Council—above all to the enthusiasm of the town clerk personally.

January 1955 Faversham Historical Society, disturbed by the decay of Abbey Street, attempts to buy Arden’s House, the most important medieval house in the street.

April 1955 Private purchaser of Arden’s House commissions the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings to report on its potential for restoration.

May 1955 Architect David Nye reports to the SPAB and recommends careful restoration; suggests also that a report is needed on the entire street.

1955-56 Restoration of Arden’s House completed.

January 1957 The late C. S. Chettoe, a committee member of the SPAB, suggests to the town clerk that the council should ask the society to undertake a survey. Council replies favourably. SPAB approaches the Canterbury School of Architecture to see whether students can undertake a measured drawings survey of Abbey Street as part of their programme.

May 1957 Form of survey discussed with town clerk.

July-November 1957 Survey completed; measured drawings presented to the borough council.

January 1958 Town clerk recommends to Housing Committee that the SPAB be asked to make a full report for a fee of £100. ‘If Abbey Street is to be saved action can be deferred no longer...’

Nye’s preliminary report accepted. He is asked to draw up a detailed scheme to establish which buildings should be preserved, what form new development on gap sites should take and what treatment open spaces in the street should
receive.
May 1958 Article in Daily Telegraph stimulates interest.
September 1958 Meeting of property owners convened by borough council to explain implications of Nye’s report. National press reports progress and stimulates further interest.
October 1958 Nye submits final report.
December 1958 Borough council makes first payments under Housing Act, in the form of improvement grants; council purchases four properties for £220; one property in divided ownership privately purchased for renovation.
January 1959 Working party of borough and county set up to consider implementation of Nye’s supplementary report on road works; borough applies to Historic Buildings Council for financial assistance.
March 1959 First: two properties put on sale to private owners who will agree to renovate them; mortgages offered to prospective buyers, as well as loans for cost of restoration.
February 1960 Ministry of Housing and Local Government upgrades fifteen properties to the statutory list.
August 1960 Work proceeding on five properties; three more for sale.
December 1961 Historic Buildings Council agrees to give £500 a year for three years, provided that the borough matches this with an equal contribution. Two more properties acquired by the borough; agreement reached on road and street lighting improvements.

Some facts and figures
Properties restored by December 1966 27
Properties in varying states of purchase and restoration, December 1966 14
Average purchase price £1,500
Maximum purchase price (one case only) £6,000
Average reconstruction costs £2,000
Maximum reconstruction cost (one case only) £10,000
Cost to local authority
(a) Recoverable:
Improvement grants of £400 given to some twenty houses £8,000
Mortgages of £200 to £300 to some sixteen houses £4,000
Local authority loans to meet reconstruction costs made to some sixteen houses £32,000
(b) Outright grants
£1,500
Total £45,500

of which recoverable in the long term £44,000
Spread over nine years the total annual cost to Faversham Borough Council is the equivalent of a 2½d rate.
Cost to central government
Historic Building Council grants £1,800
Improvement grants £8,000

---

**Beaufort Square, Bath**

Beaufort Square, closed on one side by the Theatre Royal, is one of Bath’s smaller spaces. Modest in scale, it nonetheless has great charm. Some years ago its unity of character was seriously threatened by redevelopment but initiative by the local society and co-operation by a commercial developer combined to a happy end.

1956 Half of the east side of Beaufort Square found to be in a dangerous state of disrepair and demolished by Bath Corporation.
1960 Bath Preservation Trust submits a report to the corporation asking for a comprehensive approach towards rebuilding of the east side and north-east corner of the square, and for retention of the only remaining house, No 5.
October 1961 Bath Corporation, as owners of the entire east side, decides in committee to lease the vacant sites and to allow demolition of No 5, with adjoining properties in Barton Street, for a unified scheme of commercial redevelopment: this embraced a restaurant on the ground floor, with flats above.
November 1961 Bath Preservation Trust holds a press conference asking for the corporation to refer the Planning Committee’s report back. The trust presses for preservation of No 5 and for a development on the vacant sites of Nos 3 and 4 which will pay more respect to the quality of the square. The trust also appeals for funds to meet the extra cost likely to be incurred by the corporation.
Bath Corporation refers the report back to the Planning Committee for reconsideration.
December 1961 Donations received by the trust from all over the country.
February 1962 Corporation invites Bath Preservation Trust to discuss the problem. At the meeting the corporation issues a challenge to the trust—prepare a definite plan showing how No 5 can be retained and submit within three months.
March 1962 Ernest Tew FRIBA commissioned by Bath Preservation Trust to draw up a scheme incorporating No 5.

May 1962 Tew presents plan for twenty-three flats and eight shops to trust. Proposes replicas of No 5 on sites of Nos 3 and 4, adaptation of No 22 and a new building behind fronting on to Barton Street.

June 1962 Plan approved by trust and submitted to corporation.

February 1963 No decision. Tew submits estimate of £20 000 as cost of restoration and new development.

March 1963 Corporation offers to grant a lease to Bath Preservation Trust if the trust can find a developer to build the scheme.

April 1963 Crisp, Cowley & Co of Bath finds a London firm, Bampton Property Group, willing to undertake the development. Bampton Property Group introduced by the trust to the corporation.

July 1963 Corporation asks trust to contribute £750 as a bridging payment for extra costs involved. Trust agrees, but Bampton Property Group found willing to meet entire development cost.

May 1964 Bampton Property Group signs a ninety-nine-year lease with the corporation.

October 1964 Building starts.

September 1966 Building completed; cost £90 000.

Plymouth Barbican

Plymouth Barbican, historic port area of the city, lies between Loos and the Citadel. It covers some twenty-five acres and includes, today, fifty-three listed buildings. Over the last forty years it has been in constant jeopardy. That it still stands is a tribute to the tenacity of a handful of local people, and to present co-operation between the local society, the Borough Council and the Historic Buildings Council.

1927 City council decides to clear much of the Barbican area under its slum clearance policy.

1928 Public pressure, led by newly founded Old Plymouth Society, halts wholesale clearance; council carries out a partial rescue operation and some new building.

1943 ‘Plan for Plymouth’ proposes restoration of the Barbican area as a largely traffic-free show-piece.

1945 Whole area seedy and run down as result of war damage and neglect; 127 listed properties remain.

1949 City council commissions the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings to prepare a plan of restoration for the area; plan not implemented owing to priority of housing programme.

1955 Proposal to treat the Barbican simply as a ‘blight’ area. The late Isaac Foot and others call in the Royal Fine Art Commission, which pleads for sympathetic treatment.

1956 The Ring o’ Bells, Plymouth’s oldest public house, demolished for road widening. Medical officer of health condemns fifty-six houses, many of them listed.

February 1957 City council proposes to clear a large part of the area, leaving little more than No 32 New Street (restored in the 1930s) and most of the waterfront houses standing. Royal Fine Art Commission sends two commissioners. Furious publicity results in a stay of execution.

March-April 1957 City council consults Ministry of Housing and Local Government about three historic buildings; persuades ministry to make available elsewhere the housing subsidy for slums demolished in the Barbican provided that use of historic buildings in the Barbican as dwellings is terminated.

John Macgregor FSA of the span retained by an expanded Old Plymouth Society to draw up a plan.

May 1957 Macgregor’s plan submitted to Old Plymouth Society; society submits it to city council. Restoration fund launched by lord mayor, John Betjeman and A. L. Rowse; it is announced that £1 000 has already been received.

June 1957 City council announces acceptance of Old Plymouth Society’s plan; offers thirty properties in its ownership—previously acquired for clearance—either for sale or on a 999-year lease for non-residential purposes.

October 1957 Council leases seven houses in New Street to society for £20 a year and two in Loos Street for £19 a year.

November 1957 New appeal launched for £50 000 (£500 raised on first appeal); Plymouth Barbican Association Ltd formed by society as property-holding body.

June 1958 City council approves Barbican Associ-
National Trust for Scotland

The National Trust for Scotland has for long, and successfully, been engaged in the rehabilitation of several smaller towns, such as Culross and Dunkeld. In addition, however, the Trust's 'Little Houses Scheme' provides an admirable example of the use, for restoration purposes, of a relatively small...

During the last six years work has progressed steadily. In 1961 an improvement scheme for Southside Street was completed. More properties have been purchased, bringing the total owned or on long lease to eighteen. Target date for completion of the programme is 1970—350th anniversary of the sailing of The Mayflower.

Total raised by Plymouth Barbican Association £20 195
of which:
Historic Buildings Council £6 511
Rents, donations and covenants £6 653

Three views of The Giles, Pittenweem, Fife, before (top) and after restoration (architects, Wheeler & Sproson)
'revolving fund'. Over ten years, by the use of a basic fund of £35,000, the trust has rehabilitated over fifteen properties in about six villages and small towns.

October 1957  The idea first mooted by the Earl of Wemyss: 'If all the properties that we restore have to be held inalienably, we obviously cannot do a very large number; but if we could buy, restore and resell, possibly even at a profit in some cases, the money available would obviously go very much further.'

1959  Attempts made by the trust to give this thought practical expression. However, a scheme seems impossible because of a clause in the Housing (Scotland) Act of 1950. This required a vendor to repay any improvement grant made by the local authority, if the property changed hands within twenty years of completion of the improvement.

1959  The Scottish Office drafts an amendment to the Act, reducing the period from twenty to three years.

The National Trust for Scotland decides that this makes a revolving fund scheme practicable and inaugurates the 'Little Houses Scheme' by allocating £10,000 from its general funds.

1960  Work begins on the first houses in Crail. National Trust appeals for interest-free loans. One life member responds with a loan of £5,000.

1961  Pilgrim Trust gives interest-free loan of £10,000 and a further £10,000 as a 'bank' on which the trust can draw. National Trust publicises the fact that a full improvement grant would cost a local authority £9 a year over twenty years, while a property renovated by an improvement grant may well rate at £50 to £60 a year. Secretary of State for Scotland exhorts all local authorities to make use of the grant system.

First two Crail houses completed and sold.
1962  Third Crail house completed and sold.
1963  Four houses in the High Street, Pittenweem, restored and sold.
1964  Three houses in St Monance and St Ayles Chapel in Anstruther purchased for restoration.
1965  Three houses in Crail High Street purchased for conversion into two flats.

August 1965  St Monance Borough Council agrees to join with the National Trust in restoring a group of houses at the West Shore. Provost James Braid, announcing council's decision, says, 'What the harbour-side needs now is surgery and not butcherly.'

Council agrees to purchase part of the property already owned by the trust and restore it as a shop, flats and two four-room houses. They would then rehouse the tenants of the remaining National Trust property, which the trust would then restore.

July 1966  The Gles, Pittenweem, completed.

OCTOBER 1966  More properties in Cellardyke, Crail, Pittenweem and St Monance purchased for restoration.

1966  Four houses purchased in Pittenweem and two in Crail. Seven properties acquired by the Crown Commissioners at Rysart to be leased to the National Trust for restoration.

Town council of North Berwick gives National Trust a group of buildings in Quality Street to be restored for flats. One house at Cellardyke restored. A group at St Ayles Chapel, Anstruther awaiting restoration.
BRADFORD-ON-AVON
HISTORIC BUILDINGS JOINT COMMITTEE
This committee was set up in February 1968. The main terms and provisions of its constitution are:

Constitution
1 A Joint Committee shall be constituted under section 91 of the Local Government Act, 1933, and all other powers enabling in that behalf, by the Wiltshire County Council and the Bradford-on-Avon Urban District Council to discharge certain functions of each council in the manner, and subject to the conditions, hereinafter appearing.

Powers
2 The Joint Committee shall exercise on behalf of both councils, insofar as the Urban District of Bradford-on-Avon is concerned, all their powers under the aforesaid Acts to contribute towards the repair and maintenance of buildings of historic or architectural interest and for purposes connected therewith:
The Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act, 1913, as amended;
The Ancient Monuments Act, 1931;
The Historic Buildings and Ancient Monuments Act, 1953;

Members
3 The Joint Committee shall consist of three members each appointed by the county council and the urban district council, such members to be appointed annually for a one year term from the 1st June in each year.
4 Each council may, at their discretion, appoint additional members to act as deputies.
5 The Joint Committee shall have power each year to co-opt onto the Joint Committee as a full member one person nominated by each of the two following organisations:
(a) Bradford-on-Avon Preservation Society.
(b) The Historic Buildings Council.

Financial provision
6 The county council and the urban district council shall provide the Joint Committee with an equivalent sum, of such amount as may be agreed annually, to be expended by the Joint Committee at their absolute discretion for the purposes aforesaid.
7 The Joint Committee shall keep their own separate accounts.
8 The Joint Committee shall satisfy the district audit.

Officers
9 The clerk of the Bradford-on-Avon Urban District Council for the time being shall be the secretary and the treasurer of the Joint Committee.
10 The county planning officer of the county council for the time being shall be the technical adviser of the Joint Committee.

1 FRAMEWORK OF ORGANISATION
There are two centres of responsibility around which conservation policies must group themselves. These are the local planning authority and the owner of individual properties. They must be brought into effective partnership with the building team and other authorities and institutions. This will call for new patterns of collaboration, a new management framework, and a new assessment of financial investment.

National direction
It is heartening that the powers and functions of government have now been centralised in one ministry and that a parliamentary secretary has been given special responsibility for these matters. This consolidation should greatly ease the provision of broad advice and assistance to local planning authorities.

Regional advice
In the field of conservation, specialised knowledge, experience and skills are rare. It is important, therefore, to make the best national use of such knowledge. Rather than allow available talent to be disposed of on an ad hoc basis, it should be deployed in teams and committees geared to the appropriate levels of planning and action. There will be particular need for strategic teams of expert consultants at regional level. A strong case can be made for regional economic councils taking a special strategic interest in matters relating to historic areas and for regional ‘directorates for conservation areas’ to be established alongside regional economic boards. These teams would include economists, surveyors, historians and archaeologists, architects trained to deal with the particular technical problems of preservation and restoration, possibly even master craftsmen with the requisite skills, and other specialists who
would act as an expert ‘flying squad’ and consultants for their region.

Local committees
Each planning authority should establish a strong subcommittee charged with the duty of establishing conservation areas. Once their initial task is done, such a general subcommittee might wither away and give place to individual area committees. These would have a permanent function and be rather novel in the field of planning administration.

When policies had been laid down, the area committee’s task would be more in the nature of care and management than in development; it would somewhat correspond to those committees and boards of governors which are so valuable for schools, hospitals and similar institutes. Opportunity should be taken to co-opt onto those committees people with a wide range of local and specialist experience. In the case of county authorities, joint committees with district councils could be established. An excellent prototype, the Bradford-on-Avon Historic Buildings Joint Committee, provides a framework which would be enlarged to include functions under other legislation affecting the area.

Conservation area committees would sift all planning applications and ensure that, before irrevocable decisions were taken to demolish existing buildings, their intended replacements were fully and publicly appreciated from all angles. They would need to be in the closest touch with public utility authorities, with a view to concerting the design and siting of street furniture and all the minutiæ of the scene. They would promote face-lift schemes and control advertisements.

For all this work they would have to equip themselves with full photographic records, on occasion even film and models of the area. They would report annually. In short, their task would be that of enlightened urban estate management. Their job would not be a simple passive one: their aim would be to improve appearances and pride in the ‘heritage area’ for which they were responsible.

2 MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK
Emotional conflicts associated with progress and preservation in cities invariably overshadow the practical problems. Those whose task it is to execute schemes fight a constant uphill battle, with a wastage of manpower and brainpower that is far too high. More rational management planning would create more efficiency and less frustration.

Planning and programming
Planning and the building process are often treated as separate operations. Conversely it is sometimes argued that the two processes should be integrated in some degree. Whichever way you see the argument, two things are certain: the planner does not always foresee the inherent problems of building projects and the building team frequently adopts an introverted approach to the problems of planning.

In some ways the planner can be considered the client of the building team, since his requirements must eventually be met by the team. Nonetheless he needs a management framework which can help him to carry out his work efficiently and provide a sensible link with the building team. It seems incredible that an industry which forms such a large slice of our gross national product should be permitted to waste its resources through lack of a management framework within which it can work economically. What we have really produced is a new kind of brain drain—but of the worst sort since it benefits no one, merely filtering away brainpower like water in sand. At least the conventional brain drain benefits the country that receives the immigrants! As our resources for building quickly improve, it seems that the time from inception to completion of the total project lengthens. Consider the Iden Yard scheme in Cambridge. Lord Holford was first
appointed in 1947, yet twenty years later we are still not ready to start. The minister, in approving the quinquennial review, has made the condition that alternative sites should be considered for the shopping centre now planned for Lion Yard. This means, in effect, that the proposals are again in abeyance. When is building going to start? Even if a start be made next year, shall we not have taken twenty years to plan and two to build? A century ago we would have taken three years to build (50 per cent longer) but maybe only two years to plan. In the administration of our affairs we are going backwards rather than progressing. In any large conservation scheme—as in any redevelopment scheme—there is a substantial management problem and the planning consultant is unlikely to have the resources or the experience to provide a management service. The Minister of Housing and Local Government has seen that the preservation of historic towns involves many practical problems and he has appointed consultants to look at some of these towns in the hope that they will come up with some answers to aid posterity. Does he appreciate that it is not the practical problems of preservation and restoration which pose real difficulty, nor the processes of design and construction, but the nightmare of the bureaucratic maze and the knowledge that at any time a scheme may be held up within it?

In order to leave planners, architects, estate surveyors, quantity surveyors, engineers and so on free to exercise their technical and professional skills with a minimum of hindrance, would it not help if a project manager were appointed at the same time as the planner? He would have to be a man in sympathy with design while at the same time able to get on the same wavelength as those involved in cost, economics and production. His particular discipline would not be important; he might come from the professions or the building industry but he would have to have had some training in management and be given the necessary resources.

One of his tasks would be to establish, at the earliest stage, who those people would be with a decision-making function in the scheme—not only those directly concerned but also all those on the fringe, such as the Royal Fine Art Commission, the Historic Buildings Council, all ministries affected in their various capacities, statutory undertakings, adjoining planning authorities, the local chamber of trade and commercial interests, national societies such as the SPA, the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society, the Civic Trust, local civic and archaeological societies, the fire brigade and police, as well as the professional and building team directly involved. Many of these organisations can make their decisions in parallel; in other cases the decision-making has to be done in series and it may be that authorities have to make decisions at different levels at different stages. However, whatever the complexity of the problem, all this can be put on a network and the critical path drawn through it. In fact, the more complex the problem, the more appropriate that it be treated seriously as a complicated management problem and the most up-to-date tools of management used to help to solve it.

It can also be argued that this approach would be of great assistance to the public. Such a network, if published, would enable interested organisa-

tions to see if and when they were due to be consulted and when their opinion must be ready to avoid upsetting the programme. One of the greatest difficulties in realising any building scheme lies not only in finding out who should be consulted and when but also, having done so, in tying the various parties down to their decision and the time they require to reach it. If the 'network' principle were accepted, would it not be in the national interest to make its contents binding on all parties including ministers, planning authorities, statutory undertakings, commercial interests and others?

For example, it might be desirable for all parties who have been, or desire to be, consulted to pay a fee. Should they wish to be given more time for a decision, thereby causing a revision of the network, then an additional fee would be payable. Such action would have a salutary disciplinary effect and would help towards making more efficient use of professional talent.

Another way in which this idea might help concerns the people. Aided by a project manager, consideration of the planner's ideas, public reaction and his counteraction, could be a fruitful and fairly speedy process. Again, the practical difficulties for the archaeologist in establishing the exact time for excavation between clearance of site and redevelopment have been touched on earlier in this issue. The archaeologist's work must be programmed in as one of the essential activities. A published network would enable this to be done and would be one means of making the rest of the team aware of his importance. Surely this idea is worthy of an experiment? Perhaps the minister should consider it.

Cost and benefit

The planner's concept of economic viability differs considerably from that of the design team in large scale restoration or construction work. Anticipated construction costs do not usually form a part of the planner's brief (though many believe that they should), so the most sophisticated cost benefit analysis will normally consist only of a hypothetical weighting of amenity values. Nevertheless the economic and social benefits of amenities always have their purchase price since the consumer has eventually to pay for the physical realisation of the planner's conclusions.

One of the objectives of any good manager is not only to produce a programme of how the work is to be completed but also, at intervals, to see that the cost is worked out so that decisions can be made with the cost in mind. The planning programme therefore should incorporate events at which the estimated cost of the planner's proposals will be made public; at these times the planner can publicly explain the amenity values of various proposals against a backdrop of economic feasibility, and his dialogue with the people will be more complete.

It is very important that alternative design solutions with their costs should be made known, so that it may be appreciated whether the socially desirable can or cannot be afforded. Such a requirement ensures that all members of a design team are brought into the process at the early stages, integrating their work and experience with that of the planner.

How often public meetings concerned with pre-
reservation or redevelopment produce any number of alternative proposals from the floor, accompanied by wild estimates of savings in costs! Possibly the planner has previously investigated and discarded all such alternative proposals for one reason or another, but his inability to produce independently prepared comparative total costs leaves a trail of doubt and suspicion in its wake. It is not suggested that comparative costs are any more or less important than the other factors in the planning problem, but they are important, of very direct interest to the public, and often ignored or assumed.

Consider for example the interminable wrangles about the Oxford road over Christchurch Meadow.

**Learning the techniques**

The technology of construction has changed so greatly during the present century that the use, care, and restoration of 'traditional' materials have for many—both architects and craftsmen—ceased to be a matter of everyday experience. They are well on the way to becoming a speciality in their own right. Craftsmen with the skills to undertake restoration of quality—stonemasons and stone carvers, plasterers used to working with old moulds, joiners or cabinet makers capable of making good a piece of linenfold without its showing—these are already scarce and their number dwindles steadily. The questing mind of the student architect turns, for the most part, not to historicism and conservation but to the structural possibilities of new materials, to rationalised, industrialised construction methods, and to the design problems posed by a quickly changing society. Neither by training nor experience are many architects equipped effectively, knowledgeably and sensitively to deal with the manifold problems of conserving old buildings.

Nor is it easy for them to expand their knowledge in this field. The number of specialist courses available, either part-time or whole-time, is limited. Day courses and teachers’ seminars are from time to time held by schools of architecture and other bodies. But these are of course no more than refreshers and interest-stimulators.

The SPAB runs a one-week course each year (fee £10 guineas), attended by twenty-five to forty architects, surveyors and engineers of varying age and experience. The courses are aimed at offering an introduction to the problems of dealing with historic buildings but are not regarded as training courses (attendance has mistakenly been regarded by some as providing a necessary qualification for such work).

According to the availability of funds, the SPAB from time to time offers its ‘Lethaby-Banister Fletcher Scholarship’ to architects for six months study of conversion, repair and maintenance problems (scholars have included David Nye and Donald Insall). The scholar is placed in the SPAB office, visits sites and generally sees through one particular project.

There are regular courses on the subject within the schools of architecture at Bristol and Birmingham. The only post-graduate course is that on the conservation of historical monuments run by the Institute of Archaeology, University of London. This is a two-year course, offering a thorough historical, legal and technical grounding. As many visits as possible to current building projects are arranged and a final project required to yield a course of practical training in an approved office.

In 1966, on the initiative of UNESCO, the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property was set up in Rome. The 'Rome Centre', run in conjunction with the School of Architecture in the University of Rome and directed by Harold James Plenderleith, previously of the British Museum research laboratory, aims to:

(a) collect and circulate technical documentation;

(b) institute and co-ordinate research;

(c) advise on general and specific problems;

(d) train research workers and technicians.

Students and lecturers in the courses held under (d) come from many different countries. Lectures are given in French, English and Italian, and courses last for one academic year. The 1966-7 course on conservation and restoration is full and well-balanced, and includes practical training, visits and a detailed project to be done in any country of the student's wish. It is perhaps symptomatic that, though nearly forty countries adhere to and support the centre financially, Great Britain is not among them.

If, in future, Britain aims to give greater emphasis to the conservation of the historic scene, it would seem essential that greater emphasis be given too to problems of training. There is need here, as elsewhere in the building industry, for greater inter-professional collaboration. Above all, however, if the care and enhancement of conservation areas—in all parts of the country and possibly in considerable numbers—called for by the Civic Amenities Bill is to become a working reality, it will be necessary for the subject to be brought back into the normal architectural curriculum. First initiatives in this direction have already been taken by the Standing Joint Conference for the Recruitment and Training of Architects in the Care of Old Buildings. Set up around five years ago, this body, representing the professional institutions, the ministries concerned, amenity organisations and others, keeps schools informed as to courses available and has itself stimulated the holding of a number of such courses. For the more intensive efforts now required, we must look to the schools themselves and the continued encouragement of the RIBA.
appears that the total figure under the heading of "repairs, improvements, alterations, redecoration" and the like comes to about £200 million annually. The question is worth considering as to whether this type of work can be organised on a more rational and economical basis.

The preservation and maintenance of existing buildings is a continual process comprising thousands of individual actions by owners, consultants and builders. The problem of co-ordinating these actions is a complex one but there is strong argument for facing the enormous management problem involved in so doing.

**Long term contracts**

The Ministry of Public Building and Works, and many local authorities, have long term maintenance contracts with one or more contractors. Would it be beyond the bounds of possibility to extend the terms of these contracts to individual owners, thus bringing the responsibility for preserving and maintaining both private and public buildings under the one roof? Quantity surveyors should be capable of devising tendering procedures to suit these circumstances; contractors would benefit from greater continuity of work; private owners would benefit from consultation with the authority's professional consultants; the authority would benefit by being in closer touch with the building plans of the private individual.

The "small works" section of the industry is so poorly served by statistics and public relations that it can only be suggested at this stage that the problem is worthy of further exploration, if only because of the magnitude of the drain of resources which maintenance and preservation involve. If it could be proved that such a scheme would be a better proposition generally than the myriad small contracts making up the conventional scene, then it might well be worth tackling the very considerable management problem involved in organising and administering such a scheme.

Let us, however, not attempt to tackle the problem on a national scale until we have first solved the tremendous administrative problem in one or two local experiments.

A. T. Brett-Jones

---

**3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

If we intend to preserve the best of our historic heritage we shall have to pay more to do so. That heritage does not consist solely of liabilities; on the contrary, our heritage represents a very large capital asset. Market values of old buildings can be maintained or improved by careful husbandry. The values, however, do not always accrue to the owner—they may, for instance, be reflected in tourist attraction to the locality or country as a whole.

The general manager of the British Travel Association, L. J. Lockie, recently had this to say: "In conventional accounting terms, of course, it may be argued that the widening of a street, involving the pulling down of buildings of historic interest, is justified if it gives a more efficient flow of traffic. That is a limited way of looking at it. Britain's international tourist trade is dependent on our unique attractions: on culture, tradition, pageantry and history. These are our "hard-sells" which no other country can offer. Our
historic places have values which . . . represent unique assets which cannot be recreated.

In 1965, nearly three million overseas visitors spent more than £300 million in Britain and on fares to British shipping and airlines—an amount equal to 7 per cent of all our physical exports. By 1970 numbers will have risen to four million visitors a year and revenue to £500 million. Against the background of this massive economic activity . . . historical towns have an important role.

In Britain our attitude towards the preservation of our historical raw material is rather odd. Our strange mixture of public and private subsidy still appears to be motivated by a kind of benevolence. As with the arts, our process of financing schemes for the conservation of historic artefacts is frequently regarded as falling into the realm of charity. Yet all the time our basic raw material is being eroded by piecemeal and unplanned development; our carelessness is becoming, to say the least, economically ill-advised. Progress leads to specialisation, and specialisation must in turn lead to the preservation of examples of our past achievement for future enjoyment. This is simply long term but sound investment. It means that local authorities have a direct interest in subsidising projects which will ultimately repay the initial expenditure many times over.

How much aid?

Clearly, it is always best to find a true economic use rather than resort to grants. In Stamford, for instance, one of Britain's most beautiful towns, the financial aspect of their preservation problems might be solved if a new university were to be established there. When all is said and done, however, grants, loans, reliefs from taxes or rates, or relaxation from other restrictive legislation (such as rent restriction) will be necessary on a far greater scale than now if we are serious in our conservation aims. The aid needed will of course vary from region to region, from one type of building or area to another, and in the light of differing value judgments.

Little is known as to the global amounts we now spend (on all accounts) from the public purse; whether we are getting value for the money we do spend; or what reforms are needed. The five pilot studies sponsored by the Government are intended to shed light on the deficiencies. Meanwhile there is need for more information and comparative statistics. Some random figures on central and local government aid are given here. The inadequacy of the effort is apparent.

Present government aid to historic towns, as opposed to individual buildings, is given through the Historic Buildings Council's 'town schemes'. The present upper annual limits, to which must be added an equivalent or smaller sum from the local authority concerned, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford-on-Avon</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Lynn</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>£7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures may be compared with the £1,400,000 a year spent by Birmingham Corporation on the upkeep of its parks; the Arts Council guarantee last year of over £1 million to Covent Garden Opera House; the £1,060,000 a year spent by the National Trust on maintaining its property; the £1 million annual budget of the Nature Conservancy; or the £5 million and £4 million cost respectively of the Park Lane and Euston Road improvement schemes in London.

Local government

Local authorities are empowered by the Local Authorities (Historic Buildings) Act, 1962 to make grants towards the repair and maintenance of buildings on the statutory list. Information is not available nationally on the use that has been made of these powers but it is safe to state that, globally, it has so far been derisory. Of the forty-eight county authorities in England, twenty-nine made no use whatsoever of those powers in the year 1963-64. During the following year, 1964-65, twenty-one counties made no grants. There is no reason to believe that this overall balance of roughly fifty per cent failure even to see the existence of a problem is contradicted at borough and district level.

Where expenditure is made under the 1962 Act, figures vary widely and are not on the whole encouraging. Kesteven's annual expenditure (1964-65 figures) works out at £118 13s per thousand population; Worcestershire's at £7 18s; Somerset's and Staffordshire's at 2s each.

Some actual sums are:

- Gloucestershire County Council: Spent £550 last year; estimate for current year £8,000.
- Hampshire County Council: Average expenditure over last two years £450.
- Lancashire County Council: Average expenditure over last three years £4,000.
- Northamptonshire County Council: Spends £2,000 annually in conjunction with the local authority concerned on a fifty-fifty basis. Total outlay in the county is therefore £4,000.
- Surrey County Council: Since 1962 has spent £15,805 on 110 listed buildings; in the same period £5,360 has been spent by borough and district authorities on thirty listed buildings.

County trusts

In some areas county trusts have been set up, to do for locally important buildings something of what the Historic Buildings Council does for nationally important buildings. The idea is splendid but so far the record, and the sums involved, are not impressive.

First of these was the Hertfordshire Building Preservation Trust, incorporated in 1964. It has an annual income of £1,000 subscribed by all but two of the local authorities in the county in proportion to their ratable value. (These authorities make no other grants under the 1962 Act.) This trust has received one grant of £3,000 from a private individual for a particular purpose. The policy of the trust is to acquire and restore property which would not otherwise be cared for. It has so far had, inevitably, to turn down most of those brought to its attention.

Other trusts are being set up in Nottinghamshire (the county has promised £4,000 for the first year and support for at least five years; other authorities will make £2,000 available); in Wiltshire (to have a system of private membership; the county has made an initial grant of £4,500 odd; twenty-five borough and district councils have agreed to
subscribe and the annual income is expected to be £3,500; in Kent, and in Norwich (as a result of co-operation between the city council and the Norwich Society).

These figures may be seen in the context of the £2 million spent by local authorities on the performing arts during 1961-66 or the nearly £14 million invested by them during 1965-66 in sports facilities. A mere farthing rate applied by all authorities would make about £14 million available.

It is of course recognised that the figures given above by no means represent all that local authorities do. Such figures do not cover purchase either under planning powers or other statutory functions such as education, housing and for museums. Local authorities, moreover, possess vast powers of control over the actions of others in relation to property. If, however, public conscience demands that they are in addition to become the active patrons of our historical heritage, more will be needed from their public purse by way of grants and loans. The future of our conservation areas is inescapably bound up with the financial investment that we are prepared to make in them.

A NEW TASK

1 The ‘designation of conservation areas’ is a concept that will demand new attitudes in planning procedures and techniques.

2 A start has already been made by reorganising ministries, by commissioning pilot surveys of five important historic towns and by introducing legislation in Parliament.

3 Further measures needed at national and regional level include more financial assistance (which might take a variety of forms) and the building up of teams of experts as advisers and consultants to local authorities.

4 Many different types of conservation area will emerge. Some will be small, some large. Some will need straightforward policies for continuing the life of the existing structures, coupled with improvement of their surroundings. In other cases the aim will be to define essential character while leaving scope for change within it. It must be recognised that effective use is an essential prerequisite to successful conservation.

5 New types of local authority committee (reinforced by co-opting additional members of varied experience) will be needed, not only to discharge statutory functions but also to undertake novel duties of vigilance, of care and of public estate management. Committees should be so constituted as to command wide local respect. They should exert a strong overall influence on the use, condition and appearance of conservation areas, including the fine detail of their furnishing.

6 This survey focuses attention upon many important issues that will arise in conservation, but by no means on all of them. Much needs to be added on such matters as the building trade and its crafts; techniques of restoring, cleaning and maintaining old buildings; the financing of conservation; and the education of public opinion in this new art.

7 Finally it must be understood that planning for conservation is not intended to stop development or progress. It will certainly put these processes under new disciplines in defined areas. It will often divert legitimate development pressures elsewhere and thus give them greater freedom. It should clear up woolly thinking by establishing clear values from which more sensible executive decisions can flow.