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The scope, purpose and achievement of town planning during the 1920s and early 1930s can only be broadly gauged by looking at the national context. In order to test out the main analysis it is necessary to look in depth at what actually occurred in practice at the local level. National government set the chief parameters of statutory action but it was then up to the local authorities to put into practice the activity itself. Local analysis reveals the ideological drives of national government more clearly and the values and contexts of local government. Thus the experience of town planning as a government activity is shown to be a blend between the desires and constraints upon action that operate at local as well as national state levels.

Two key themes are explored in the following local studies which reflect the aims of the study, outlined in the Preface. Arranged alongside these two main themes are a number of subsidiary issues which help to provide a context for the main themes. The purpose of identifying these themes is to provide evidence and insights into the six hypotheses outlined in Chapter 3.

The first main theme relates to the ideology of town planning which has been identified in this study as being strongly rooted in notions of consensus. This theme is intended to illuminate Aim A of this study which is, "to assess the role and purpose of Town Planning in Britain between 1919 and 1933." By relating this theme to local studies it is also intended to provide further evidence for testing out relevant aspects of all the hypotheses, but is particularly relevant to Hypotheses 1 and 5. Hypothesis 1 suggested that town planning was used as a regulatory mechanism rather than a radical, reforming tool and Hypothesis 5 put forward the view that local
government officials saw their role in town planning as neutral and non-political.

The second main theme is concerned to gain evidence of the success and failure of town planning. This has been discussed in this study in general terms and it is hoped to provide more detailed insights from local studies. This theme is linked to Aim B of this study which is, "to examine the progress of Town Planning in Britain between 1919 and 1933 at both national and local government levels." From studying this theme through local studies it is hoped to develop further insights into the hypotheses, particularly Hypothesis 2 and 6. Hypothesis 2 suggested that the key words of success might be seen as 'economy' and, 'efficiency' and Hypothesis 6 explored the possibility that the experience of the Second Town Planning Act was crucial in establishing it as a 'safe' activity within a market-led economy. Both of these suggestions can be seen to relate to aspects of success or failure.

Before going on to look at the local studies in detail, aspects of the two themes are explored further in both their general and local dimensions.

(i) Consensus Ideology & Town Planning

The first key theme concerns the question of consensus ideology. As suggested in the previous Part, town planning nationally had been an essential part of the supposed radical package offered after the First World War opening up prospects of a reconstructed Britain. In fact it can be seen to be more realistically a part of a stabilising programme designed to head-off further class conflict and to create conditions for orderly development processes in a still essentially capitalist Britain. Nationally it is possible to see how town planning fitted into an emerging scheme of things which sought to leave behind the old
order of laissez-faire and yet avoid the collectivist vision of socialism.

The Agenda for Local Studies & Consensus

The purpose of the local studies within this context is to explore the extent to which this consensus message, more unconscious than conscious, should find reflection in the practice of town planning by the local authorities. How did local power interests, business, landowners, owner occupiers and working class respond to the new activity of statutory town planning? Did local authorities embark on town planning schemes in the early 1920s with high hopes of creating a 'new' Britain or were they more sceptical from the start? And once in operation, how were the statutory schemes received? In what ways were the local interests reflected in the local Councils by local politicians? These are the sort of questions posed in order to understand the extent to which the ideas of a 'middle way', (to use the phrase of one of the key consensus ideologists, who represented a constituency covered by these local studies - H. Macmillan), found reflection at the local level.

A number of related themes are also embraced at this point. Town planning itself had as a discipline a complex set of values born out of the nineteenth century experience of industrialisation. Part of that baggage of values consisted of notions of radical change, based initially on utopianism and later on reformism. The local studies will seek to explore how far the historical impulses of town planning survived into twentieth century pragmatic state activity. The ideology of town planning, as espoused by its leading figures, its professional institute and through journals reveal a clear move to adapting to a consensus approach. As we have seen town planning ideology became
essentially de-gutted of political content and instead located the requirements of town planning in practical, technical terms. This process can be explored at local level by examining the schemes and recommendations of statutory town planning activity, the attitudes of professional advisors, and the way local activity was reported and reflected upon in the professional journals.

The idea of irresolvable conflict is, of course, antipathetical to the notion of consensus. The Ministry of Health in its Circulars and Notes to local authorities provide many of the key guidelines to local approaches in the matter of all legislation. As a subsidiary theme the issue of the relationship between the central and local governments will be looked at particularly through the conflicts which inevitably arose at local level.

The Notion of Consensus

The use of the term 'consensus' in reference to social policy is relatively modern and is not to be found in the literature of town planning and allied subjects in the inter-war years. But it aptly describes an approach to social conflict that owes much to the inter-war experience. Consensus implies that agreement can be reached between opposing points of view, or more precisely between different interests, that reflect the interests of both. Such a notion fits in admirably with a value-free, technical view of social issues. According to this idea there are optimum solutions to social problems, including arranging future land uses, that can be attained through discussion and debate. This 'scientific-rational' approach held sway with many intellectuals in the period after the First World War which had demonstrated the folly of conflict on a grand scale. The spread of this notion in the inter-war years was discussed in
Chapter 12. Perhaps it reached its high point in the 1960s in Britain when it was allied to a form of technological determinism in social policy.

Although the term 'consensus' wasn't used by either the Ministry of Health or the professional town planners after World War One it nevertheless seems to be the main notion behind the approach to potential conflict as was noted in Chapter 14. This will be examined in the context of local statutory town planning in Teesside and Hartlepool in the period 1919 to 1933. It will be demonstrated that the Ministry of Health would go to extraordinary lengths to dress up decisions as consensus agreements and that local town planning officials were also very loathe to clarify issues of conflict or to press for resolution of such conflicts which would seem to damage the interests of local landowners. There were some exceptions but these prove the general point.

Laying the Ground Rules for Consensus 1919 to 1933

The Town Planning Act of 1919, later consolidated into the 1925 Act, laid down the scope, provision and requirements of statutory town planning. Chapter 14 noted that for further insights into the ways in which the Act was intended to be administered, it is necessary to look at the various Circulars, Regulations and Statements that the Ministry of Health issued to local authorities. Of particular interest in the illumination of the theme of consensus was a Statement issued by the Ministry of Health in August, 1921.\(^1\) It covered a number of topics of which the first and most significant was the 'Consultation of Local Interests', which was quoted in Chapter 15. From the Ministry's Statement it is important to note the general rhetoric about planning for people and the specific urging to consult particular groups of
interests. From the Statement it is clear that consultation is not for the working class, the Trade Unions or Community groups. The phrase 'general public support' means in essence the support of the main landowners be they business or agricultural. This is made clear in the following extract from the Statement,

"... the Minister considers it of the highest importance that both the Local Authorities and his Department should have the full advantage of the consideration of town planning schemes by all parties specially interested, e.g. businessmen, landowners, persons concerned with transport or housing (including the private builder) and social agencies." (2)

The desire for consensus is clear in the last paragraph of section 2 where the Statement talks of harmonising class interests. But it then goes on to provide two general circumscriptions, 'compatible with the public interest' and with a 'sound scheme'. Notions of the public interest and sound schemes figure prominently in all subsequent planning matters and often in all issues of public policy. Invariably they are used to overcome popular objections and only rarely to overcome the sectional interests of the business community. Indeed the interests of the business community and the national interest are invariably seen to coincide.

Another important feature of the Ministry's Statement is the significance accorded to town planning as promoting efficiency rather than any other objective. In a later section of the same Statement the Ministry says,

"The focussing of public opinion and of the views of the specific interests on the proposals will help to prevent the
adoption of either too narrow or too idealistic a plan. It has to be remembered that a town plan is pre-eminently a business proposition, and, above all things must be practical." (3)

The Statement referred to above simply put a gloss on what was already contained in the Regulations to the 1919 Act issued in March, 1921.

"Any objections are to be carefully considered and conferences arranged with a view to securing, so far as possible, agreement on matters covered by the (Preliminary) Statement." (4)

But it was an important gloss and one that authorities were forced to take into account by the Ministry of Health. This was particularly so as schemes were progressed through the 1920s since the Ministry could insist on exhaustive amendments to both the Preliminary Statement and the Draft Scheme before giving final approval. Public Inquiries at both stages also emphasised the need for local authorities to reach accommodation with objectors. At all points in the process, as well as the granting of Interim Development, the local authority was urged to obtain agreement with landowners. This is hardly surprising given the nature of power in the country and the need to deal with reality. What is interesting, though, is the presentation of this policy as one of harmonising class interests. This was in part an aspect of the language of reconstruction used after the First World War. But it was also the language of consensus and sought to suggest that the state was neutral and policy reflected the 'best of all worlds'. It is notable that town planning and more generally, planning, was presented as a non-party political issue and an essentially technical exercise. Town planners themselves had contributed to this view. The Journal of the Town Planning Institute reveals through its pages an overriding concern for the technical problems of planning. Rarely are the moral and
political issues entered into and when this is done the main and continual justification for town planning is that it is economical. For a short period after the First World War there were sentiments expressed which linked town planning to the provision of a better environment for the mass of the people. Pepler expresses this view in his year as President of the Town Planning Institute, in a paper to the Institute.

"...a prominent sign of the times is the demand that the pleasures and comforts of life, and leisure to enjoy them, should be attainable by all. Almost the chief immediate expression of this demand is the universal appreciation of the need for good homes.... To make good homes is the central aim of the Town Planner." (5)

After the financial crisis of 1921 and the fall of Lloyd George and the Coalition Government and its replacement by a Conservative Administration the popular slogans alter from an emphasis on securing a better life for all to the need for economy and efficiency. The town planning movement, which had often advocated town planning in these terms, easily adopted the new language.

The dichotomy between meeting the needs of the ordinary man in the street and the needs of the industrialist and major landowners can be seen in the Ministry's Statement referred to above. In broad political terms it was necessary to present town planning as providing something for everyone. In narrower class terms it was essential to reassure those whose land was being planned that they would not lose, but in fact could gain. This approach was very apparent in 1931-32 when the town planning lobby swung into action to ensure the placing upon the statute books of the 1932 Town and Country Planning Act. A major
public relations exercise was undertaken, particularly by the Local Authority Associations, to persuade the capitalist interests that the new town planning legislation was all-party, non-political and in their interests. A document called, 'Planning and National Reconstruction' was skilfully put together with a number of prominent people presenting short pieces. The whole exercise was prefaced by a series of quotes. Appendix 4 provides the details of this document by listing the people quoted, the articles and their authors. The thrust of the document was aimed mainly at Members of Parliament.

The third Town Planning Act of 1932 was passed but only after a number of crucial elements, such as compensation and betterment, had been watered down in committee. The weight of pro-town planning opinion among the leading circles in society still came mainly from the professional and local authority interests. There was a notable lack of support from industrialists, and many landowners with agricultural backgrounds remained hostile. Consensus had come a long way but had not overcome all opposition. More importantly the character and scope of town planning was clearly designed to uphold, rather than to challenge the power of property owners, businessmen, and, what might be termed, the power elite. This consensus message continued to be put forward throughout the remainder of the 1930s.

Consensus and the Town Planning Movement

Professionals of any breed are especially suited to adopt a consensus ideology. Indeed the very term in its modern usage probably stems from the medical practice of obtaining a consensus for the purposes of diagnosis. In the town planning profession there was always a powerful current which in a bid to find acceptance among the older established professions stressed the technical, scientific aspects of the work.
Plan making was described as both an art and a science but the part of art was the instinctive, individualist talent which a professional brought to bear within a technical framework. The social purpose of town planning in this scheme of things had to be removed as far as possible from the political arena. The drive to portray town planning as a technical discipline to be governed by professional rules and conduct went hand in hand with the notion of planning as a rational process which would bring benefits to all. The alternative view that town planning was a radical, even if peaceful, path to real reform (to quote the sub-title of Ebenezer Howard's book on Garden Cities) was increasingly consigned to the background as town planners struggled to obtain a statutory position. Even the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, the standard bearers of town planning as social reform, succumbed to a more mundane and non-political stance in the 1920s. But they had begun the post-war period in militant mood. Their immediate reaction to the 1919 Act as recorded in The Garden Cities and Town Planning Magazine was, 'unqualified disappointment', the 'town planning clauses are altogether inadequate'.(7) R.L. Reiss, in the same edition of the magazine, was more balanced in his views but still thought the town planning provisions inadequate.(8) By 1923 a shift in the values of the Association can be seen in their issue of a popular leaflet, Town Planning, What it is and Why it is Needed. In this leaflet, reproduced in Appendix 2, town planning was described as 'the application to social conditions of the principles of preventative medicine'. The traditional all-round benefits of town planning were spelt out, 'The lack of town planning has been bad for domestic economy, industrial efficiency, and the health and moral welfare of the people.' The last section stressed the 'Reasonableness of town planning' and urged everyone to be active in promoting and pursuing town planning.(9) Naturally the Association maintained a constant call
for Garden Cities and also, because it incorporated the defunct magazine the 'Housing Reformer', a strong interest in housing matters. It, therefore, retained a 'reformist' quality throughout the period of this study in contrast to the Town Planning Institute which eschewed any overtly propagandist role.

Nevertheless, the Institute did reflect the views and attitudes of the country's leading practitioners, many of whom were involved in a direct relationship with local authorities in the preparation of town planning schemes. In the early twenties this role was essentially an advisory one. The town planning 'expert' as he was often called, was engaged on a consultancy basis to prepare, in conjunction with officers of the authority, usually the Surveyor or the Engineer, either an Advisory Regional Plan, or as time wore on, a statutory Town Planning scheme. Another trend in the later 1920s, which accelerated in the 1930s, was for local authorities to directly employ town planners, often in Surveyor's or Engineer's Departments, to work on preparing schemes and controlling development. A reflection of the growth in local authority planning officers was the setting up of a Town Planning Officers' Section of the Town Planning Institute in 1935 which also produced its own journal, the Planning Officer.

The official of the local authority was often crucial in transmitting the ideas of town planning to councillors and aldermen. The critical point frequently made to the local councillors was that town planning cost very little. The average councillor in this period was middle class, often a local businessman or shopkeeper and his outlook reflected this background. He (very few women) was conservative (and often Conservative Party as well), reluctant to increase the rates and therefore reluctant to expand the activity of the Council and the number of employees. But, like central government, local government's
activities increased steadily in the inter-war years, reflecting the social pressure for more services. The growth in housing, both public and private, meant that expansion and development were a fact of local government life. To accompany this it was necessary to provide roads and services and a range of social facilities such as schools and hospitals. The Surveyor or Engineer was the key officer in the local development process. Through the aegis of the Institutes and their journals the ideas of town planning were channelled through to these local officials who, if they were sympathetic, would find opportunities to urge the adoption of statutory town planning on their Councils. Sometimes the Town Clerk would take a leading role and, in any event, was always a decisive force in local affairs. Town planning was unlikely to make much headway locally without the support of the leading local officer.

The Presentation of Town Planning in Teesside & Hartlepool

In the Teesside and Hartlepool case studies the main impetus behind the adoption of local authority town planning was invariably a local official. George Pepler, for the Ministry of Health, was, of course, a major initiator, but further progress required the support of a local official. In Middlesbrough, Preston Kitchen, the Town Clerk, was generally supportive of town planning. In West Hartlepool the main support came from W. Durkin, the Borough Engineer. In Thornaby both the Town Clerk and the Borough Engineer were keen. The Borough Engineer, J. Draper, probably provided the Members of Thornaby Town Council with their first main introduction to town planning in 1922 when he presented a report to them called, 'Town Planning'. (10) In this report, Draper set the context for statutory town planning in the Public Health Acts and then went on to say of the 1919 Act that although it was only compulsory for the larger authorities with over 296
"the subject is so important and fraught with such great possibilities for improving the health and welfare of their District that one would expect every local authority would be anxious to support a Town Planning Scheme." (11)

In defining what Town Planning was Draper said:

"Town planning provides the alternative to the old uncontrolled development and should provide economic town conditions. It is important to have in mind that the intention of town planning schemes put into operation should not only tend to improve the health conditions of the people, but effect an economy in the expenditure involved in urban development." (12)

The need for consensus planning was spelt out,

"It (i.e. town planning) also emphasises the necessity of co-operative planning and action on a large scale, insisting upon unity of agreement between the individual owners of land and the local authority." (13)

As to cost,

"The only inevitable expenditure is the actual cost of preparing the plans, printing the notices, resolutions and notices to 'prescribed persons'." (14)

Draper then spelt out for his Members the precise costs involved in Thornaby for a scheme involving 1,110 acres. At five shillings per acre the cost was estimated to be £277.10.0d. plus £100 each year for three years to meet other expenses. The Borough Engineer went on to say that town planning actually pays,
"Town planning is merely the laying down on paper of a policy for future fulfillment and is not a prelude to spending large sums of money, but rather the prevention of wasting large sums of money in the future. Changes are bound to occur and town planning makes them in the right way." (15)

Draper saw town planning as providing a major role for himself, with the assistance of the Town Clerk. His task would be to exercise great foresight and take an imaginative look at least fifty years hence to ensure that future prosperity would not be hampered by obsolescent obligations.

Draper's report has been dwelt upon in order to provide an insight into how town planning was presented locally in Thornaby. It is suggested, through wider reading on this issue, in the Teesside and Hartlepool context, that such a presentation was typical and indicates how consensus perceptions were transmitted at local government level. Local government, with its tradition of service to the 'community' and its identification with power that was remote from ordinary people understood the 'neutrality' of town planning. Local government was perceived by officials, Members and many among the public as above class interests - a local state machine that mirrored the central state in terms of being a local umpire where conflict was concerned. When this ideology is overlain by professional attitudes of officers in local government a powerful self-reinforcing position of technical service provision as value-free and apolitical was established. Town planning became linked into this framework, often as an adjunct to the existing work and approach of Engineers, Surveyors, Town Clerks and other officers. The next section considers the second key theme: success and failure of town planning.
The second key theme relates to the difficult question of the success of town planning in the 1920s and early 1930s. Generally it has been seen as a failure both in terms of its practical achievements and in terms of the extent to which it became a recognised local, technical activity. Success can only be properly judged against the appropriate objectives. The problem here is to decide just what are the appropriate criteria against which to measure success or failure. Most town planning commentators, both recent and contemporaneous, have tended to judge success by their own yardsticks. Although operating very largely within consensus parameters they nevertheless still retain aspects of utopian and reformist dreams of the early movement. These hopes for town planning in the 1920s and 1930s, were to see it create environments and land-use arrangements that brought about drastically improved circumstances for the mass of people. But, the reality of town planning in a capitalist context is bound to be radically different. The needs of the mass of the people are unlikely to be met and the outcomes of conflicts will tend to see the dominant class interests prevail. It is difficult to judge town planning to be a success in these years in terms of the impact it made on the lives of ordinary people, or even in terms of the effective controlling of land-use in the national interest. But as Chapter 16 sought to reveal, when set against the less spectacular hidden and barely understood perspective of making control of land-use politically acceptable then it can be seen in a new light and to have been considerably successful and, indeed, to have been crucial in laying the ideological basis of the post Second World War compromise.

Success & Failure - The Local Agenda

The extent to which town planning did achieve success, both in terms
of what is taken to be the underlying purpose of town planning in this period and in more traditional terms of the effective and efficient control of development can be and will be considered in the local studies. Alongside this the apparatus of town planning will also be examined in terms of the degree to which the process and procedure of town planning was laid down within local government in these years. From this analysis it is hoped to test the view that the machinery of modern British town planning is not a creature of the 1940s but a creature of the 1920s. With the return in the 1980s to the possibility of Joint Town Planning Committees in Metropolitan areas it is useful to reflect upon the fact that local collaboration of this kind between authorities was begun in 1920. It will also be noted how far the daily routine of town planning at local level—planning applications, public inquiries, appeal systems and scheme preparation—was operating during the study period.

Local studies of the 1920s and early 1930s have a sharp relevance to the experience of 1980s. Not only can we understand by such studies the general context within which practice operates today but there are a number of parallels that shed light on the intended scope and purpose of town planning today. But caution is needed in such a comparison. The 1920s and early 1930s were moving towards the historic compromise of the 1940s. The 1980s appear to witness attempts to move back to the 1920s. The current perception at Government level is that the roots of our economic and social problems lie in the fudge of consensus and compromise. The cool breeze of monetarism is seen to cut realistically across the current of Keynesianism that was gathering momentum in the 1920s and 1930s. The Governments of Baldwin and even MacDonald, had a similar rhetoric to Thatcher's but were actually moving to accept more and more state involvement and management as was analysed in Part 3 of.
this study. Thus the parallels with the inter-war years are interesting but fraught with difficulty.

National Objectives for Town Planning

As stated in Part 4, it is necessary to clarify at the outset both the overt and hidden purposes of town planning in the 1920s and early 1930s before reaching a judgement as to the success or failure of this government policy area. As already established earlier in this study, the overt purpose of town planning in 1919 was to provide an improved environmental framework for the expected rush of industrial and housing development after the war. The language of the times was centered around the key word, 'Reconstruction' which had both a physical and a social dimension. It is a theme to which politicians returned again in 1945 after the Second World War. Town planning was not given a high national profile in 1919. The accent was on 'homes fit for heroes'. Town planning had achieved its breakthrough as an arm of government at national and local level in 1909. This too had been a quiet affair, the result of patient education and lobbying among the 'powerful and the good'. The changes to town planning after the First World War owed much to the rational reformers who had entered Whitehall in the course of the war to sit on various Reconstruction Committees. That, together with the skilful pressure of the National Housing and Town Planning Council, ensured that town planning stood alongside the new post-war housing effort and, therefore, has to be seen as part of the Government's package of reforms to ostensibly reconstruct Britain.

The assertion that the Lloyd George Coalition Government of 1919-1922 supported reforms with the motive of seeking to appease the growing labour movement and even to prevent a bolshevik-type revolution has also been discussed earlier. There is no doubt that in selling the
package of reforms to Conservatives within the Coalition, and in the Houses of Parliament which they dominated, such language was used. But whether this was a more serious strategy is open to doubt. The mood of the country after the war was radical but only a few sections of the working class had drawn revolutionary conclusions. The Russian Revolution had certainly fuelled domestic worries of revolt, and Clydeside was always seen as a potential point of open rebellion, but further evidence of an imminent British revolution is lacking.

The genuine desire of the Government to reconstruct Britain was probably limited to the radical Liberal element and the gathering band of Labour M.P.'s. For the Tory majority, described by Baldwin as 'hard faced men who looked as if they had done well out of the war', the main desire was to return to pre-war days of Edwardian splendour for their class. It is also necessary to stress that many of those who did desire a 'reconstruction' did so only within reformist limits, i.e. they stood for an amelioration of conditions for the mass of people rather than the transfer of power to them.

When in 1921/22 there was a financial crisis the Tory majority in Parliament asserted itself over the radical leadership and both mood and policies turned to a period of class politics in which the key objectives of government were to limit the rising power of the trade unions and lower real wages. Town planning was not directly affected by this turn in events but its context was altered. Hopes of industrial growth were replaced by the reality of lengthening dole queues. The role of town planning in a 'New Britain' was now to be replaced by objectives embracing economy and cost-saving proposals. In addition, the part town planning was to play in conserving amenities came gradually more to the fore, at least in the rhetoric if not the reality.
This change in mood and purpose will be examined in the local context of Teesside and Hartlepool. Examples will be taken to show how the initial town planning moves were received as part of a new, hopeful expansion, only later to be abandoned in the depression that hit the local area in the 1920s. For a period town planning was looked to as a means to lever extra unemployment grants from the Government. More particularly it will be shown that the continuity of town planning in this local area owed more to special local circumstances and the urging of the Ministry of Health than to either a popular demand or to a national political will.

The Ministry of Health under the leadership of George Pepler in the Town Planning Division maintained their own clear set of tacit objectives throughout the period under study. Simply put it was to ensure local authorities took up town planning and that 'good practice' was promoted. Naturally in the post-war euphoria the Ministry of Health reflected the notions of reconstruction, especially in the countless meetings held up and down the country between Ministry officials (usually Pepler) and local authorities to try and stimulate a desire to undertake town planning schemes. Ideas of 'economy' and 'efficiency' quickly replaced ideas of 'reconstruction' after 1922. But the Ministry also had to foster what was a relatively new and ill-supported activity among local authorities and to achieve a degree of uniformity in approach. The extent to which the Ministry succeeded in these objectives will be examined in the content of statutory town planning in Teesside and Hartlepool.

As already observed, town planners had long carried in their ideological luggage the dichotomy of seeking to create something new alongside the wish to make the existing more efficient. There is ample evidence in the town planning literature of the 1920s and early 1930s.
of this dichotomy, often expressed by the same authors in the same pieces of work. In the local context such views were expressed by both the town planning advisors commissioned by the local authorities and by those other professional officers of the local authorities who took an active part in preparing town planning schemes.

Local Objectives for Town Planning

Locally on Teesside and Hartlepool the mood and purpose behind town planning after the First World War reflects the national scene. In 1920 there was much optimism expressed by Pepler and the local representatives when they gathered in Thornaby Town Hall to discuss the advantages of town planning in general and the desirability of establishing a Joint Town Planning Committee to oversee town planning in the region.

The accent of the Ministry's efforts at this time was on promoting town planning in areas which would be expected to experience industrial growth. That is why several coalfield areas were given special attention. Certainly Teesside itself envisaged substantial developments. The local newspaper chose to headline a report on the conference, 'Greater Teesside', which expressed both the joint working proposed and the hopes for improvement.

Teesside and Hartlepool representatives supported the general arguments for town planning and agreed to undertake town planning on a joint basis. But local parochialism surfaced when the Durham side of the river refused to join with the Yorkshire side. This atavistic gesture may have been due to a fear of becoming pawns to the greater power of Middlesbrough. Apart from this divisive decision, the local authorities on Teesside and in Hartlepool appeared ready to take on the new town planning activity. The hopes borne in the post-war years had not yet evaporated in 1920.
But the collapse of the domestic economy was already underway and unemployment was rising fast. Within a year of the Thornaby conference unemployment had rocketed in Teesside and Hartlepool. In Hartlepool 60% of insured persons were unemployed, in Stockton 49% and in Middlesbrough over 40%. When Pepler returned to Teesside to preside over the inauguration of the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee in February, 1921, the mood was still positive and the Committee agreed to appoint Professors Abercrombie and Adshead to prepare an Advisory Regional Plan. However the local paper in reporting this meeting and a similar one in West Hartlepool, saw these town planning initiatives as having a direct bearing on the unemployment situation,

"Whilst the present crisis in trade and industry becomes more acute about Teesside, it is gratifying to note that there has been an acceleration of activity on the part of the neighbouring local government authorities appointed to deal with unemployment problems. Yesterday, on both banks of the Tees, conferences, whose primary object was to consider ways and means of absorbing in some useful capacity, the labour left suddenly at a loose end, met and explored the town planning and extension possibility of coping with unemployment distress... what is considered of primary importance is the rapidity of preparation for threatened emergencies." (19)

While this report does not appear to reflect what actually happened at these meetings it does nevertheless, express what many councillors came to think. The subsequent meetings of the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee were primarily concerned with implementing, at the earliest stage, key capital projects as a means of soaking up the unemployment. This will be examined in detail later.
Teesside and Hartlepool were among the first areas in Britain to consider joint working under the 1919 Act. The South Teesside Joint Committee was one of the first to get underway. Yet even in this locality the economic collapse of the country soon shattered any pretence that Town Planning was about to usher in a 'New Britain', reconstructed to prevent a return to pre-war days. Notions of 'economy' and 'efficiency', always included in the town planning message, assumed a greater relevance to the hard-pressed authorities of Teesside and Hartlepool.

For the period 1919 to 1933 the claim that town planning should act as a part of a reforming drive was not heard very loudly in the local study areas and its success or otherwise should not be mainly judged by such a claim. More valid criteria for success lay in the expectation that it would help solve unemployment and that it would lead to long-term savings. The issue of success can also be looked at in terms of specific schemes. If it is accepted that by the mid-twenties few expected town planning to deliver the basis of a new reconstructed Britain it can be said that most wanted a more rational process of development. How reasonable was such an expectation in the light of experience? Both the general record of the local town planning schemes and specific projects designated in the schemes will be studied in subsequent chapters.

Whilst the two main themes, outlined above, provide the central thrust to the local studies which follow they are by no means the only purposes for undertaking local empirical studies. By looking in depth at the way the activity of town planning unfolded in, what are seen here as its formative years, it is also hoped to provide a deeper insight into the nature and scope of British town planning generally. Town planning was a local government activity and only by looking at
how it evolved in some detail can a proper understanding be gained of
the nature of that activity.

Before looking in detail at the key issues which seek to illuminate the
study themes in each of the three areas; South Teesside, North Teesside
and Hartlepool, two contextual chapters are provided. The first
provides an introduction to Teesside and Hartlepool, showing how it
evolved in social, economic and political terms up to 1933. The second
gives an overview of how town planning itself evolved and developed in
Teesside and Hartlepool before and during the study period.
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Chapter 18 - The Evolution of Teesside & Hartlepool

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the social, economic and political context for the examination of how town planning developed in practice in the Teesside and Hartlepool areas.

Whilst to the outsider Teesside and Hartlepool may appear to be a homogeneous area of the North East of England (see Map A) it is in fact very diverse in both tradition and characteristics. The process of industrialisation and its accompanying drive to urbanisation eventually forced a degree of similarity in its social and economic base that was recognised in 1974 by the creation of one administrative unit called Cleveland. But even this creation is regarded by many as a false imposition that ignores native differences.

In order to accommodate the differences the detailed background of the area is considered in three parts; South Teesside, North Teesside and Hartlepool. (See Map B) These three areas possess sufficient parochial singularities to make such a division feasible. Moreover, they also accord with the separation during the period under consideration into three areas that served for town planning purposes. But before delving into the features that are special to the three areas it is necessary to look at what unites them.

The common factors are the economic ones. In particular, all three areas experienced the unleashing of new productive forces that followed the industrial revolution. The diverse nature of the area became drawn together by the threads of an industrial economy that linked the extraction of coal in south-east Durham to that of iron ore in the Cleveland hills. Communication routes by rail, sea, train and road helped to make the links a physical reality and to provide an outlet to markets elsewhere in the country and abroad.
MAP B: The Teesside and Hartlepool Areas
The economic transformation of the Teesside/Hartlepool area from an agricultural society to an industrial one was a rapid and tumultuous event, perhaps as swift and dramatic as anywhere in Britain. Hardly any part of the area was untouched and in the space of one generation, between the 1820s and the 1850s, the whole area was transformed.

Population is one clear guide to the way the different parts of Teesside/Hartlepool were affected by the economic changes. Communities once small and unchanged over centuries were subject to a massive influx of migrant labour. The bare figures tell a story of differential rates of growth. Behind the figures lies a multitude of cultural changes.

Table 7. Population of the main Teesside & Hartlepool Settlements 1801-1951

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>1801</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>91,300</td>
<td>131,100</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>147,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>27,700</td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>64,100</td>
<td>67,700</td>
<td>74,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hartlepool</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>68,600</td>
<td>69,500</td>
<td>72,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>22,700</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>17,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eston</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>31,300</td>
<td>33,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>27,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billingham</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornaby</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>23,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Population (rounded to the nearest '00).

The picture in 1801 reveals a sparsely populated area punctuated by two communities that by virtue of having populations of 1,000 or more could be called towns and a scattering of other villages. The two towns,
Stockton and Hartlepool, both owed their importance to their port facilities which in turn were to some extent a result, historically, of patronage by the Palatinate power of the Lord Bishops of Durham. Middlesbrough, it should be noted, was at this time no more than a collection of farms.

The early period of industrialisation, that is to say the first fifty years of the nineteenth century, saw a dramatic growth in what was to become, after 1831, the planted town of Middlesbrough. Industry was also behind the rapid increase in population of Stockton, West Hartlepool and Hartlepool Town. The spin-off in this process is visible in all the settlements except perhaps Billingham.

The last fifty years of the nineteenth century saw a massive rise in population in all the main centres. Middlesbrough grew more than 11 fold, West Hartlepool by more than 12 fold and other towns by varying amounts up to 11 fold. Later decades in the twentieth century were to witness greater numbers in growth but not faster rates. After 1921 the rate of growth and the numbers expand at a much slower pace except for Billingham which doubled in size between 1921 and 1931 due to the expansion of the ICI chemical plant.

The key industries of the area which helped to attract such a rapid rate of population growth were the iron and steel industry, shipbuilding, heavy engineering, ironstone mining and heavy chemical industry. The area became a centre for heavy industry and this was its chief abiding characteristic.

It is within this general framework that the evolution of three parts of the study area can be examined.
South Teesside is something of an upstart in industrial terms. In 1820, a century prior to the considerations of this study, a bird's eye view of the area would reveal that whilst the industrial revolution had indeed arrived it was not south of the river. For all that could be seen on the south side at this time would be a few farms and hamlets in an otherwise flat and wholly agricultural scene. Stretching south-east beyond the mouth of the Tees several small fishing villages could be discerned continuing a pattern of life not dissimilar to that pursued for centuries past. The next 25 years would witness as dramatic a change in the area as any experienced in the country during its rapid and socially shattering industrial transformation. The start of this metamorphosis was the choice, by Quaker entrepreneurs, of Middlesbrough, for a rail and coal centre. From its start in 1829 Middlesbrough achieved a most startling growth, due in no small measure to the establishment of iron and later steel industries. From a recorded population of 40 in 1821 the town grew a thousand fold over the next 50 years.

The 1871 population of 40,000 trebled by 1921 to reach 131,700. Whilst Middlesbrough was the focus of the wealth and industry in south Teesside, other industrial communities grew in its wake. To the west, Thornaby, originally known as South Stockton, grew from a small hamlet to a sizeable manufacturing settlement of some 20,000 by 1921. To the east a collection of iron and steel works with their attendant workers' communities amalgamated into an urban district known as Eston. By 1921 Eston comprised over 30,000 people. Even the fishing villages were embraced pell mell in the pace of industrialisation. Redcar took on new functions of industry and tourism and the smaller Marske and Saltburn became attractive suburban towns for the better off.
The Economy of South-Teesside

By the end of the First World War, south Teesside represented one of the country's most important sources of heavy industry. Much of this endeavour was heavily concentrated along the banks of the Tees, but even large areas of the rural hinterland were characterised by iron mining. The dominant industrial base of south Teesside was not as stable and solid as might have appeared to the casual visitor. The sudden vision of Teesside from the prominence of Ormesby Bank appeared to reveal an area of seething activity witnessed by a prolonged vista of chimneys, furnaces and the like. Yet, similarly to today, unemployment often registered in excess of 20%. In fact, the area has always been prone to periodic booms and slumps, magnifying the national economic fluctuations. Heavy, traditional industry is by its nature slow and ponderous—prey to new developments that can be accomplished in fresh environments. Iron and steel production on Teesside has continually been rationalised and adapted to accommodate new methods and processes. The revolutionary invention of Henry Bessemer in 1856 marked a turning point in steel technology. But initially only non-phosphoric iron ores were suitable, thus ruling out Cleveland ore. To tackle this problem Bolckow Vaughan persuaded Gilchrist and Thomas to come to Teesside. In 1879 their experiments successfully enabled phosphoric ores to be adapted using the Bessemer process. By linking local ores to the steelmaking process the Gilchrist and Thomas invention marked a turning point in the industrial development of Teesside. (1) However, the position of the British iron and steel industry to the rest of the world in terms of output began to decline in the latter part of the nineteenth century. At its height the industry's share of the world markets was dominant. British pig-iron accounted for more than half of the world supply in 1870 but fell to
only 20% by 1901. In the case of steel the fall over the same period was from 43% to 16%.\(^{(2)}\) Teesside as one of the main centres of production in Britain reflected this decline. Between 1907 and 1911 Teesside firms were hit by a severe depression forcing many amalgamations and specialisations.\(^{(3)}\) By 1914 the iron and steel industry was dominated by three giant companies: Bolckow and Vaughan, Dorman Long and South Durham.

During the war the iron and steel industry was geared to war production. The government encouraged the companies to increase production. As a result, Bolckow and Vaughan built a new steel plant and Dorman Long took over the smaller plants of Redcar and Newport. Extra coke and steel capacity was established at the Skinningrove works. Despite the immediate post-war problems of dislocation and readjustment, general boom conditions in 1918 and 1919 encouraged still further local optimism and innovation, leading to Dorman Long reconstructing their plant on open hearth principles in 1919. But the optimism was short lived. In 1919 acute shortages of rail waggons and raw materials led to lay offs. In 1919 a rail strike affected production and a coal strike the following year did likewise, illustrating the vulnerability of the area. In general, the 1920s were bleak years for Teesside's staple industry. Challenged by cheap imports and expanding competitors, several firms were forced to close or merge. The iron industry virtually ceased in the 1920s. In 1922 the last puddling furnace closed (in 1872 there had been 1,000).\(^{(4)}\) The iron mining industry, concentrated in the Eston Hills and East Cleveland had been in decline since the 1890s. At its height in the 1880s production of Cleveland ore accounted for over a third of the national total. But between 1890 and 1914 over two thirds of the mines were closed. By 1919 only 25 mines remained and of these a further 15 were shut during the inter-war years.\(^{(5)}\)
Shipbuilding was even more drastically affected by the economic problems of the 1920s. During the war several shipyards, buoyed up by war productions, expanded. Others actually re-opened or were created. But their prosperity was shortlived. The big fall in world trade in the 1920s saw ship tonnage on the Tees crash from a record 200,000 gross in 1920 to only 43,000 gross tonnage in 1923.\(^6\) By the end of the decade nearly all the shipyards on the Tees had closed, most of them never to re-open.

On a brighter note the engineering and chemical industries proved more prosperous. Although the heavy engineering works were hit by the depression, the high, world-wide, reputation of many companies led to some expansion in the later 1920s. A capacity for diversification saved others. The chemical industry was, until the 1940s, chiefly located on the north side of the Tees but the effects of its dramatic growth there in the inter-war period left its mark on the whole region. On the south side Sadlers, a well established chemical concern, prospered during the 1920s and grew.

South Teesside was rightly recognised by the end of World War One as an important centre of several heavy, basic industries, particularly iron and steel and shipbuilding. In these areas it had made a major contribution to the war effort. The war may have proved of special benefit to these industries at the time but it served also to mask long-term problems and to create new ones of dislocation and readjustment. South Teesside emerged from the war with extensive needs for industrial reorganisation, improved communication and greater economic diversification. The failure to provide these requirements led to prolonged economic distress with consequent unemployment and hardship.
The local political response to these problems was slow to gain definition. This was due, in part, to the strong sense of parochialism that pervades the several communities. The area as a whole lacks cohesion and a sense of homogeneity. Middlesbrough as the largest town was the dominant political force and many of the smaller towns reacted to this in a suspicious and sometimes hostile fashion. Within Middlesbrough a strong Liberal tradition was a powerful factor in both local and national elections. This tradition stemmed largely from the strong influence of the early ironmasters who were usually of Quaker and Liberal persuasion. Towards the end of the nineteenth century this Liberal factor was overlain by a Labour one when Havelock-Wilson, the seamen's leader, became one of the first three M.P's in the country to be elected on a Labour-only ticket. That was in 1892 and apart from a brief interlude, Havelock-Wilson dominated the constituency until he retired in 1910. However, notable as the initial victory under Labour colours was, it is important to realise that Havelock-Wilson was essentially a Liberal and did, in fact, call himself such after a few years in Parliament. The Liberals continued to dominate the seat until the election of 1918 when it was split into two constituencies. At this election only Liberals and Labour stood, the Liberals winning the seats. This may be taken to indicate something of the local mood at the beginning of the study period. One might say the mood was too radical for the Conservatives to even consider standing but too cautious to elect Labour. During the 1920s, political feelings became more polarised with a Conservative victory in 1922 in one of the seats, followed by a Labour victory in 1924, the Liberals continuing to easily win the other seat. The Labour victor in 1924 was Ellen Wilkinson, later famed for her role in the Jarrow hunger marches and the subsequent book she wrote about the plight of that town. The
gathering force of the Labour Party, fuelled by continued high unemployment and genuine hardship, reached its apogee in 1928 when they came within 89 votes of capturing the other Middlesbrough seat, Middlesbrough West, in a by-election. In 1929 Ellen Wilkinson was again returned for Middlesbrough East, a Liberal, T.K. Griffiths winning the other seat and Conservatives coming bottom of both polls. In 1931 both seats went to Liberals standing on a National Government ticket.

The other South Teesside constituency was the Cleveland seat covering both the remaining industrial settlements and a large rural hinterland. During the nineteenth century this was solid Liberal territory with the seat being initially held by the Pease family, one of the main founders of Middlesbrough. Later H.L. Samuel, a prominent national politician, held the seat until he was defeated by a coalition Conservative in 1919. Throughout the 1920s the constituency was marginal, initially between Conservatives and Liberals and later between Conservatives and Labour. All three parties held the seat at some time during this decade. (10) In a two-cornered election contest in 1931, R.T. Bower easily defeated the sitting Labour M.P., W.T. Mansfield, an ex-ironstone miner. (11)

In national political terms South Teesside exhibits many of the features one might expect of an industrial area with strong Liberal traditions. The Conservative Party, although powerful, tended to play second fiddle to the leading Liberal and Labour players who fought out the battle for the allegiance of the largest class in the area - the industrial working class.

In local elections, however, traditional opinions held sway, usually under 'independent' colours. Labour's representation on all the
Councils in South Teesside was either non-existent or tenuous. Only in Middlesbrough did Labour have a consistent foothold and even here it was restricted to just a couple of wards. When Labour gained a seat it was a cause of considerable comment. Thus in November, 1924, (a good year for Labour), the local paper reported, 'Elections: Labour increases its power in local government. A Middlesbrough sensation'. Yet the results to us today hardly seem to justify such a dramatic headline for Labour gained only two seats in Middlesbrough and none anywhwere else on South Teesside. It was, nevertheless, indicative of a growing tide that would eventually take municipal power, but not until after the Second World War.

Questions arise about the men (there were very few women) who dominated the local councils at this time. Who were they and what were their motives for directing council policy in the way that they did? Generally they came from commercial and professional backgrounds, replacing the earlier ironmasters and industrialists who had dominated civic life in the nineteenth century. Their essential policies appear to have been twofold and often in conflict. On the one hand they desired to keep the rate to a minimum and to ensure that council business was kept small and as efficient as possible. On the other hand, they were keen to develop a growth in the power and esteem of their council. Other pressures came to play an important role too. Unemployment and the consequent distress, particularly of those 'out of benefit' became a continuing source of concern, not only on humanitarian grounds but also on those of civil order. In the bad periods of unemployment large groups of the unemployed would gather in most of the towns to hear speeches. Many representations and deputations came to the councils to press for improved assistance. Within this complex range of desires and pressures, the councils of
South Teesside undertook various initiatives during the 1920s and early 1930s, some of them in half-hearted fashion, some out of fear, some out of pride, but always with at least one eye on the financial implications.

(ii) The North Tees Area

Like the south bank of the Tees the north side consists primarily of low estuarine land split by the occasional indented beck. The main landscape difference between the two sides of the river lies more in their respective backdrops than in any intrinsic separate identities. The sudden rise of the Eston Hills to the south provides a sharp counterpoint to the floodplain, whilst on the north side the land rises more slowly in gentle undulations to the Sedgefield hills. A further feature of the landscape worth mentioning is the extent of the marshy land subject to tidal flooding. Extensive areas on both sides of the Tees were subject to cover by the sea at high tide and considerable effort has gone on since the nineteenth century to reclaim such land. Indeed, one wonders at the potential scale of modern reclamation had not the iron masters of Teesside had such a constant destination for their waste slag. By canalising the Tees with slag-built training banks and then raising the adjacent land, again with slag, a foundation was provided for most of the industry that now lines the river. (15) On the north side of the Tees the problem of flooded land was of vast proportions and much of the land known as Seal Sands was not in fact reclaimed until comparatively recently and substantial areas still remain unreclaimed. The solid geology of the estuary is similar on both sides of the river but the deposits of anhydrite and salt are considerably more extensive in the north Tees area and provided a significant element in the development of the chemical industry at Billingham. (16)
The Economic Evolution of North Teesside

The history of the north bank of the Tees is very different from its southern counterpart. The history of south Tees only begins to gather momentum with the planting of Middlesbrough in 1829. On the north side, however, Stockton, Billingham and Norton provide important continuities of settlement reaching back at least until the thirteenth century. Stockton, destined to emerge as the largest settlement on the north bank, was a foundation of the Bishops of Durham, as were most of the townships in County Durham. Living under the rules of the closed economy of the Palatinate was a mixed blessing. Whilst Stockton was granted a near monopoly of trade in south-east Durham it was prevented from establishing trading links with Yorkshire or developing other long distance commercial partners. Its early history was, therefore, pampered but hampered and this permitted other trading communities such as Hartlepool and Yarm to build up a dominance. This situation changed after the sixteenth century when the Bishop of Durham lost his power of absolute jurisdiction. After a period of uncertainty, Stockton emerged as the most important centre between the Humber and the Tyne - a position it held until the middle of the nineteenth century. The basis of Stockton's prosperity lay in the growth of the national economy and particularly in the demand for food from the rapidly expanding capital, London. Butter and other dairy products were gathered from the rural hinterland and shipped out of the Tees from Stockton. Yarm, an early leader as a Tees port, was too far downstream to accommodate the increasing size of boat, Hartlepool too far removed from the main producing areas. Thus Stockton achieved its pre-eminent position and on the basis of its wealth rebuilt the town and expanded its activities to include shipbuilding and allied trades. By the beginning of the nineteenth century Stockton's merchants and
industrialists were still a dynamic force. They recognised the developing threats and promises of the emerging industrial revolution. In efforts to capitalise on new trade and industry, and combat possible competitors they threw their energies and cash into improving Stockton's communications, particularly to the Tees and later in the development of the railways. The Stockton and Darlington Railway (1825) owed much to the widespread support it received from the commercial community of Stockton. Ironically it was this development which led to the foundation of Middlesbrough and thus provided the major rival to Stockton and its eventual successor as the largest and most important settlement on the Tees. (17)

Stockton's position as the largest town on Teesside ended between the 1851 and 1871 censuses. By 1921 its population was about half that of Middlesbrough, a relationship that was maintained throughout the inter-war period. Billingham, the only other significant settlement in the north Tees area under consideration, remained relatively small until after the First World War. The growth of Billingham towards the end of the nineteenth century, was due to the outward spread of Stockton's suburbs into the large parish area of Billingham. The real expansion of Billingham, due to the location of large chemical works, does not occur until after 1919. During the 1920s Billingham was the only settlement on Teesside to exhibit any growth. Had there been a Census in 1941 this same phenomenon would have been shown to be true for the 1930s.

Following the great developments in industry in the early and middle years of the nineteenth century, the next outburst of major activity occurred during the First World War. The war years were boom years for Teessiders. Their products were in high demand. After all, most implements of death were metal based and most required skilled
engineering, two factors in plentiful supply on Teesside. Shipbuilding on north Teesside acquired a new importance and the large increase in demand led to new investment. In 1917 Lord Furness bought 85 acres of marshy land by the Tees at Haverton Hill to build a new shipyard. The reclamation and construction work was highly costly and difficult and largely undertaken by women. The yards were open within the year. To accommodate the workforce Lord Furness established a new model village. (18)

Other investment also began during the war, commensurate with the strategic significance of the area. Thus new roads and railways were constructed and a massive new power station was started by the Newcastle Electric Company. The Tees Conservancy Commissioners were also moved to plan further schemes of land reclamation and by 1920 secured an Act of Parliament to reclaim the vast expanse of Seal Sands, together with its subsequent servicing and development for industry. (19)

The pattern of development in the nineteenth century witnessed a rapidly expanding industrial base, centred mainly on the iron and steel industry. This affected all of Teesside but the south side more than the north. Although several ironworks were established in Stockton it was generally true that Middlesbrough made iron and Stockton used it. Engineering dominated the growing industrial structure of the north Tees area, particularly foundry work, marine and locomotive engine building and iron shipbuilding. (20)

The social composition of Stockton in its industrial phase presents a more variegated composition than the more or less single-class communities of the south Tees area. The town retained its position as a regional market centre for south-east Durham and also much of
Cleveland. Stockton was, therefore, able to sustain a much larger professional and middle class than Middlesbrough.(21)

The government as well as supporting some of these developments also had a direct hand in the one project that was to change the entire character and history of the area, that is the establishment of a large, heavy chemical industry at Billingham. An outline of developments at Billingham is provided in Appendix 5. The government factory was bought by Brunner, Mond and Company in 1920. Brunner, Mond established a wholly-owned subsidiary, Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited (S.A. & N.) to undertake the task of purchasing the site and developing the synthetic ammonia process as the basis for producing agricultural fertilizers. Research and development occupied the first three years of operations but after 1923 production and diversification grew rapidly.(22)

The activities of S.A. & N. at Billingham provided the one bright spot in an otherwise gloomy industrial picture on north Teesside in the period after the First World War. The collapse of the post-war boom and the onset of trade depression began to seriously affect production and employment during 1921. Unemployment and firm closures dominated the remaining years of the 1920s in Stockton. The main shipyards, Ropners and Craig Taylor's closed in the early 1920s thus ending a 200 year tradition of the town.(23) Many engineering works and iron and steel works were either forced to close or to diversify their operations, particularly those linked to shipbuilding. Thus the Stockton Malleable Iron Company initially producing plate for ships, was forced in 1927 to switch its operations to pipe making. This was only achieved after it had been bought by the South Durham Steel and Iron Company.(24)
The trade depression of the 1920s also had a marked effect on the activities of the Tees Conservancy Commissioners. The port and river users had urged the Commissioners to improve docking facilities since the early 1920s. The railway company, London North Eastern Railway (L.N.E.R.), who owned Middlesbrough Dock and a large area of foreshore at South Bank, abandoned a projected improvement of dock facilities in 1925.\(^{(25)}\) In 1927 the Tees Conservancy Commissioners decided on a limited programme of improvement, following a detailed survey. But the planned expenditure only amounted to half a million pounds over a 5-6 year period.\(^{(26)}\) The lack of unity among the port and river users probably prevented a more decisive and significant improvement of facilities. S.A.-& N. and other north bank industrialists naturally favoured a north shore docking scheme, while the powerful south shore companies insisted on improvements to their side. Furthermore, most of the large companies had their own wharves and berths which, no doubt, detracted from a concerted move to force the Tees Conservancy Commissioners to undertake major works. The Commissioners also found their dwindling reserves a cause to delay their reclamation schemes. Work eventually began on Seal Sands in 1928, aided by government unemployment grants, but progress was very slow.

**The Political Background**

The political temper of the north bank appears to be little different to the south side. In terms of national politics a Liberal tradition appears to prevail in the main constituency, Stockton-on-Tees, until 1924. In that year Harold Macmillan was elected as a Conservative member, having been narrowly defeated the previous year. The Labour vote was a strong one, however, only failing to win the seat in 1922 by 1,200 votes. By 1929 Labour's developing strength was sufficient to dislodge the young Macmillan and take the seat. Each main political
party, therefore, held the seat at some stage in the 1920s. In 1931 Macmillan won the seat back for the Conservatives, on a National Government ticket. Interestingly, Macmillan stood in 1935 as an Independent Conservative and again won the seat. (27)

In local affairs the Labour party failed to match their appeal at national elections, a phenomenon that was noted in the south Tees area. Stockton Borough Council had only a handful of Labour councillors throughout the 1920s. The majority on this, as on the other Councils in the area, comprised individuals who tended not to stand on a party 'ticket'. This is not to say that they were not members of the Conservative and Liberal Parties, many probably were. But it was traditional, as it still is in some rural areas of Britain, to believe that local politics was not political and representatives were essentially elected for their position in society and their reputation as honest, decent citizens.

(iii) The Hartlepools

Hartlepool is one of those towns used by comedians to evoke a joke image of the cloth-capped northern community. As such, to many people, particularly in the south of England, it probably conjures up a picture of dour factories, wet pavements and old fashioned working class ambience. The fact that Reg Smythe, the Andy Capp cartoonist comes from Hartlepool can only add to such a view. It would have to be admitted, by even the most fervent Hartlepudlian, that the town is not exactly the Venice of the north. But, there again, nor is it nearly so bad as its notoriety suggests. There are, as in any northern industrial town, dirty factories and evidence of past workplaces now forlorn and derelict. But there are also richer and deeper layers of historical experience etched into the fabric of the settlement.
reflecting the fact that the history of Hartlepool extends back far beyond the industrial revolution. There is also, perhaps, a greater expression of the wealth accumulated in the intensely capitalistic period of Hartlepool's growth, than can be readily seen in Teesside. Finally, despite the fact that Hartlepool is in fact two communities, and hence the frequent use of the plural when referring to the town, there is a clear sense of place. Much of Teesside merges one community into another without clear distinction, but Hartlepool, by virtue of its geographical position is separate and distinct.

The Evolution of the 'Hartlepools'

The Hartlepools comprise, historically speaking, two settlements; the original town of Hartlepool dating back to before the time of William the Conquerer, and West Hartlepool, a company town of the nineteenth century. Old Hartlepool is situated on a narrow promontory of land that enclosed a natural shelter from the North Sea and was therefore a favoured location for fishermen. It achieved a degree of recognition and thus growth in the early middle ages due to its crucial position in the defence of north-east England against the marauding Scots. Its natural port facilities were developed by the Bishops of Durham and used on occasion by Kings of England. Such services enabled the town to achieve a charter in 1200. From that time until the Reformation the town appears to have been a relatively prosperous community of merchants and fishermen. But, although its harbour was a natural advantage, it lacked vital connections to a thriving hinterland to grow beyond 1,000 population. So long as it received the special patronage of the Bishops of Durham it was able to maintain its position. But, after the erosion of the Bishop's power and the consequent release of other ports, particularly on the Tees, to pursue an unfettered trade, the fortunes of the town declined. By the start of the nineteenth
A 19th century Hartlepool was solely a fishing community, its harbour in a poor state of repair and by all accounts a law unto itself. The old Corporation of Hartlepool was honorific and decadent. The fishermen ran the town in an independent, and some say, anarchic fashion. The development of the railways had a decisive influence on Hartlepool. The Hartlepool Dock and Railway Company, formed in 1832 sought to develop the potential of the existing town and harbour of Hartlepool. The plan was to extend the port facilities and export coal brought from the South Durham coalfield. This was an attractive proposition since the alternatives involved using the River Tees, still a tortuous and costly entry to the old port of Stockton and even to the new developments at Middlesbrough. Moreover, the area behind the old harbour at Hartlepool was a low lying zone, known locally as the Slake, ideal for further dock extensions. The population of Hartlepool rose rapidly with the influx of navvies and allied workers engaged to develop the dock and railway. In 1831 the Census recorded 1,330 population. Ten years later this had risen to 5,256. Alive to the threat posed by the Hartlepool Dock and Railway Company the original railway companies on Teesside sought to counter the gains of the new company by linking Teesside to Hartlepool via the Stockton and Darlington Railway and the Clarence Railway. Such rivalry between companies was not uncommon at this time and led to a variety of developments in many towns. In Hartlepool's case it ultimately led to the creation of a rival town itself. In their original prospectus the Stockton and Hartlepool Railway sought not only to link Hartlepool to Teesside but to develop a new and rival dock. Compromises staved off this prospect for some years but eventually an Act of Parliament was secured setting up a new company to develop a new dock. This was called the Hartlepool West Harbour and Dock Company and its guiding
spirit was Ralph Ward Jackson. In a series of developments the company laid the basis for a thriving, new industrial town. A coal dock was opened in 1847, helping West Hartlepool, as it became known, to secure a large slice of the important trade in coal exports. Subsequent docks developed in 1852 and 1856 ensured that West Hartlepool would become the major settlement at Hartlepool, a situation much resented by interests in old Hartlepool. The competition between the Hartlepool Dock and Railway Company and Jackson's Hartlepool West Harbour and Dock Company ended in victory for Jackson's company and the two companies merged in the 1850s. Jackson continued to seek to expand the interests of his company. Although this proved, in the end, to be his downfall, it led to a greatly diversified industrial base. In particular, Jackson secured the introduction of shipbuilding and later iron and steel production to West Hartlepool. (30) In his attempt to stave off the take-over bids of George Hudson of the (North Eastern Railway) N.E.R. Jackson went beyond the legal limits laid down in the Act of Parliament which had created his Company. This was confirmed in an Inquiry in 1861, and Jackson was forced to resign. (31) In 1865 the N.E.R. acquired Jackson's Company. Recognition of the growth and separateness of West Hartlepool was given in 1887 when the town was incorporated and made a Borough. Fifteen years later after continued sustained growth the town was accorded County Borough status.

Hartlepool and West Hartlepool continued to grow and develop in the latter half of the nineteenth century, West Hartlepool becoming the dominant partner between 1851 and 1871. The economic basis for the growth of both towns lay in the development of shipbuilding, iron and steel and allied engineering and support industries, themselves the outgrowth of dynamic and thrusting railway companies and their allied dock systems. Shipbuilding finally ceased in West Hartlepool in 1962.
Such an event would have been unthinkable to earlier Hartlepudlians who had witnessed an enormous amount of activity in this industry. Indeed, West Hartlepool's first Mayor in 1887 was Sir William Gray, the shipbuilder. Shipbuilding suffered severely in the recession of the 1920s. Prior to 1920 there had rarely been a year when at least a dozen ships had not been built. In the early 1900s the figure had been nearer to two or even three dozen. Yet after 1920 it was unusual for the figure to exceed half a dozen. As well as that the number of shipping companies, i.e. companies who owned ships, declined drastically. In 1931 there were 42 shipping companies. By 1938 these had shrunk to just 8.(32)

The iron and steel industry was a visible sign that West Hartlepool had developed the full range of heavy industry. A variety of works grew up, some of them extremely close to the centre of town. They had logically followed the establishment of shipbuilding and other heavy engineering industries who required iron and steel. Rationalisation of the several plants in the town was conducted by two industrialists whose main interest was shipbuilding. William Gray and Christopher Furness established the South Durham Steel and Iron Company that brought together several plants in Teesside and Hartlepool and by a process of closure and amalgamation reduced the main producing centres in Hartlepool to two; West Hartlepool Works and Seaton Carew Works, the latter acquired in 1928.(33)

The economic fortunes of the Hartlepools were clearly on the wane after the First World War. Strong concentration on shipbuilding, iron and steel and the export of coal linked the fortunes of the town to these heavy industries that suffered more than most in the inter-war years. As in Teesside, the First World War produced an artificially high demand for just the sort of products the Hartlepools specialised in and
this fuelled a post-war optimism. William Gray opened a new shipyard at Graythorp in 1918 thus confirming, so it seemed, the prospects for growth in the south Hartlepool area that West Hartlepool used to justify their town planning proposals before the war. But the reality was slowly perceived in the mounting closures and lengthening dole queues of the 1920s. Hartlepool became truly a depressed area in the inter-war period. Unlike North Teesside's chemical industry, there were no new ventures in the 1920s to give hope of some future improvement although the Steetley Magnesite Company remained prosperous and expanded using a new sea-water process after 1936. (34)

**Political Background**

Surprisingly, given the cloth-cap image of the town, the political fortunes of the Labour Party in Hartlepool were slow to mature. In 1918 Labour came a poor third in a contest in which the Conservatives easily beat the Coalition Liberal. In 1922 the Liberals narrowly defeated the Conservatives, probably due to the fact that Labour did not stand. In 1923 Labour lost their deposit, the Liberals again winning, but by only 145 votes. Thereafter the Conservatives won each successive election until 1945. In 1945 the Labour victory was only by 275 votes over the Conservative. (35) These results suggest a sustained pattern of working class Tory voting that would appear to be much higher than on Teesside and the explanation for which would require further research.

Locally the Labour representation on the Councils remained small throughout the study period and apparently non-aligned representatives dominated the chambers as they did throughout the wider area.
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Chapter 19 - Town Planning on Teesside & Hartlepool, 1919-1933

The purpose of this chapter is to present a chronological account of town planning on Teesside and Hartlepool in order to provide a context for the subsequent, more detailed chapters which are related to the main themes outlined in Chapter 17. In addition, this chapter will seek to demonstrate the extent to which the local authorities on Teesside and Hartlepool engaged in statutory town planning and how they joined together in Joint Town Planning Committees to prepare both advisory Regional Plans and statutory schemes.

Post-War Town Planning

The emerging pattern of town planning after the passing of the 1919, Housing, Town Planning, Etc. Act, was complex. All authorities, other than County Councils, could undertake statutory town planning for relevant areas of land. Such Town Planning Scheme areas need not necessarily be limited solely to land within the boundary of a local authority, although Ministry approval was needed if one authority proposed a scheme which covered the area of another authority. Larger authorities, defined as those with populations over 20,000, were obliged to prepare Town Planning Scheme for their appropriate areas.

In addition to these permissive and mandatory powers applying to individual authorities it was also possible for authorities to join together for town planning purposes, into Joint Town Planning Committees. Both the Ministry of Health and the town planning movement proved very keen, after 1919, in advocating such joint working. It was widely held that the fragmented local authority structure might lead to conflicting and inefficient town planning proposals unless such Joint Committees were established.
Joint Town Planning Committees could follow two routes. They could opt to prepare an advisory plan, often referred to as a Regional Plan which could form the basis for the individual authorities to prepare their own statutory town planning schemes. Alternatively the constituent authorities of a joint committee could agree to delegate their town planning powers to a Joint Committee. Such a committee would then become an Executive Committee and prepare a Town Planning Scheme for the relevant areas of the several local authorities within the Committee. It was expected that once approved such a Town Planning Scheme would then be implemented by the individual local authorities. The Joint Committee might meet occasionally to review progress but would otherwise cease to function.

After 1929 the County Councils also became Town Planning Authorities, but could only directly prepare Town Planning Schemes if the District Councils within the County area agreed to delegate their powers to the County Council. Additionally, County Councils, who had, before 1929 participated in Joint Town Planning Committees on an uneasy basis in law, were able to become full members of Joint Committees, both advisory and executive.

Virtually all of these different town planning options were exercised in the Teesside and Hartlepool areas, between 1919 and 1933. Only the preparation of a County Planning Scheme was unrepresented and this is unsurprising given the urban character of the area. A North Riding Town Planning Scheme was commenced in 1934, following a study by Professor Abercrombie and this has been the subject of separate research. (1)

The Ministry of Health made an early attempt to influence the progress of town planning on Teesside. In November, 1920, a conference on Town Planning was held on Teesside, chaired by George Pepler on behalf of
the Ministry. The object of the conference was to try and establish a Joint Town Planning Committee covering all of the Teesside and Hartlepool Local Authorities. Whilst all of the authorities attended, including representatives from Durham and North Riding counties, agreement to form one Joint Committee was not forthcoming. Rather, it was agreed to form two Joint Committees, one North and one South of the River Tees. However, even this agreement seemingly carried with enthusiasm at the time was not implemented. A South Tees Committee did quickly emerge, but the situation on the North side of the river took some time to develop until eventually it was covered by two Joint Committees.

Details of how this occurred between 1920 and 1933 and other aspects of town planning progress are provided below. The information is presented in terms of three contiguous areas; South Teesside, North Teesside and Hartlepool. These three areas were shown on Map B in the previous chapter.

South Teesside

(1) 1920-1929

The town planning history of South Teesside between 1920 and 1929 can be divided into two main phases. Firstly an initial enthusiastic period from 1920 to 1925 when the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee commissioned Professors Abercrombie and Adshead to prepare an advisory Plan. Secondly a trough, following publication of the Plan in 1925, in which there was little apparent interest in pursuing a regional town planning scheme and not a great deal of fervour for local statutory planning. Such a condition lasted from 1926 until 1929. The history of the Joint Committee's activities in the first period is outlined first, followed by brief accounts of individual authority
MAP C: South Tees-side Advisory JTPC Area, 1921-30

Reproduced from the South Tees-side Regional Planning Scheme Report by Professor Adshead and Professor Abercrombie
progress in statutory town planning. Map C shows the area under consideration.

South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee, 1921-1929

The South Tees JTPC was born out of the still warm post-war optimism for growth and harmony. However, by the time the Committee met for the first time in February, 1921, the economic climate was rapidly cooling. George Pepler, nursing several fledgling joint committees, took the chair of the inaugural meeting and his tireless work behind the scenes led to rapid progress. Professor Abercrombie had already been approached by Pepler about undertaking the Advisory Plan and so was ready and waiting to accept the proffered commission. Abercrombie requested that his friend and collaborator, Professor Adshead, join him. They both knew Teesside, having worked together on the wartime project at Dormanstown. The two professors were taken on for a fee of 500 guineas. Their remit was to prepare a report and plan to the scale of 6" to the mile showing the main transport routes to be provided and improved and areas to be reserved for different uses such as housing, industry, civic uses, shopping and open spaces. In addition, they were required to consult with the Borough and District Surveyors. (2)

As for the organisation of the Joint Committee, Pepler had again been busy and had asked North Yorkshire County Clerk, Mr. Jevons, to so act. Perhaps the motive in calling upon the County Council to provide the Secretary was to avoid inter-authority rivalry. In any event North Riding refused the services of its County Clerk and played little part in the proceedings of the Joint Committee at this stage. (3) The role of secretary to the Committee fell to Preston Kitchen the Town Clerk of Middlesbrough. His influence was to remain throughout the subsequent history of the Committee.
The dominating planning issues for South Tees were related to communications. The underlying social and political factor which coloured the approach to town planning was unemployment. These two issues became intertwined and are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 21, and Chapter 22 which looks specifically at the proposed new River Tees crossing and the Middlesbrough-Redcar Trunk Road Scheme. These two schemes were of special concern to the South Tees area, and were the main features of the Professors' Advisory Plan which was shown to the Joint Committee at only their third meeting in September 1921. Professors Adshead and Abercrombie were able to come to rapid conclusions due to their earlier work. The main principle of the Plan was simple: that heavy industry would be zoned along a broad band adjacent to the River Tees and housing and associated facilities would be allocated south of this band. Between the two primary zones the Thornaby-Redcar Trunk Road would provide both a barrier and a means whereby both industry and recreation could be served. The road also had a recreational function as it was planned to continue along the coast to the resorts of Marske and Saltburn. This framework, on to which was later grafted the Tees Crossing, altered very little over the next few years. A full draft of the Plan was held up pending agreement on the Tees Crossing. Once this was achieved in September, 1924, the Joint Committee accepted the Draft Plan which was eventually published in 1925, as the South Tees-side Regional Planning Scheme. Further details on both the process and the content of this Adivsory Plan are given in Chapter 21.

At the time of the completion of the Advisory Plan the Joint Committee recommended that the constituent authorities should pursue their individual Town Planning Schemes in conformity with the agreed Plan. It was also the intention to maintain the Joint Committee in order to
exchange experience and to co-ordinate the various statutory schemes. In fact, the Joint Committee did not meet again between February, 1925 and November, 1929. In the intervening four and a half years very little town planning work was achieved. Parts of the Trunk Road, particularly in Eston and Redcar were built but there was no progress at all on the Tees Crossing. Individual authorities showed little zeal for statutory town planning, as is shown by the brief survey below.

The South Tees Local Authorities, 1920-1929

The local authorities within the South Teesside Joint Committee can be divided into two camps; those that were required under the provision of the **1919 Housing, Town Planning, Etc., Act** to undertake a Town Planning Scheme and those that weren't. Schemes had to commence by 1st January, 1923, and be completed within three years of that date. The Ministry of Health extended the completion date several times until the **Local Government Act of 1929** extended it until 1934 with additional powers granted to the Minister to extend it further until 31st December, 1938.

The record of the constituent authorities of the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee in the period 1920-29 is shown below. The location of the areas was shown on Map C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Town Planning Progress, 1920-29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Eston U.D.C. (compulsory)</td>
<td>Passed resolution to prepare scheme in 1925 for 6,131 acres (incl. 1,002 acres in Guisborough RDC). No further action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Thornaby M.B.</td>
<td>Passed resolution to prepare scheme in 1923 for 1,653 acres. Preliminary Statement approved 1926. No further progress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Middlesbrough R.D.C.  
No statutory action.

6. Redcar M.B.  
No statutory action.

7. Saltburn by the Sea U.D.C.  
Passed resolution to prepare scheme in 1924 for 79 acres. Preliminary Statement approved in 1928. No further progress.

It can be seen from the above summary that while progress was patchy and not at all what the Ministry of Health would have liked, it did represent some development from pre-war days under the 1909 Act. Three of the seven authorities in the Joint Committee advanced as far as the Preliminary Statement approved stage and one other passed the necessary resolution so as to obtain Interim Development Control powers. Of the three remaining authorities who took no action the biggest surprise is that Middlesbrough C.B. had taken no steps at all. Brief consideration is given to each authority in turn.

**Middlesbrough County Borough**

The County Borough gave much support to the Joint Committee both in terms of officer time and premises but this did not become translated into a desire to undertake the statutory requirements imposed upon them by the 1919 Act. The records do not indicate why this should be so. In fact in 1921 a Borough Committee suggested that the Council should pass a resolution to prepare a scheme but it does not appear to have been acted upon.(6) Perhaps the Borough's active involvement in trying to implement the Trunk Road and Tees Crossing schemes diverted attention from the broader issue. Perhaps the Council wished to await the outcome of the Regional Scheme, and by that time enthusiasm had expired. These are speculations and no firm evidence exists on the matter.
Eston Urban District

Eston Urban District Council was the other authority required to prepare a scheme. Often one of the most vociferous authorities in favour of developing a major Trunk Road scheme and seemingly keen to pursue town planning the authority only did the minimum necessary under law by passing a resolution to prepare a town planning scheme, and then not until 1925. There is no record as to why Eston acted in this way. Perhaps they found the Trunk Road controversy off-putting. They also disapproved of the outcome of the Tees Crossing discussions.

Redcar Municipal Borough

Redcar Municipal Borough were one of the authorities who took no action. This is surprising in that they were a very active authority in the 1920s, busy undertaking many municipal schemes. However, the Council was dominated by a vision of Redcar as a resort, and tended not to see Redcar as part of urban and industrial South Teesside. Perhaps parochialism prevented Redcar's involvement in what was seen as a Regional exercise.

Middlesbrough Rural District

Middlesbrough Rural District maintained a very low profile throughout and in any case tended to follow the example of the County Borough.

Thornaby Municipal Borough

Thornaby and succeeded in taking town planning further than any of the others. The authority seemed to have been strongly influenced by their Engineer who was keen to undertake town planning. As early as 1923 the Borough Council had passed a resolution to prepare a town planning scheme. Unfortunately, enthusiasm of the officials was too high for
they sought approval for a scheme covering all the authority's area and this was rejected by the Ministry. Despite this setback Thornaby proceeded and took their scheme through to the Preliminary Statement stage. Failure to pursue matters through to a full scheme may have been due to the fact that the two main proposals in their scheme, the continuation of the Trunk Road and a new Tees Crossing received low priority from both the Joint Committee and the Ministry of Health. Further discussion of Thornaby's attempt at statutory town planning is contained in a Chapter 21.

Saltburn-by-the-Sea Urban District

Saltburn's scheme was a relatively small one designed to achieve one main object, the maintenance of an attractive wooded gully as open space and across it to reserve a line for a bridge to carry a new coastal road into town. The authority only took the scheme to Preliminary Statement stage. To some extent all the objectives had been met by then. Agreements had been achieved with Lord Zetland after a public inquiry in 1926 and there was no obvious advantages in proceeding.

Guisborough Urban District

Guisborough Urban District were invited to join the South Teesside Joint Committee but refused all blandishments and also undertook no independent town planning action in this period.

(ii) 1929-1933

The regeneration of town planning activity on South Teesside occured in 1930/31 when the Local Government Act of 1929 gave the Ministry of Health the opportunity to urge local authorities to take advantage of the new powers given to County Councils and to convene or re-convene.
Regional Committees to prepare town planning schemes. This policy was very successful nationwide and particularly in South Teesside. Map D shows the area and constituent authorities of the JTPC for this period.

**South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee 1929-33**

The South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee reconvened late in 1929 following Ministry of Health advice and a flurry of local conferences consequent upon the Local Government Act, 1929. George Pepler journeyed once more to Teesside to prompt the Committee to look upon the new Act as an opportunity to make progress with statutory town planning schemes. At a meeting in November, 1929, he asked the Joint Committee to recommend to their constituent authorities that they be given executive powers to prepare a scheme for South Teesside and that they invite representation from the North Riding County Council and once again, ask Guisborough Urban District to join. The Committee agreed to these proposals and, after a lengthy period of consideration by the various authorities, unanimously agreed to adopt executive status on 17th September, 1930.

The South Teesside Scheme area covered 56,035 acres and involved the following authorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough C.B.</td>
<td>Extended to include most of Middlesbrough R.D.C. in 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eston U.D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redcar M.B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornaby M.B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guisborough U.D.C.</td>
<td>Extended to include parts of Guisborough R.D.C. in 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltburn &amp; Marske U.D.C.</td>
<td>Marske added in 1929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Middlesbrough R.D.C. )
Guisborough R.D.C. )
Stokesley R.D.C. (Nunthorpe Parish)

Ceased as independent authorities in 1932
Did not join Joint Committee.
Area added.

In addition, the North Riding County Council of Yorkshire also became a constituent authority of the Joint Committee.

The new executive Joint Committee met in early 1931 to consider how to go about its task. A number of options were available. They could once more engage professional advisors, such as Abercrombie and Adshead, or they could seek to utilise existing professional skills within the authorities. In the end they decided to appoint a small town planning staff to prepared the plan. In October, 1931, it was decided to appoint Mr. Geoffrey Knowles as Regional Town Planner on £500 p.a. The following year a draughtsman (Mr. Baker) and a clerk (Mr. Bean) were also appointed. In retrospect it is surprising that the Committee appointed Geoffrey Knowles in preference to Thomas Sharp who also applied for the post. Sharp went on to publish several books and to achieve a national and international reputation, while Knowles remained a local figure. It is also interesting to note that Mr. Bean later became County Planning Officer of Cleveland County Council (1974-1979).

Another important decision was to establish a Technical Sub-Committee comprising the Surveyors and Engineers of the constituent authorities whose task was to oversee the technical aspects of the scheme preparation. In effect the Sub-Committee became the power and the full Committee tended to simply rubber-stamp its recommendations.

The Joint Committee moved quickly to pass the necessary resolution to prepare a scheme thus giving itself interim development control powers.
In the wake of this it was decided to seek to co-ordinate the control of development throughout the South Tees area. Constituent authorities were urged to adopt the model planning application forms issued by the Ministry of Health and it was agreed that Mr. Knowles would seek and make comment upon all planning applications. This was to prove a far larger task than anyone had envisaged. By 1934 Knowles was inspecting 700 planning applications a year.\(^{(11)}\) As to the content of the scheme, one of Knowles' first studies was to review the Abercrombie/Adshead Plan and subsequent progress.\(^{(12)}\) It was not a very encouraging report. Many difficulties existed over the Trunk Road and a builder had constructed a number of dwellings over the line of the coast road near Saltburn. Brighter news was forthcoming on the Tees Crossing for Middlesbrough and Durham County had taken joint responsibility and achieved an special Act of Parliament to build the bridge, having also secured reasonable financial support from the Ministry of Transport.\(^{(13)}\)

Knowles recommended that the original design of the trunk road be abandoned as too expensive and instead suggested a much reduced width. This was endorsed by the hard pressed local authorities as were a number of other suggestions for main road, open space and other zoning proposals. The preparation of the Preliminary Statement began in July, 1931.

Finally, it is important to note that all this work was proceeding at a time of national crisis. The new Committee first met at a time when the second Labour Government had just been established as a minority Government and was intending to introduce a new Town Planning Bill. However, the Government fell in August, 1931, after the defection of the Prime Minister and the formation of a National Government. This arrangement was confirmed at the elections of October, 1931. The 1931
Town and Country Planning Bill was lost. After much agitation a new
Town and Country Planning Bill was introduced in 1932. The new Bill
came under intense pressure from anti-planning forces and the South
Teesside Joint Committee aligned itself with the Manchester Joint
Committee in making representations to the Government to maintain the
original Bill.\(^{(14)}\) In the event a much weakened Bill received the Royal
Assent in July, 1932, just as the South Tees Scheme was getting into
its stride. The new Act was due to become operative on 1st April,
1933, and special transitional arrangements were put in hand. However,
it was still possible to proceed on the basis of the 1925 Act provided
that the Preliminary Statement was submitted by June, 1934, and work
was duly begun on this basis.

For two years the team struggled to try and complete the Preliminary
Statement. But, after several time extensions they failed to meet the
deadline of June, 1934. The Joint Committee accordingly agreed to move
over from the 1925 Act to the 1932 Act and proceed directly to prepare
a Draft Scheme, as was allowed under the new Regulations. A Draft
Scheme was finally produced in 1936 and placed on local deposit.
After 18 months seeking to satisfy the many objectors the Joint Town
Planning Committee, with Ministry of Health approval, moved on to
prepare the Final Scheme, despite the fact that 21 objectors remained
unresolved. In February, 1938, the Final Scheme went on local deposit
together with 12 large maps. After a few amendments it was forwarded
to the Ministry of Health later in 1938. A public inquiry into the
scheme was held in Middlesbrough Town Hall in April, 1939. Due to
the outbreak of war the scheme was rever ratified. The Joint Committee
continued to meet occasionally during the war and resumed more regular
meetings after 1945. The last meeting of the Committee was held in
January, 1948.
North Teesside

(i) 1920-1923

The North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee was not constituted until late 1923. Prior to that only two of the three authorities that were to comprise the Joint Committee were in existence. Billingham Urban District Council did not come into being until April, 1923. Before that it was a parish within Stockton Rural District Council. The idea of a separate authority on the north bank of the Tees had been mooted shortly after the First World War. In 1921 a proposal to form a North Tees U.D.C. comprising the parishes of Billingham and Cowpen Bewley was formulated. But residents in Cowpen Bewley objected with support from Durham County Council and at a public inquiry the promoters of the North Tees U.D.C. agreed to submit fresh proposals excluding Cowpen Bewley. The record of Stockton Borough Council and Stockton Rural District Council in the years 1920 to 1923 is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Town Planning Progress, 1920-1923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stockton M.B. (compulsory)</td>
<td>Passed resolution to prepare scheme in 1919 for 5,561 acres. No further progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stockton Rural D.C.</td>
<td>No statutory action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stockton-on-Tees Municipal Borough

The commencement of town planning on the north side of the river passed through many false starts and difficulties. Stockton Borough Council, the premier authority on the north side of the river, had shown interest in town planning before the First World War but had made no progress. After the passing of the 1919 Act the Stockton Town Clerk attempted to revive local interest and reminded the Council of their
earlier commitments. The Council agreed to undertake a town planning scheme under the new Act and the Borough Engineer was authorised to hold discussions with the Ministry of Health. These talks took place in March, 1920, several months before the regional town planning conference at Thornaby. It is likely that it was Stockton's interest which triggered George Pepler into calling the Thornaby conference.

Stockton were urged by the Ministry to proceed as quickly as possible and as a consequence the Borough Council passed a resolution to prepare a scheme for the entire area of the authority. From the evidence it would seem that this decision, like that of Thornaby's, was taken without full understanding of the legislation. It was possible to plan for built-up areas but only on very exacting conditions, usually related to small areas. Stockton's approach was unacceptable to the Ministry, who pointed out that the legislation was intended to cover only undeveloped land. Stockton's impetus was checked by this issue and then a few months later by the Thornaby conference.

As we have seen the formula agreed at the Thornaby conference was for the formation of two Joint Town Planning Committees, one north and one south of the Tees. The north side was to comprise West Hartlepool, Hartlepool, Easington Rural District, Stockton Rural District and Stockton Borough. Such a group of authorities was much more disparate than those of the south and in the event there was little commitment to such a body. An attempt was made in February, 1921, to bring all these authorities together but the meeting merely served to show the lack of interest of several of the participants.

Stockton M.B. & Stockton R.D.

Stockton Borough resolved to try and proceed with a town planning
MAP E: North Tees JTPC Area 1923–33
scheme which embraced both their own area and adjacent zones in Stockton Rural District. Both authorities agreed on the desirability of collaboration. Many areas of Stockton Rural District were essentially urban and industrial and formed part of the North Tees settlement pattern. By 1922 agreement had been reached between the two authorities to form their own Joint Town Planning Committee. It was also recognised that this would only be a short-term arrangement as Billingham Parish was then in the process of seeking Urban District status. In the event the Stockton Joint Town Planning Committee only held an inaugural meeting in May, 1922. Pepler was more concerned to try and implement the Thornaby conference decision and made one last effort to obtain a wider Joint Committee. A conference was held in West Hartlepool in July, 1922. Once again Pepler's rhetoric won the day and the conference recommended local authorities to establish a North Teesside Joint Committee and prepare a scheme. But the Hartlepool authorities refused to endorse the conference decision and Pepler's ambition was defeated.

The final stage in this frustrating period came with the birth of the new Billingham Urban District Council in 1923. This paved the way for three authorities, Stockton Borough, Stockton Rural District and Billingham Urban District to agree in September, 1923, to form their own Joint Committee which they called the North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee, thus ushering in a new era of town planning north of the river. The area and constituent authorities are shown in Map E.

This account leaves out one vital factor that pushed the three authorities into statutory planning. This was the rapid growth of the new chemical works at Billingham. The expansion of these new works led to a sudden growth in the population of Billingham and gave a spur to its separation from Stockton Rural District. The development of 'The
Synthetic', as the factory was known locally, undoubtedly gave adjoining authorities a vested interest in seeking an agreed land-use plan to which future developments could conform.

(ii) 1924-1933

North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee

The North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee achieved a record in British statutory town planning. The constituent local authorities took the historic step of delegating their town planning powers to the JTPC, which thus became the first executive Joint Committee in the country. The Committee's task was to prepare and obtain government approval for a statutory town plan under the 1919 Act. What was intended to take a few years at the most ended up by taking the best part of a decade, but still became the first such plan by an executive committee to win approval, achieving another 'first' for North Tees.

The working arrangements of joint town planning committees varied a great deal. In the case of the North Tees Committee the chief officers of the largest authority, Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council, undertook to provide the main technical and administrative work. The Town Clerk acted as the Secretary and the Borough Engineer as the Executive Engineer. A separate office was found in Stockton and additional staff recruited. In order to ensure a professional approach an eminent architect and town planner, H.V. Lanchester, was commissioned, who in 1923 had been the President of the Town Planning Institute and operated a well known firm of consultants. The Joint Committee itself comprised 12 elected Members, 4 from each authority and they opted to hold a firm grip on proceedings rather than appoint a sub-committee of technical officers. Accordingly they met monthly.
The early stages of the planning process were deceptively smooth and aroused little interest. Only one person inspected the deposited maps showing the proposed extent of the scheme area. Interim Development control powers were received in April, 1924. (19) By September, 1924, the Joint Committee had agreed the draft Preliminary Statement and Map that was to be circulated to the constituent authorities and landowners for comment. (20)

At this stage the process slowed down considerably due to significant objections to the proposals by several major local interests. The Councillors who had expected a relatively rapid and cheap exercise were disappointed and some of them wanted to abandon the whole thing. But the majority opted to continue and for several months the Committee sought to meet the objections, particularly those from the vast new chemical works of Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited (S.A. & N.) but also including the shipping firm Furness and Company and Durham County Council. Despite many attempts to reach agreement with the objectors, there were still many unresolved questions by the time the Ministry of Health held a Public Inquiry into the Preliminary Statement in September, 1925.

The Inquiry failed to resolve most of the outstanding issues, particularly those between S.A. & N. and the Committee. For nearly two years after the Inquiry there was an endless round of discussions, letters, memos and manoeuvrings between the Joint Committee, the Objectors and the Ministry of Health. The 'Synthetic' in particular proved to be a firm opponent of any proposal which restricted their sphere of operations in any way. This will be the subject of a more detailed examination in Chapter 20.

The Joint Committee was forced to concede virtually all the points of
the objectors and by so doing eventually received approval of the Preliminary Statement and Map No. 2 in May, 1927.

In a little over a year the Joint Committee had prepared the Draft Scheme so that a new round of consultations and objections could start. Public interest in the Draft Scheme was considerable and surpassed any previous level of public awareness. This was largely due to the fact that the scheme included a number of improvements to main roads which involved taking in parts of front gardens and the like. This led to hundreds of objections and the necessity to hold public meetings to try and resolve the matter. At the same time the main objectors at the previous stage were once again to the fore with fresh objections, especially the 'Synthetic'.

The chorus of opposition to the road improvement proposal led the Joint Committee to retreat. Fearing major claims for compensation when the County Council refused to accept responsibility for main roads the Joint Committee successfully persuaded the Ministry of Health to allow them to remove major road improvements from the scheme. Whilst this eliminated several hundred objectors at a stroke the objections of the big companies and Durham County remained unresolved. This, too, will be the subject of more detailed analysis in Chapter 20.

The Final Scheme was sent off to the Ministry for approval in October, 1929, and a Public Inquiry arranged for January, 1930. (21) The Inquiry, like the previous one, failed to settle any of the key outstanding issues and so these were left for another round of tripartite negotiations involving the Committee, the Ministry and the objectors. In 1930, six months after the Public Inquiry, the Joint Committee agreed to accept into membership Durham County following the new powers accorded to County Councils in the 1929 Local Government Act. (22)
The pattern of events around the approval of the Preliminary Statement was repeated in this, the final stage. Only by agreeing to succumb to the points of the objectors was the Joint Committee able to make progress. Even so, this took time. Many issues were not yielded without a struggle and often only after high level pressure had been exerted on the Ministry by the main objector, ICI. After agreeing to dozens of amendments the scheme was finally approved in March, 1933.

The Joint Committee decided to wind up its affairs after the statutory town planning scheme was approved. The whole exercise had taken nine and a half years and cost the constituent authorities £9,457.(23)

Hartlepool

(1) 1920-1927

West Hartlepool C.B. dominated the town planning activity of the Hartlepool area throughout much of the 1920s. Their involvement in statutory town planning stretched back to before the First World War and continued in peacetime. Their individual progress was halted by the pressure of the other adjacent authorities who wanted to participate. A Joint Committee was established in 1928 involving the County Borough, Hartlepool M.B. and Hartlepool R.D.C. and the participation of Durham County Council. The record of the three planning authorities in participating in town planning prior to 1928 is indicated in summary form below, followed by a brief account of progress in each district. Map F shows the relevant areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Town Planning Progress, 1920-1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. West Hartlepool (compulsory)</td>
<td>Passed resolution to prepare scheme in 1914 for 5,300 acres. Approved after inquiry in 1917 for 3,800 acres. Switched to 1919 Act procedure in 1921. 1926/27 Draft Preliminary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Hartlepool M.B. (compulsory)

Statement produced but never formally adopted.

Passed resolution to prepare scheme in 1927. No further progress was made as their action promoted a Joint Committee.

3. Hartlepool R.D.C.

No statutory action.

West Hartlepool County Borough

West Hartlepool County Borough declined to join the North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee as proposed at the 1920 Thornaby conference. It also refused to respond to overtures for a Joint Committee with Stockton. Instead it decided to continue with its own scheme. The Local Government Board had approved an amended scheme area in January, 1917, after numerous objections and a Public Inquiry presided over by Raymond Unwin. This was briefly related in Chapter 5. The approved scheme area, although reduced to meet the main objectors, was still a substantial area of nearly 4,000 acres, much of it situated to the south of the Borough, in Hartlepool Rural District, but also including significant parts of the adjacent Hartlepool Town. (See Map F). During the remainder of the war period the Borough Engineer prepared four reports on various aspects of town planning. (24) After the war, despite opposition from the County Borough to joint working, the West Hartlepool scheme seems to have made little progress. No further reports were made until 1922 when the Borough Engineer produced a report on Open Spaces and recommended that the authority seek approval to change over to the new regulations and procedures of the 1919 Act. (25) This was accepted and between 1923 and 1926 the Borough Engineer prepared the Preliminary Statement and Map No. 2. A draft Preliminary Statement was circulated for comment late in 1926. There seems little doubt that this was probably the first time since the war
that the other local authorities had had an opportunity to consider the question of the West Hartlepool scheme. (26) It led them to re-appraise their own position and for Hartlepool Borough Council in particular to undertake a provocative step that altered the whole situation.

Hartlepool Municipal Borough

Early in 1927 Hartlepool Borough Council passed a resolution to prepare their own Town Planning Scheme. This may not have been so remarkable except that they wished to include in their scheme area a piece of land ripe for development and already included in West Hartlepool's scheme. The land in question, at Throston, was adjacent to the Town's boundary in the Rural District and owned by the County Council. (See Map F). Hartlepool Town had no surplus land within its own boundary and the site was a logical extension to its existing settlement. The fact that the site was already included in the West Hartlepool scheme was, of course, not lost on either Durham County or the Rural District who pointed out the anomaly to the Ministry of Health. (27)

A stalemate was prevented by the suggestion of Durham County that a new approach should be made to the Ministry to establish a Joint Committee to prepare a scheme for an area much larger than either West Hartlepool's or the Town Council and which ran contiguous to the North Tees Scheme. Once again the redoubtable George Pepler arranged to come up to the North-East to preside over a conference of local authorities on the issue. This matter is the subject of more detailed analysis in Chapter 21.

(ii) 1928-1933

A conference of Hartlepool authorities was held on 19th January, 1928. The conference accepted the suggestion of forming a Joint Town Planning
Committee and of seeking an expanded scheme area put forward by Durham County Council. An advisory Joint Committee was formed on the basis of five representatives from the County Borough and Durham County Council. The Ministry of Health agreed to the participation of the County after it was pointed out that the County would not be making any financial contribution.\(^{(28)}\) The boundary of the JTPC area is shown in Map F.

**Hartlepools Joint Town Planning Committee**

Unlike the other two Joint Town Planning Committees previously discussed, the Hartlepools Committee declined to appoint an 'expert' professional and opted instead to recruit some junior town planning assistants to work under the Borough Engineer. It was also decided to establish a Technical Sub-Committee of the various Engineers and Surveyors of the constituent authorities.\(^{(29)}\) The Technical Sub-Committee in effect did all the work and made recommendations to the full Joint Committee which met approximately every three months.

Later in the year, on the initiative of West Hartlepool, it was agreed to make the Joint Committee an Executive one and proceed immediately to prepare a statutory scheme.\(^{(30)}\) Work began on the Preliminary Statement late in 1928 and took approximately a year to finalise.

In 1929 the Committee agreed to ask each constituent authority to submit all planning applications to the Joint Committee for comment prior to arriving at a decision. This was agreed by the authorities thus ensuring a degree of harmony in development control decisions and reinforcing the 'regional' town planning approach.\(^{(31)}\)

The draft Preliminary Statement was finally ratified and issued for public discussion late in 1929. The Ministry of Health arranged a Public Inquiry for September, 1930. The several objections involved
major landowners, individual house owners as well as public companies such as the Water Company and the Electric Company. As had been noted in North Tees, the Public Inquiry proved a prelude to a long drawn out process of negotiation and, where possible, compromise. As we have seen the Ministry of Health was committed to the notion that all parties should agree to any town planning scheme and therefore, objectors who held out long enough would generally win through as the patience of the local authorities wore thin. This issue is discussed in more detail in Chapter 21. In the instance of the Hartlepool scheme the post-inquiry discussions took an inordinate time to be resolved. Final approval of the Preliminary Statement did not occur until March, 1933, just before the new Town and Country Planning Act became operative.

Progress on the Hartlepool scheme continued to be very slow and whilst it is outside the scope of this study it is interesting to note that the scheme never did receive Ministry approval. A draft scheme was produced in 1936 and a Public Inquiry held into the scheme in November, 1937. Ministry delays seemed to have been the main reason for a failure to obtain approval prior to the onset of World War Two. The Joint Committee wrote several times to the Ministry protesting at the long delays. Once the war came the Ministry ceased to approve any schemes and so the Joint Committee's efforts were not rewarded. Further progress had to await the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act.

An Overview

Teesside and Hartlepool underwent a varied experience of town planning between 1919 and 1933. The overall local picture approximately coincides with the national development of town planning in England and Wales in terms of engagement in advisory and statutory planning.
The 1920s were a period when a growth occurred in town planning practice on Teesside and Hartlepool, but it was a patchy and a slow progress. The immediate enthusiasm and optimism, after the First World War, for a Greater Teesside, quickly evaporated in the slump of 1921. Thereafter local authorities tended to look to town planning to provide quick schemes to launch as unemployment relief projects. But despite the disappointments in achieving a major post-war reconstruction, momentum was maintained for town planning in some areas. In South Teesside the Advisory Plan of Adshead and Abercrombie was completed. In North Tees the pioneering work of the country's first executive Joint Committee kept going throughout the 1920s and in Hartlepool the County Borough sustained a town planning commitment. Although the completion of a statutory scheme was only managed by North Tees several authorities did take the procedure to Preliminary Statement stage.

During the early 1930s there was a more responsive mood for town planning among Teesside and Hartlepool local authorities. Prompted by the Ministry of Health and the empowering of County Councils in town planning matters all local authorities in the study area joined in with statutory regional schemes.

The final chapters of this study will explore in greater detail the local practice of town planning on Teesside and the Hartlepools. The next chapter looks in depth at the theme of consensus and how it was used as an approach to resolving conflict. Following that, the theme of success and failure in undertaking town planning is considered and the final chapter examines the problems of implementing schemes.
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The theme of adopting a consensus approach to resolving conflict was discussed in Chapter 17. The point was made that the town planning profession and the Government, through the Ministry of Health, took self-reinforcing stances on this issue. The Ministry of Health, by laying down the procedures and regulations under which town planning activity would be governed at the local level tried to ensure that conflicts would be overcome through compromise. The town planning profession had long portrayed town planning as an exercise in balancing different competing claims on land and securing an even-handed outcome. The skill of the town planner was seen to be in establishing future land uses and lines of communication which would maximise the potential of an area. The essence of the planned approach was seen in terms of harmonising different interests into a consensus view of future land arrangements. Underlying this rationale of both the professions and administrators was the view that diametrically opposed interests in society did not exist and that a 'middle-way', or compromise between two apparently conflicting views, could be achieved through patient discussion or arbitration. 

The extent to which this was a valid analysis will be revealed in the course of this chapter. It should be noted, however, that the Government, through the Ministry of Health was concerned to re-assure landowners that, although their long-cherished freedom of unfettered use of their land was at an end this would not mean that their interests would not be upheld. The procedures of town planning between 1919 and 1933 were designed to ensure that the private landowners' voice could be heard at every stage and that town planning authorities would not implement schemes against their wishes without every
opportunity to object and appeal. In this context the Ministry of Health acted as mediator and umpire.

The issues of conflict to be examined in this Chapter are not neatly categorised, although broad distinctions are employed. There were likely to be several key actors involved in any dispute over land. Inevitably in the first instance one can identify the local planning authority, whose proposal was likely to spark-off the conflict. The landowners affected by the proposal was usually the main antagonist. Finally, the Government, through the Ministry of Health acted as the arbiter. The landowners, however, could be of several categories. They could be small landowners, such as owner-occupiers of dwellings, or they could be major landowners. In the latter category there were large industrialists, local authorities and central government. The ordinary non-landowning public, in this era the vast majority of the population, were generally not involved or invited into the planning process. If any assumptions were made about them it was that their interests were looked after by the planning authority. However, the elected members of local authorities in this period were drawn primarily from a narrow band of the local population, principally shopkeepers, small businessmen and the professions and were unlikely to understand or sympathise with the needs and aspirations of the mass of local people. The professional local government officers in charge of the town planning activity would themselves tend to have a relatively narrow field of social interest and were in any event not required to seek popular opinion about planning matters. Occasionally a popular issue directed at town planners did however, arise and will be studied.

For the purposes of this Chapter three main types of conflict are examined, although, as will be demonstrated, aspects of other types are present in each. The first type of conflict is described as involving
the planning authority and local people. In this category 'local people' are seen as representing the small land-owner or owner-occupier. In the second type the main protagonists are the planning authority and the large private local industrialists, such as ICI and Dorman Long. In the course of this analysis examples of public protest from non land-owners over planning issues will be examined. Finally a third type of conflict is examined between planning authorities and public land-owners. This category chiefly involves conflicting relationships between Joint Town Planning Committees and County Councils. But it should be noted that this problem surfaced across all categories. Additionally an example of conflict between a local planning authority and the Crown Commissioners will be considered.

Before looking in detail at different examples of specific conflicts a brief analysis of the broad factors underlying potential conflict is dealt with on an area-by-area basis. The North Tees area is dealt with first and in greater detail than the other two areas because it contains more examples of conflict and subsequent attempts to impose 'consensus' solutions on such issues than in the other areas. This is due partly due to the fact that the development of ICI led to a more dynamic situation in which conflicts were more likely to occur and partly to the fact that the North Tees statutory town planning scheme was progressed through all its stages. Whilst the other two areas are different in terms of industrial growth and the extent of progress on statutory schemes they do furnish examples of conflict and responses to that conflict which support conclusions that can be reached on the basis of the North Tees experience.
Dealing with Conflict: The Case of North Tees

The planning area under the North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee covered a large tract of land embracing the major settlement of Stockton-on-Tees, the growing industrial district of Billingham and the large rural hinterland of South-East Durham administered by Stockton Rural District Council. The industry was strongly related to the banks of the River Tees, which formed the southern boundary of the scheme area. Shipbuilding, iron and steel and associated heavy engineering factories obscured the river from all but the workers in the riverside plants. The vast chemical works at Billingham also stretched down to the river, but was centred more into the rural hinterland, which became transformed during the period of the scheme into a vast technological complex. Map G indicates the main points of conflict which arose in the North Tees area.

The main pressure to undertake town planning on the north side of the Tees came from Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council. However, Durham County Council were hostile to these aspirations. Consequently a number of important conflicts developed over the North Tees scheme which were not effectively resolved until the County Council achieved new powers under the 1929 Local Government Act and joined the Committee. One possible explanation for this tension lay in the balance of power between a County Council and a Borough Council. Unlike County Boroughs the powers of Borough Councils, such as Stockton-on-Tees, were more limited and the County Council was a higher tier authority. Evidence in correspondence suggests that at least some officers in the County Council felt the need to assert their dominance and that Stockton responded with barely concealed annoyance. This issue is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 21.
The Joint Committee agreed to undertake most of the preparation work by using the resources of Stockton Council, principally the Town Clerk and the Borough Engineer. Separate offices were put aside and extra staff employed from time to time to undertake the duties. Both the Town Clerk and the Borough Engineer received honoraria for these duties. To provide technical advice the Joint Committee had, as already noted, appointed H.V. Lanchester. Lanchester was, at this time, at the peak of his architectural and town planning career and undertook several overseas commissions. For much of the period of his appointment with North Tees he was involved in work in India. His relationship with the Joint Committee was not always very cordial. His early proposals appeared to have been sketched without gaining any real 'feel' for the area or undertaking any Geddesian-type survey. The Joint Committee were not very impressed. More importantly Lanchester appeared to side with ICI during the public inquiry into the Committee's Preliminary Statement. Lanchester was often absent at critical moments. His deputy was no doubt competent, but one senses a tone of exasperation in the Committee's references to Lanchester being away and there was talk of dispensing with his services.

As we have seen, the North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee was the first one in the country to acquire executive powers. The main spur to this innovative action as, indeed, to the general desire to prepare a scheme in this area, was, as noted, the formation of the new chemical company, Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited, later part of the ICI company. The 'Synthetic' as it was known locally, was destined to establish one of the largest chemical complexes in the country and even as early as 1923 it was clear that the plant was going to have a major impact on the surrounding area, both environmentally and economically. As the buildings began to multiply it was apparent to the local
authorities that whilst the works would bring substantial benefit they would also bring problems. The benefits to an area of high unemployment with attendant vices of poverty were all too clear and such advantages were always paramount. But, the development of such a large plant raised enormous problems for a local authority. First, as the number of workers increased from a few hundred in 1923 to 600 in 1925 and then to 5,000 in 1932, so the need for houses and associated services and facilities had to be met. Secondly, the nature of a chemical plant posed special problems of pollution and hazard over which the local authorities naturally sought to establish some control. Thirdly, the size of the works also raised to a higher profile the relationship of the local economy to the national one in terms of communications and national interest.

Broadly put, the local authorities looked to the statutory town planning process as a means of exerting some measure of public control over a large private concern. Their hopes for a relatively quick and easy route to achieve control through town planning proved optimistic. The scheme took over nine years to complete and none of the local authorities original proposals survived the sustained objections of the various landowners.

Dealing with Conflict - The Case of South Tees

The situation in the South Teesside area compared to North Tees was very different from a town planning point of view. Whereas North Tees embarked on statutory town planning as early as 1923, South Teesside did not take that step, as a Joint Committee, until 1930/31. Prior to that time the Joint Committee had taken the Advisory Planning route, leaving the statutory initiative to the constituent local authorities. The Advisory Plan, prepared by Professors Abercrombie and Adshead was
completed in 1925 and after 5 years post-advisory planning very little progress could be recorded in terms of statutory town planning. The records suggest that the problems experienced in trying to implement some of the recommendations of the advisory plan, notably the Redcar-Thornaby Trunk Road and the new River Tees Crossing, had led to widespread disenchantment. But these are conflicts between planning authorities and as such are dealt with under the theme, success and failure in Chapter 21.

The two local authorities in South Teesside who were required, under the compulsory clauses of the 1919 Act, to prepare schemes, Middlesbrough Borough Council and Eston Urban District Council, declined to do very much, as seen in Chapter 19. Other authorities did show more enthusiasm, notably Thornaby Borough Council and Saltburn Town Council, but neither of these statutory experiences offer great insights into the theme of conflict and consensus. The Saltburn scheme only covered a small area of land and was intended, as already noted in Chapter 19, to try and secure the line of a future coast road into Saltburn. The land was owned by Lord Zetland who objected to the proposal. Agreement and compromise led to the eventual approval of the Preliminary Statement. Any further statutory steps were overtaken by the move of the South Teesside Joint Committee into statutory town planning. The proposal was eventually abandoned as too costly and difficult. In the case of the Thornaby scheme which is discussed in greater detail in the next chapter, there were issues over Main Roads, although relations with the North Riding County Council appear more cordial than in the case of Durham and the North Tees Joint Committee. Thornaby's scheme, like Saltburn's, eventually became subsumed within the South Teesside scheme.
This experience of town planning on South Teesside during the 1920s, does not furnish many clear examples of conflict between planning authorities and landowners. The main areas of conflict were to be found within the Joint Committee and between the South Tees and North Tees Joint Committees and this issue is covered in following chapters.

The spur to adopt a regional approach to statutory town planning in South Teesside came from the Local Government Act of 1929. The local authorities of South Teesside, perhaps encouraged by the Ministry were hopeful that by bringing in the County Council some of the problems experienced in the past over main roads and bridges could be resolved under the new Act.

The North Riding, who agreed to join the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee in 1930 tried to persuade the Joint Committee that the professional work could be done from Northallerton, at County Hall, as the County Council were in the process of setting up a Town Planning Department. The County argued that a central staff could offer advantages. But the Teesside authorities were concerned to keep the control and emphasis on Teesside and to this end established their own team at a Regional Town Planning Office. Middlesbrough Borough Council provided other back-up staff, such as the Secretary to the Committee, Mr. Preston Kitchen, their Town Clerk and various members of the Borough Engineer's staff. In the long run this didn't lead to any strong conviction between the County Council and the South Tees Joint Committee. The County supported the Joint Committee and attended its meetings but generally its focus of town planning concern was on its more rural areas.

During the early 1930s two issues did arise on South Teesside, in
response to growing town planning activity which do reveal different aspects of conflict. The desire to expand the scheme area to include a rural parish which was perceived to be a potential area of suburban growth, gave rise to objections whose resolution could not be achieved easily through a consensus approach, nor could a consensus 'gloss' be put on the eventual result.

In another, completely contrasting area, the expanding activity of a large industrial company led to local objections. How the planning authority dealt with this issue and the final outcome reveals another aspect of resolving conflict. The company was Dorman Long which was a very large and powerful Iron and Steel company. It is not possible to compare the longer-term situation between ICI and the North Tees Joint Committee and Dorman Long and the South Tees Joint Committee concerning their relationship to town planning because the South Tees scheme had not progressed far enough by 1933 to make such a comparison. Of more significance, the fortunes of Dorman Long did not revive until the mid 1930s and, therefore, during the study period they were not expanding and not, therefore, in conflict with other land users or the planning authority. However, their influence was very powerful as one particular incident will reveal. It is also possible to look forward and to note that as Dorman Long did expand they did so without any recognition of the need to consult the planning authority. The points of conflict are identified on Map H.

Dealing with Conflict - The Case of Hartlepool

Hartlepool's experience in town planning presents contrasts to both North and South Teesside. As already observed West Hartlepool had embarked upon statutory town planning before the First World War. This move had aroused considerable opposition from adjoining local
authorities whose land the scheme covered. It also led to opposition from large landowners in the southern area of the scheme with the result that much of this area was excluded.

In 1928 a new phase of statutory town planning arose when it was agreed to set up a Joint Town Planning Committee covering West Hartlepool County Borough, Hartlepool Town Council and the Hartlepool Rural District Council. This event was an example of success for the Ministry of Health who sought to bring about a compromise to the sharpening conflicts between local authorities in the Hartlepool area, and is dealt with in greater detail in Chapter 21.

It is also interesting to contrast the relationship between Durham County and the authorities in the Hartlepool area to that revealed in the North Tees situation. Durham appeared much less antagonistic to West Hartlepool than to Stockton Borough. Perhaps this was a mutual factor, with West Hartlepool being less anti-County. In any event, the County were able to join with the new Joint Committee in a fruitful working arrangement.

The Hartlepools Joint Committee also differed from the other two Committees in the way they undertook the scheme. They relied to a large extent on local expertise. They did not appoint a professional advisor but employed town planning assistants to work to the instructions of the West Hartlepool Borough Engineer who was the leading technical officer for the Committee. To support him a Technical Sub-Committee of the Engineers of the other local authorities was established.

The experience of statutory town planning in Hartlepool between 1919 and 1933 is limited to two examples of schemes which reached the Preliminary Statement stage. First, West Hartlepool Borough Council
succeeded in preparing its draft Preliminary Statement in 1926/7 and was in the course of circulating this draft when opposition to West Hartlepool crystallised and a new way forward was arranged. Second, the later, Joint scheme also reached the Preliminary stage. A draft was circulated in 1929, a Public Inquiry held in 1930 and approval secured by the Minister in 1933.

Generally speaking, once the major conflict between the authorities had been resolved in 1928, the scheme progress was relatively lacking in controversy.

(1) Planning Authority v Local People

The only example that can be clearly identified in this category is one that occurred in North Tees. The North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee put forward proposals for improving and widening several main roads in Stockton and Norton. This led to substantial opposition from home owners fronting these roads. However, while this is the core of the dispute the outcome was heavily influenced by the action and attitude of Durham County Council. This example is, therefore, also a study of the relationship between a Planning Authority and a County Council.

Main Roads Issue

Central to all town planning schemes in the inter-war years was the road system. In many respects it was the dominant concern. The Ministry of Health emphasised the part to be played by the provision of roads for the future and issued a series of model clauses covering among other things the issue of new roads, improved roads and the stopping up of roads. One key problem however, throughout the period was that the lead authority on main roads was the County Council who were excluded from active participation in town planning. In 1925 the
Ministry of Health issued Circular dealing with just this point. The Circular said,

"One of the principal objects of town planning is to make provision for new roads and the widenings of existing roads, together with any building or improvement lines, in order to meet the requirements of future traffic, and to reserve the necessary land for this to take place, while there is still time to do so with economy.

To enable this to be done satisfactorily and effectively in the case of projected main roads or main road improvements, it is essential, not only that the County Councils should be consulted, but they should take an active part in determining the proposals to be included for these purposes in any town planning schemes for areas within the county." (4)

Further aspects of the Circular dealt with the desirability of County Councils indicating to the Town Planning Authority that they were prepared to undertake responsibility for those proposals which involved current and future main roads. As the Circular pointed out, failure to do so may cause the Town Planning Authority to hesitate to include the necessary main road proposals or to exclude them altogether. To allay possible County fears the Ministry played down both the worry over incurring major expenditure by agreeing to such new proposals and fears about possible claims for compensation. The Circular pointed out that a projected new road or widening did not have to be carried out until the work was required. As for compensation the Ministry averred that experience shows that claims did not often arise, and then were not serious as long as extensive interference with existing buildings is avoided. Consultations with owners and a commitment to reach agreement with them, it was said, would always reduce any claims.(5)
The case of seeking planning improvements to the Main Roads of Stockton will demonstrate that the concerns of the Ministry were well justified. The roads issue was to the forefront of the North Tees Town Planning scheme from the outset.

**The North Tees Preliminary Statement**

The Preliminary Statement presented for approval in 1924 stressed the need to improve communications in the area. Two main needs were identified. First, the links between suburban area required strengthening, secondly, there was a need to provide ways of diverting traffic from the centre of Stockton. In both instances it was necessary to widen existing main roads. The difficulty of doing this was recognised and only a general policy of seeking an 80 foot width to all main roads where practicable, was outlined. (6)

Lack of consultation and sympathy between the Joint Committee and Durham County Council resulted in all road planning issues being subject to struggle and often outright disagreement. On receiving the Preliminary Statement the County Council lodged a number of objections to specific road proposals which they sustained through initial discussions, the Public inquiry and subsequent tripartite negotiations involving the Ministry of Health.

**Responsibility for Road Improvements**

The more particular issue of responsibility for the implementation of the road proposals did not surface until December, 1926, over two years after the draft Preliminary Statement had been first circulated. It was raised by the Ministry of Health who suggested that the County Council should be urged to make provision for the widening proposals and the projected building lines under the Public Health Act, 1925 and
the Roads Improvement Act, 1926, so that the scheme could then include them as existing building improvement lines. (7) In a subsequent conference between the various parties at the Ministry offices in London the County Council agreed to accept responsibility for main road proposals in the Preliminary Statement, except for a western by-pass proposal, whose cost the County refused to bear. (8) Agreeing to shelve the issue of the by-pass for the time being the Ministry granted approval. (9)

At this stage the road proposals included 40 completely new roads, 10 partly new and partly improved roads and 26 road widenings. Before proceeding to the next stage of the planning process it was necessary to survey all the lines of these roads. It was agreed to split this responsibility between the County Council and the Joint Committee. In practice the County surveyed all road proposals outside of Stockton Borough and Stockton undertook, through the aegis of the Joint Committee to look after all the proposals within their Borough. This work was completed in 1928 and enabled the Joint Committee to prepare a draft scheme.

**Compensation**

It was at this moment that both Billingham District Council and Stockton Rural District Council decided to raise, once again, the issue of liability for compensation due to the main road proposals. It was resolved to write to the Ministry of Health to clarify the position should the scheme proceed on the existing basis. (10) The Ministry's reply was in marked contrast to their earlier advice. They pointed out that the local authorities on the Joint Committee would be liable for any compensation claims until such time as the County Council actually exercised their powers under the relevant Acts. A hurried conference
between the Ministry, the County and the Joint Committee led to a re-affirmation by the County Council that it was still their intention to exercise their powers under the 1925 Acts. On this understanding the local authorities of the Joint Committee were persuaded to proceed to approve the Draft scheme, including all the roads proposals. (11)

The Householders' Revolt

The next stage of the process involved an unprecedented level of public interest. 3,468 property owners were notified of the Committee's intention to adopt the Draft scheme and invited to study the proposals and, if necessary lodge an objection. Previous invitations had led to very little interest and the only objections were either from industrialists or public bodies. But in the month that the scheme was on deposit 33% of all owners visited the offices to inspect the proposals. (12) Clearly information had circulated that the scheme contained issues of concern to the ordinary houseowner. Several hundred householders proceeded to object to the scheme on the grounds that the road proposals affected their property. The worst fears of the constituent authorities appeared to be coming true, particularly after a packed and heated meeting between the Joint Committee and two hundred angry houseowners. (13) After this confrontation both Billingham and Stockton Rural Councils demanded that the Joint Committee should remove the main road proposals from the scheme in their areas unless or until the County Council actually exercised their powers under the relevant 1925 Acts. (14) The County Council were not prepared to go further than their general undertaking given some time earlier. They were also using the issue to bargain for future representation on the Joint Committee. The 1929 Local Government Act was going forward at this time and the County Council wished to become part of the Joint Committee. In effect the County were saying that they were not
prepared to adopt the Main Road proposals without representation on the Committee.

The Joint Committee's Retreat

In March, 1929, the Joint Committee decided, in view of the County's position, and confirmation from the Ministry of Health that the constituent authorities would be liable to compensation claims if the Main Road proposals went ahead on the present basis, to seek the Ministry's consent to eliminate Main Road proposals from the Draft scheme. The Ministry reluctantly agreed subject to re-inserting the proposals at a later date if and when the County Council became partners to the scheme and exercised their road powers. The immediate effect of this move was to reduce the number of objectors to the scheme from a few hundred to a few dozen. Not all road proposals were eliminated and so a number of objections to road proposals remained, but these were practically all in Stockton-on-Tees Borough.

When the public inquiry was held before Major Lockhart at the beginning of 1930 there was still a strong public interest generated, no doubt, by the Mains Road issue, and the local paper reported a large attendance. The Main Roads issue was reported to the Inspector who in his report, written some time later, said, "the Constituent Authorities took fright at possible liabilities". Nevertheless Lockhart could see no objection to removing these 'County Roads' provided that the building lines were retained.

Attempts to re-instate the Road Improvement Proposals

The County Council were invited to join the Joint Committee as early as May, 1929. But the County replied that they were not permitted to arrive at any definite position until the 'appointed day' of the Local...
Government Act which was April, 1930. It was shortly after this that the County Council made two decisions. One was to undertake responsibility for Main Roads in the scheme and the other was to seek proper representation on the Joint Committee. This was rapidly agreed and by October, 1930, the County Council had written to the Ministry of Health suggesting that County Roads should now be reinstated into the North Tees Scheme. The Joint Committee also agreed to this revision if the Ministry of Health agreed.

The Ministry then did an amazing volte-face by replying to the County and the Joint Committee that to re-introduce Main Roads at this stage would be difficult and that it would necessitate another public inquiry. The Joint Committee decided to consult the constituent authorities and their Professional Advisor, Lanchester on the matter. The County Council reaffirmed their wish to reinstate the Main Roads but the other authorities were less keen. In April, 1931, the Ministry of Health drafted a letter to the County Council agreeing to the inclusion of County Roads but still pointing out the necessity of serving Notices upon all those likely to be affected and the consequent need for a new inquiry. However, this letter was never sent and instead a meeting was arranged between officials of the Ministry and County Council at which the Ministry sought to persuade the County Council to drop its demands. By the summer of 1931 the County Council had reluctantly conceded that Main Roads would have to be left out in order to expedite proceedings. The scheme, therefore, went ahead without this vital ingredient. This convoluted story indicates the tangle that arose because of three interweaving features. First, there was the overriding fear among the smaller authorities of having to meet expensive claims for compensation. Secondly, there was a confusion over responsibilities and a degree of antagonism between the
County Council and the authorities which comprised the Joint Committee. Finally, there was a degree of uncertainty about the advice from the Ministry. Their initial stance in favour of including Main Roads later gave way to a pragmatic desire to see the end to a scheme which had given them so many troubles.

The primary point to emerge from this example relevant to the conflict/consensus theme is that no compromise did emerge. According to the Ministry of Health's advice and procedure there should have been a dialogue between the planning authority, i.e. the North Tees JTPC and the objectors. However, such was the strength of feeling of the householders and the fear of the local authorities of having to pay substantial sums in compensation that there was no real desire to reach a consensus. Even when, in 1930, Durham County finally agreed to shoulder the possible burden of compensation the Ministry of Health decided that the case was a lost one and effectively prevented it being revived. In this instance the consensus model was a failure and the result a victory for those who opposed the road improvement proposals.

(ii) Planning Authorities v Large Companies

In pressing the consensus approach on town planning to local authorities the Ministry of Health stressed the need to take particular account of the interests of industry and business. There was bound to be some concern as to how large, influential companies, who were substantial landowners, might react to statutory town planning. The influence of big business in the economic and political life of the country was a dominant one. The class which essentially owned such companies represented a powerful sector of the capitalist interest. Their response to town planning can, therefore, be seen as
crucial to the short and long term success of such a policy area. In this context the following case studies of how conflicts between town planning authorities and large industrial companies on Teesside were resolved may be of value in seeking greater understanding of the evolution of modern British town planning.

The main example used in this section concerns the company known as Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited, or 'The Synthetic'. Prior to 1926 the company was a subsidiary of Brunner Mond Limited, a large chemical concern. After 1926 it became part of Imperial Chemical Industry and thus part of one of the world's largest private combines. Appendix 5 provides further detail. The other example used concerns Dorman Long Limited also a very large and powerful industrial company. Both companies employed substantial number, mainly men, on Teesside and also owned very large tracts of land, ICI to the north of the River Tees, and Dorman Long to the south. Both also had a national presence and had influence at the highest level of Government. The following detailed studies show how these companies, the Planning Authorities and the Government reacted to conflict over town planning and how far the consensus approach was deployed and what success was claimed for it.

**Town Planning and the Power of ICI Billingham**

The long passage of the North Tees Town Planning Scheme is dominated by conflicts between the 'Synthetic' and the Joint Town Planning Committee. These conflicts arose out of a contradiction between the aspirations of the local community and the needs of the Company. Both were involved in a struggle for local hegemony that would enable control to be exerted over the future disposition of land in the area. Both sought to legitimise their actions in terms of serving the needs of the people. The Company frequently pointed out, sometimes as
blackmail, the extent to which the prosperity of the area depended on their well-being. The local authorities sought, however imperfectly, to reflect the needs of the community by trying to increase and improve the provision of housing, by seeking to establish parks, recreation areas and so on. If the prosperity of the area depended on a healthy Company then it could be asserted that a prosperous company also depended on a healthy and well-disposed workforce.

The main aspirations of the growing working class community of Billingham during the inter-war years centred around the desire for more houses close to the works, freedom from pollution and hazard, improved recreational facilities and better roads and public transport. All of these demands found some expression in the Town Planning Scheme and most of them led to conflicts with the Company. There was, however, some common ground and collaboration, particularly in the provision of housing and the improvement to communications. But, even in these examples, proposals for the future by Billingham Council invariably led to disagreements.

The needs of the Company ran counter to many of the efforts of the Town Planning Committee. In a general sense their aims were inimical. The chemical industry was a rapidly developing field where advances in knowledge and technique were being made every few months. It was impossible, so the Company claimed, to predict what land needs or plant arrangements might be required even a few years ahead let alone 10 or 20 years. Given this degree of uncertainty the Company sought to retain maximum flexibility. In pursuit of this, the company resisted every attempt to restrict their options, both internally, in terms of how their existing factory site might be arranged and peripherally where their future requirements for land or access might be affected. This led them into direct confrontation with the North Tees Joint Town
Planning Committee and occasionally the Government. A further need of the Company concerned their own image of social responsibility. The 'Synthetic' continually sought to promote the view that they were a benign force operating in the public interest. Such a position lies within the traditions of welfare capitalism and the paternal company. The formation of Imperial Chemical Industries in 1926 reinforced this approach which continues to this day. However, there could never be complete accord between that aspect of the Company which strove to protect its interests come what may and that part which stressed its attitude of social responsibility. The contradiction between these competing roles is well illustrated in the issue of pollution which is considered, along with two other issues, in this section.

Three examples are studied below to illustrate the way in which the Company and the Joint Committee became locked in conflict. These are chosen to represent the main strands of debate and to show the different ways in which the Company secured its ends. They are not special cases but reside entirely within the general experience of the relationship between the 'Synthetic', the Joint Committee and the Ministry of Health.

The three detailed studies concern, firstly, the Joint Committee's proposals to protect present and proposed housing areas from the more polluting and dangerous parts of the Company's operations by means of a buffer-zone. Secondly, the Joint Committee's attempts to secure the long-term future of the Company's playing fields by zoning it as Private Open Space and finally, the opposition of the Company to a definition of their works as, 'noxious'.

(a) The Buffer Zone - The Joint Town Planning Committee decided at the outset that a buffer-zone was required to the west and north of the
'Synthetic' site in order to prevent a close proximity of housing, schools and noxious industry. (See Map G). Accordingly, the Preliminary Statement of 1924 states:

"The Local Authorities shall have power to permit the establishment of industries regarded as noxious on account of smoke, smell or other reasons, within the industrial area, provided these are not less than 400 yards from any area allocated to housing." (21)

This gave quite a degree of latitude to the Company. Offices, storage and all manner of non-noxious industry could be built in the 400 yards zone without planning permission. The reaction of the Company was, however, indignant and aggressive. The Joint Committee tried to be conciliatory and invited the Company to talks. After discussions the Joint Committee agreed to compromise by reducing the buffer-zone to 200 yards. The Company was not appeased. In response to the amendment they wrote:

"In our opinion the whole of the area (i.e. the 850 acre site) should be treated as an existing factory, which may come under the denomination, 'noxious'......just because land is at present agricultural it is manifestly unfair that it should be treated as such." (22)

In this instance the Company chose to imply that all their operations might be seen as 'noxious'. There is no evidence that the Joint Committee saw it like that.

Public Inquiry, 1925

A public inquiry into the Preliminary Statement was held in September, 1925, but the Company tried to influence the outcome by making two
approaches, one to the Ministry of Health and the other to the Committee's professional advisor, H.V. Lanchester. The Ministry declined to become involved at this stage but Lanchester proved more amenable. Following talks the 'Synthetic' claimed that Lanchester's opinion was that a buffer-zone could not be made retrospective and that the whole of their site could be dealt with as the Company thought fit. Lanchester never refuted the Company's claim, and, indeed, largely backed it up in the subsequent inquiry, thereby losing much of the Committee's confidence.

The inquiry was held before Mr. Benson Greenhall, who was clearly confused over the buffer-zone issue. Mr. Lanchester's evidence gave the impression that an 'agreement' had been reached between the Company and the Joint Committee. In fact, this was far from the case and after the inquiry the Joint Committee moved quickly to reaffirm their desire for the 200 yard belt. Within the Ministry there was some doubt about how to proceed but Pepler thought that the Joint Committee's proposal to exclude noxious industry in a 200 yard belt had merit.\(^{(23)}\) Such a view must have prevailed because when the first set of modifications was released by the Ministry in April, 1926, it contained no alteration to the buffer-zone proposal. The Company were astounded and wrote bluntly to the Ministry:

"we cannot see how the suggestions of the Ministry of Health in any way meet the difficulties of Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited." \(^{(24)}\)

Pressure on Government by I.C.I.

Finding that the Ministry had not immediately come round to their way of thinking, the Company decided to try and use its contacts at the highest level. Sir Alfred Mond was an influential figure both as
Chairman of Brunner Mond and at Westminster. As a leading Liberal he had held a number of posts, notably becoming Minister of Health in 1921. In 1926 he decided to move over to the Conservative ranks and was, therefore, on good terms with several government figures. It was into this sphere that the Company now moved in order to try and get its way on the buffer-zone issue. In July, 1926, Mr. Conway Davies, M.P., Mond's personal secretary, wrote to Douglas Veale, M.P., personal secretary to Neville Chamberlain the then Minister of Health:

"At the inquiry the Inspector saw the force of the Company's argument... It was pointed out that the Company had bought the site long before any question of town planning was considered and it was, therefore, not possible for the Company to agree to any limitation on its undertaking... The Company's point of view is that they expect every assistance from government in view of the fact that it was at the pressure of government they entered into the undertaking in the first place... Anything Mr. Neville Chamberlain can do in the matter will be greatly appreciated." (25) (My emphasis, D.G.)

The blend in the letter of intransigence, pressure and special pleading is powerful and speaks volumes about how the Company saw its own position over town planning and the power it felt it was able to wield, even over governments. The response in Whitehall was instantly placatory. On the advice of the Ministry officials, Veale replied that the Minister was now prepared to reconsider the matter and would ask the Joint Committee for their views. He assured the Company that the Minister was most anxious that the scheme should not hamper the expansion of the Industry. (26)
In dealing with the Joint Committee the Ministry initially took a rather disingenuous line by suggesting that there had, after all, been an agreement between the two parties which meant that, 'practically the whole of the Company's land would be unrestricted as regards the erection of noxious industry'. Such a statement not only flew in the face of repeated denials by the Joint Committee that any 'agreement' had been reached but it was a flagrant distortion of the original versions of the so-called agreement and one that obviously the Joint Committee could not agree to. The Joint Committee's reply to the Minister of Health pointed out these facts and ended:

"...it was said at the meeting of the Joint Committee that at a much greater distance than 200 yards from the Company's works the fumes are sometimes of an extremely noxious nature and members of the Committee strongly expressed the hope that the Ministry would support them in what they considered their reasonable views..." (27)

But the Ministry was not disposed to help them. The reply was blunt and revealing,

"...the Minister doubts whether any provision, could be fairly included in the scheme which might be at variance with those plans or whether the Company should reasonably be asked to do more than give an assurance that they would locate the more noxious parts of their industry as far from dwelling houses as they reasonably could without unduly hampering the industry itself." (28) (My emphasis D.G.)

In other words, the company's wishes were paramount. This was more
clearly stated in a handwritten note by a Ministry official on a letter Conway Davies wrote asking for progress. It said:

"I think it is pretty clear that the decision will have to be very much what the Company claim it ought to be." (29)

The search for 'Consensus'

The last stages of this dispute were something of a charade. The Ministry was reluctant to appear to be too obviously coming down on the side of the Company and tried to go through the motions of obtaining an agreement. But the dogged stance of the Joint Committee denied the Ministry an easy way out. When a suggested date for a conference of all the parties proved difficult for the Joint Committee the Ministry tetchily refused to alter it and decided to see the Company first. The meetings were a foregone conclusion in any event. Although the Ministry kept up a pretence and asked the Company to restate their case, a draft approval of the Preliminary Statement exists on a Ministry file excluding the buffer-zone proposal and predating both the meeting with the Company and the subsequent conference with the Joint Committee. (30) The final meeting with the Joint Committee in January, 1927, was a sorry affair with Ministry officials forced to repeat well known Company arguments and to tell the Committee representatives that the 200 yard zone would now be scrapped. The reply of the Committee put the truth of the matter in simple and plain language.

"...the man in the street's view would be that a powerful Company could secure more favourable terms than a poor man." (31)

Although the issue emerged in other guises at later stages in the planning process, the Joint Committee were never able to establish a buffer-zone. The Minister finally approved the Preliminary Statement, according to the wishes of the Company in May, 1927.
The Playing Fields Issue - As part of its role as a caring, responsible employer, the 'Synthetic' agreed during the 1920s to provide a 20 acre site for playing fields for its employees. The area was in the extreme west of its holdings, directly adjacent to housing, shops and a new school. (See Map G). It wasn't all philanthropy though since the operation of the playing fields, the establishment of a Sports Club and so on, were to be paid for by the workers contributing a regular sum from their wages. At much the same time as the grounds were being laid out the Joint Committee were considering the approval of a draft scheme. After due consultation and several amendments the draft scheme was adopted in September, 1929. Among its proposals was the zoning of the Company's playing fields as Private Open Space. Although the 'Synthetic' were once again the principal objector to the scheme they failed to pick up the proposal until well after the public inquiry which was held in January, 1930. When the Company did realise what the Joint Committee intended they objected most forcefully and began a wrangle that lasted two years.

I.C.I. Object

In outlining their objection the Company adopted the same kind of stance as in the case of the buffer-zone. They stated that they would not accept that any of their land could be zoned for anything other than industry. They argued that they needed flexibility for all their lands and while they had no immediate intention of dispensing with the playing fields who could say what future developments might require. The Joint Committee's reply followed the advice given them by the Ministry of Health in response to a similar objection a few months previously. This was to the effect that should circumstances warrant a change of use in the future the Company could always apply and the Local Authorities were bound to look responsibly on such an
application. The Company found this unacceptable. They were reluctant to yield any power to the local authorities. Their reply stated:

"...while we have every confidence in the helpfulness of the local authority, we realise that should alteration of the zoning be required such a matter may take considerable time to arrange and, as you are aware, this may easily be so serious a matter as to compel us to take the development proposed to another district. We would repeat that only in a case of necessity should we be prepared to interfere with our recreation fields...At the same time we feel that your Committee would not wish us to sterilise useful land on which industrial development of your district may at some time depend and will appreciate our reasons for desiring to preserve entirely unfettered, our right to dispose of it and utilise our own property." (32)

Involvement of I.C.I. Workers

Meanwhile, news had leaked out locally that the 'Synthetic' wanted to have the playing fields zoned for industry. This alarmed many workers in Billingham who considered that the grounds were theirs and that such news meant the imminent demise of the facility. As a result of their representations a local M.P., J. Herriotts, wrote on their behalf to Arthur Greenwood, then Minister of Health, urging him to intercede on behalf of the Company workers. Greenwood's reply might have been written by the Company since it included all the arguments put forward by the Company and none from the perspective of the Joint Committee. In addition, the Minister added, that, without the Company's agreement the zoning desired by the workers and the Joint Committee would involve a claim for compensation. (33)
An Attempt at Consensus

The Ministry did, however, press the Joint Committee to arrange a conference between themselves and the Company to see if any compromise could be reached. At such a meeting, attended by Ministry officials, local representatives of the Company made a surprising and uncharacteristic concession. They agreed, subject to approval of ICI in London, to accept an open space zoning for the western half of the site. This area was closest to the housing and the school and also contained the Club House and the Tennis Courts. They refused to agree to extend this to the eastern half which they wanted zoning as industrial land. The Joint Committee very reluctantly accepted this compromise. Unfortunately, ICI headquarters in London were in no mood to compromise and overturned their colleagues' proposal. In letters to both Billingham Council and the Ministry of Health, ICI reaffirmed their original position, saying:

"...therefore, we propose to take all the steps that may be necessary to preserve undiminished our rights over the area in question." (35)

Following several more months of fruitless local talks, the Company referred all the correspondence to Whitehall and asked the Ministry to support the Company. This request put the Ministry in something of a dilemma, since they had been a party to the original compromise. They attempted to extract some element of compromise from the Company at the same time as pushing Billingham to realise that they were unlikely to secure either their original proposal or the subsequent 50-50 compromise. The Company's final offer made in 1932 gave little away, yielding nothing in respect of possible open space zoning but providing for some limitations on the kind of industrial buildings they could
erect in the western half of the site. In effect, the Company accepted that they wouldn't put up noxious industry in the areas adjacent to housing and the school. Billingham reluctantly accepted that they had no choice but to agree.

Events later in the year suggested that there may have been a simmering dispute within ICI between 'hardliners' and 'softliners'. For, in late 1932, ICI made another approach to the Ministry of Health seeking to retract the 'final offer' and to have the whole site zoned for general industry. On being informed of this move the reaction of the Joint Committee and Billingham was understandably angry.

"...contrary to all the ideals and principles of town planning... (Billingham) have met the Company very reasonably and under no circumstances should they (i.e. the Company) be allowed to erect industrial buildings on this specific piece of land as it is surrounded by dwelling houses and a school."(36)

The local authorities' case was a strong one and the Ministry retracted the latest proposed modification and obtained the agreement of ICI to stand by the earlier agreement. In the end, it was a very small victory. The Joint Committee had failed to secure any part of the playing fields as open space zoning. As Billingham Council rather plaintively pointed out to the 'Synthetic'.

"The area in question was only 10 acres and it was the only 10 acres in the whole of Billingham in which the views of ICI had not been met." (37)

(c) **Noxious Industry** - The third and final example concerns the Company's attitude to the definition of its activities a 'noxious'. Such a description might seem axiomatic in reference to a heavy
chemicals works but to the Company it became both an important point of principle and a matter of practical concern. On the issue of principle the Company consistently sought to portray its activities as beneficial to the community and any suggestion to the contrary was opposed as damaging to their image. The practical question revolved around the struggle to maintain local hegemony. If it became established that the works were noxious it strengthened the argument for careful zoning. The Company set out the dual nature of its objection in a letter to Billingham Council in 1931.

"We do seriously suggest that it would be detrimental to the industry of your district to allow the suggestion that the establishment of such important works are a menace to its amenities or to put even the obstruction of the necessity of consent in their way." (38)

The Problem of Pollution

That the works did create considerable pollution in the form of dust, grit and smells, is a matter of record. (See Map G). Throughout the 1920s Billingham Council received numerous complaints from local residents about the works. Frequent visits to the 'Synthetic' by the Sanitary Inspector led to acrimonious letters from the Company, including the, by now familiar, note of blackmail, as shown in this letter:

"There is but one alternative to the dust nuisance at the present time, and that is the complete closure of the Billingham works, which would throw some 11,000 men into the miseries of unemployment." (39)

But this was not true. The Company were persuaded to spend some
£50,000 on dust prevention methods. But, as the Inspector to the 1930 Public Inquiry, Major Lockhart observed in his report, this wasn't so much a response to the needs of nearby residents as an attempt to reduce the harmful effects of grit in the Company's machinery. Moreover, local farmers and businessmen had lodged claims for compensation. In any event, it was a strange firm that spent £50,000 trying to eradicate a nuisance that in other circumstances wasn't supposed to exist!

The extent to which the works were clearly harmful and noxious can be gauged from the following extract from Major Lockhart's report:

"The whole of the country for some distance from the works on the leeward side is black without a blade of grass or a trace of vegetation to be seen. On the Furness Estate, where things are at the worst, the conditions are appalling as in addition to the grit deposits, the ammonia fumes are drifting across the works." (40)

In the light of this evidence and other observations, it is difficult to credit the nerve of the Company in seeking to deny that it was 'noxious'. It certainly didn't seek to deny the harmful effects of its works when it might thereby gain something. In this connection the Company made much of the pollution when trying to get the Ministry of Health's backing for re-zoning land to the North and East of the Company's works from housing to industry. This was the area into which the company hoped to eventually expand. It argued that the area was entirely unsuitable for housing as proposed by the Joint Committee, owing to the prevalent wind carrying smoke, grit and fumes across the land in question. This was supported by the Inspector and eventually incorporated into the adopted scheme.
All of this sits oddly with the three year struggle by the Company to try and convince the Ministry that their works did not merit the description 'noxious'. The Company first voiced its disquiet at having its works so described in 1926 when discussing the buffer-zone. One Company representative averred then that noxious fumes were 'almost non-existent'. But the issue wasn't pressed at this stage. It really only became a major issue for the Company in 1931 when the Ministry of Health proposed altering the wording of the section dealing with noxious industry to include all works liable to be registered under the Alkali etc., Works Regulation Act, 1906. The 'Synthetic' at once lodged a strong objection.

The Company v The Ministry

In the first response to the Company's objection, every participant supported the Ministry against the Company. Durham County Council could see no reason for the objection as they could always appeal to the Minister if any proposals were made to schedule any of their trade as noxious. Billingham and the Joint Committee accepted the Ministry's proposed modification without reservation and the officials to the Joint Committee bluntly wrote, 'the trade is a definite menace'. Little sympathy was elicited from the Ministry by the Company during a meeting held to discuss the matter in October, 1931.

The Company asserted that they were categorically not noxious and tried to use the precedent of the Fleetwood Town Planning Scheme to argue against inclusion of the Alkali etc., Act. The Company were asked rather coolly to put their detailed case in writing. The attitude of Ministry officials at this time may be revealed in an internal memo by Major Lockhart in which he gave his opinion that the object of the Company was to get a free hand on the area of the Furness Estate which was re-zoned as industry, 'expressly to meet their wishes'.(41)
Failing to make much progress at the first meeting, ICI pressed for a second conference at which the national chiefs of the Company could meet the most senior Ministry officials. The Company's case was put by their secretary, J.E. James. At the outset he said that ICI were 'affronted by having their works described as noxious. Under no circumstances would they agree to it'. On the question of the Alkali etc., Act, James clarified the Company's objection which was that as worded the scheme would mean that the Company would have to get planning permission for developing their site. It was, he said, unfair to select alkali works and place them under control of the local authority. If such controls were necessary James went on, why couldn't the Company apply direct to the Minister. The Ministry officials back-pedalled and agreed to suggest a definition which would dispose of their objection and keep offensive trades and alkali works distinct. However, on the issue of direct reference to the Ministry, little hope was extended as such a provision was not included in the Town and Country Planning Act. (42)

By having the term noxious industry removed from the scheme, which the Ministry eventually conceded, the Company achieved its main objects. Its image as non-harmful was strengthened and the control of the local authority removed. Although still subject to the control of the Alkali Inspectorate the Company's experience of this clearly led it so see this as no undue problem. The way was now clear to the virtual unfettered use of the site as the Company had so long pronounced it ought to be.

Dorman Long and Company & South Teesside

Dorman Long and Company became established on Teesside in 1875. By 1914 they had expanded to become one of the three main iron and steel
companies located at Teesside, the others being, Bolckow and Vaughan and the South Durham Steel and Iron Company. During the First World War Dorman Long again expanded with the help of Government funds and bought the steel works at Redcar. It was here that they built Dormanstown to cope with expansion. After the war many aspects of their works were modernised but the anticipated post-war boom soon collapsed. The slump of the 1920s led to a halt to iron and steel modernisation and considerable lay-offs from their workforce. Like the other iron and steel companies Dorman Long diversified into structural engineering and became world famous for their bridge building. In 1924 they secured the coveted order for the Sydney Harbour Bridge.

In 1929 Dorman Long and Bolckow and Vaughan merged after Bolckow and Vaughan had got into increasing financial difficulties. This led to Dorman Long becoming the largest iron and steel company in Great Britain, employing 33,000 men. Attempts to merge South Durham Steel and Iron Company with Dorman Long failed and they remained rivals. (43)

Dorman Long's Teesside plants were situated on the south banks of the River Tees from Middlesbrough, through Eston to Redcar. As such they dominated the South Teesside local economy and labour market. After 1931 the company began a process of reorganisation. In the mid 1930s, as the world market began to improve, largely consequent upon re-armament, Dorman Long embarked on building new plants, mainly on those sites closer to the mouth of the Tees. This development eventually led the Company into conflict with the South Tees Joint Town Planning Committee. The planning authority sought through their scheme to provide a buffer-zone between industry and the east-west Trunk Road. Dorman Long's development in the later 1930s ignored these planning proposals and led to disputes with the Joint Committee. This issue is referred to in a postscript because it lies outside the study period.
The main issue dealt with here is included to illustrate the power of a company such as Dorman Longs in overriding local objections to its activities and gaining support of the planning authority.

The Eston Iron Ore Crusher

There were very few occasions in the inter-war years when working class families became involved in town planning issues. There were incidents in Billingham when local residents complained of the fumes and the dust of the chemical works and then later of the dust from the coal dump. (See Map G). None of these issues were resolved to the satisfaction of the local people. Similarly the workers at the 'Synthetic' also protested when they feared that they would lose their Sports Ground. As shown earlier in this Chapter although they did not lose their Sports Ground they did lose town planning guarantees and had no certainty over its future.

Few similar issues occurred over the statutory scheme for South Tees. But there was one incident which points up both the lack of power of ordinary workers to secure their legitimate environmental demands and the ability of large companies to persuade professionals of their case.

In November, 1933, Knowles received a petition from local residents in Eston who were objecting to the noise caused by an Iron Ore crusher, operated by Dorman Long. (See Map H). In his initial response Knowles was sympathetic stating that the noise was certainly detrimental to their amenity. However, after this response Knowles was invited, along with the Eston District Engineer, to see Dorman Long Managers to discuss the situation. At this meeting the Company revealed that far from removing the crusher they intended to build two more. Clearly the Company were able to impress the two officials. Knowles reported to his Committee that the Company were aware of the problem and were
taking steps to minimise the noise. But, the revealing aspect to this case is the following statement made by Knowles to the Committee.

"It is necessary to realise the employment benefits such a development would bring. It is not possible to site the crusher anywhere else and in any case people who live in an industrial district must expect a certain amount of noise." (44)

It is perhaps not surprising that if town planning advisors held such views working people did not see a great deal to town planning.

A Postscript

The South Tees JTPC submitted their Draft Scheme in 1937 and eventually a Public Inquiry was held in April, 1939. The Inspector was Mr. Arnold Morris. Dorman Long and Company were one of the principal objectors to the Scheme. In particular they objected to the inclusion of a proposal for a 1,000ft. buffer-zone, zoned for open space, between their works and the Middlesbrough to Redcar Trunk road. The Inquiry was interesting in that it revealed how ignorant the company and its representative at the Inquiry were of Town Planning law. In particular it was revealed that the company had recently built some new works without obtaining any by-law approval. This omission was illegal and the Inspector remarked:

"I know that the name of Dorman Long is worldwide, but I did not think it went as far as that." (45)

(iii) Planning Authorities v Other Public Authorities

There were many cases of conflict arising between the planning authority and other public authorities. This arose partly because local authorities and central government were themselves landowners who
could and did object to proposals in Town Planning Schemes. Disputes also arose because of local jealousies and fears between authorities. Both types of conflict are examined in the case studies below.

(a) **Durham County Council & The Smallholding Issue**

Smallholdings were widely established after the First World War by County Councils in order to provide self sufficient plots for returning servicemen. The *Land Settlement (Facilities) Act, 1919*, gave additional powers to County Councils who had been empowered to provide smallholdings ever since the **1892 Small Holdings Act**. Little was achieved however, until the **1908 Small Holdings Act** gave compulsory powers of purchase to the County Councils. The 1919 Act was specifically related to the needs of ex-servicemen and gave them a right to a smallholding. As a result of the 1919 Act and the subsequent acceptance by the government of financial responsibility, the number of smallholdings rapidly increased. But Government financial support ceased in 1926 and counties were left with the burden of the cost. Whilst there were some examples of success among the 20,000 to 30,000 smallholders that eventually settled on the 500,000 acres of settlement, many found the reality far removed from the age-old urban dream of 'three acres and a cow'.

(46) The unsuitability of many tenants, lack of capital and an unwillingness to co-operate with neighbours led to many examples of poverty, depression and failure. Winifred Holtby graphically illustrates this in her novel, 'South Riding'. In the book, the smallholding known as Cold Harbour Colony is described as,

"A grim place... a Socialist experiment carried out by people who don't believe in Socialism.... Few colonists had had previous agricultural experience. The agents sent to supervise..."
their efforts were unpopular with the local farmers, and by the spring of 1933 poverty and despair had weeded out all except the bravest, the most sanguine or the most efficient."

County Agricultural Committees were established in 1919 as a result of the Ministry of Agriculture Act. These Committees were unusual in that they had a minority of Members on them appointed by the Minister of Agriculture. They were, therefore, somewhat separate from the other County Council Committees and had a close relationship with the Ministry of Agriculture.

North Tees Planning Scheme & Stockton Grange Smallholding

The early proposals of the North Tees Joint Committee, embodied in the Preliminary Statement in 1925 showed three new roads cutting through a County Council Smallholding, called Stockton Grange, situated on the then northern edge of the built-up area of Stockton. The site is shown on Map G. The notion was that the area was ripe for future development and to make this feasible new roads were required to open up the land for development. Stockton Grange, however, had only been acquired in 1921 and the County Agricultural Committee were astonished at the proposal. They also thought that the Ministry of Agriculture, which had spent £40,000 on the site would refuse permission and so thwart the idea. At a meeting between the County Director of Agriculture, the County Surveyor and Stockton's Borough Engineer, the latter, Mr. Wakeford, sought to head-off criticism by agreeing to delete one of the road proposals. But since the other two road proposals remained the County Council continued to object. The County's objections were considered at the public inquiry into the Preliminary Statement in September, 1925. Lanchester in giving his evidence stuck to his proposed development of the smallholdings but suggested some amendments to the remaining road crossing the site.
Durham County & the Ministry of Agriculture

The Director of Agriculture at Durham continued to insist that all idea of developing the site should be dropped and opposed any new roads being included in the scheme. In October, 1925, he sought to obtain the support of the Ministry of Agriculture and asked them to secure the exemption of the smallholdings site from the scheme. The reply from the Ministry was mixed. On the one hand they rejected the idea of exemption and told the County so in no uncertain terms. On the other hand, they supported objections to the new roads and promised to make this position clear to the Ministry of Health. There was some concern at County Hall that the Ministry of Agriculture may have misinterpreted the motives of the Agricultural Committee and so they arranged to meet Ministry officials. At this meeting Durham representatives assured the Ministry officials that their opposition to new roads cutting through the smallholding was not based on any antagonism to Stockton Borough. This little incident is significant for the light it sheds on background tensions that undoubtedly did exist between the County and Stockton, of which Whitehall was obviously aware. This is explored further in Chapter 21.

A Compromise?

In the event the pressure of the County Agriculture Committee was successful. In February, 1926, the Clerk to the County Council wrote to the Secretary of the Joint Committee a somewhat gloating letter to inform him that the Ministry of Health would be suggesting a modification of the scheme to delete the remaining two roads. This was confirmed by the Ministry in April, 1926, but was not accepted by the Joint Committee. Eventually an alternative arrangement was reached whereby no roads would cut through the smallholdings site but provision
would be made for the possibility of a peripheral road in the vicinity of the smallholdings. This was then incorporated into the approved Preliminary Statement.

One final hiccup occurred during the Draft scheme stage. When the Draft scheme proposals were circulated in 1928 the County immediately objected to the one remaining road in the vicinity of the smallholdings because the County claimed that the line of the road was incorrect and the vital restrictive clause was omitted. In the end this was amended in line with the County Council suggestions and incorporated into the final scheme. The restrictive clause read:

"Provided that the Authority shall not without the consent of the County Council declare to be a street such part of the land reserved for the site of the new streets numbered 47 to 59 (in effect one road, D.G.) on the map as forms part of the County Council's smallholding, nor exercise any powers of compulsory purchase with respect to it under Section 8 the Act, during the currency of existing leases or fresh leases for reasonable periods of smallholdings which would be affected thereby." (51)

In effect, the County Council with the support of the Ministries of Health and Agriculture had defeated the Joint Committee. The Joint Committee had desired to prepare the ground for the future housing development of the smallholdings. The 'compromise' maintained the main part of the site intact and only a peripheral road was envisaged and even this could not be begun without the restrictive clauses being overcome. In fact, this site was to remain undeveloped until Local Government re-organisation in 1974 transferred the ownership of the smallholdings from Durham County to Cleveland County Council.
This case study related to the South Teesside JTPC's Scheme. One of the first actions of Geoffrey Knowles on assuming office was to recommend that the Joint Committee seek to include Nunthorpe Parish within their scheme. The location of the Parish is shown on Map H. The original scheme area had embraced the whole of Middlesbrough Rural District which abutted on to Nunthorpe Parish to the south which came under Stokesley Rural District. In 1932 Middlesbrough Rural District ceased to exist and its area divided between Middlesbrough Borough Council and Stokesley Rural District. It was hoped that Stokesley would seek to maintain continuity for some of the south Middlesbrough areas it now controlled and become involved in the work of the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee. Before this could be ascertained, Knowles recommended the inclusion of Nunthorpe Parish as a priority.

An Approach to Stokesley Rural District Council

Whilst the Joint Committee recognised the value of such an extension to their scheme they rejected Knowles's rather peremptory approach and agreed to write to Stokesley District inviting their agreement to such an inclusion. But, Stokesley Rural District were strongly opposed to any suggestion that Nunthorpe Parish should be included in the South Tees scheme and also declined to join the Committee. Once again Knowles recommended that the Joint Committee should take unilateral action and pass the necessary resolution and let the Ministry of Health adjudicate. But the Committee were reluctant to proceed without the agreement of Stokesley and decided to make a direct appeal and send a deputation. This move also failed to budge Stokesley opinion and so with reluctance the Joint Committee agreed the resolution to include...
Nunthorpe Parish in their scheme and sent it off to the Ministry of
Health. (52)

The North Riding of Yorkshire's Position

Stokesley would probably have expected strong support from the North
Riding County Council but that Council had been moving powerfully in
the direction of adopting town planning. Not only had they agreed to
join the South Tees Joint Committee but they had engaged Patrick
Abercrombie to prepare a report on planning in the North Riding. The
County Council, therefore, were being consistent when they declined to
support Stokesley. (53)

Public Inquiry, 1933

The full reasons for the Joint Committee's desire to extend their
scheme and the opposition of Stokesley and others became clear during
the course of the Public Inquiry into the proposal which was held in
March, 1933. Preston Kitchen, presenting the case for the Joint
Committee stressed two main reasons for their action. In the first
place the Parish was on the point of potential development. The Joint
Committee could envisage that the parish was coming under pressure for
development and that this would increase. Already a large tract of
land owned by the Owners of the Middlesbrough Estate had layout plans
prepared for it. The area was ideal for commuters and if allowed to
proceed without any control would add to sprawl and poor quality
development. Secondly the area was unspoilt and had considerable
natural beauty which the Committee desired to protect. In addition
there were also two main road proposals which went through the parish.
The Joint Committee were keen to ensure a continuity of treatment to
these roads and to tie them into the existing scheme. The Joint
Committee, therefore, placed ensuring orderly development and
protecting amenity as the two key factors. A subsidiary issue was that the area also had an inadequate sewage systems which had to be dealt with before any large scale development could be undertaken. (54)

**Opposition to Nunthorpe's Inclusion**

The objections of Stokesley were essentially that it did not want to be linked to urban Teesside in general and with Middlesbrough in particular. They pointed out that only three houses had been built in the previous twelve months and that Nunthorpe was a purely rural area whose development could be adequately controlled by by-laws with the assistance of the North Riding County Council. From the evidence of Mr. James Jackson, Chairman of the Plans Committee of the Stokesley Rural Council, it is clear there was much bitterness towards Middlesbrough. Jackson was reported as follows:

"Since Grey Towers had passed out of the hands of the late Sir Arthur Dorman into the control of the Middlesbrough Corporation they had lost many of the amenities they had hitherto enjoyed. "We have lost our cricket ground", he said, "and when Middlesbrough took the land over they would not even allow the team to finish their fixtures. They were just bumped off." Mr. Jackson also said that Middlesbrough had been responsible for closing footpaths in the area. "That is the kind of thing you get from Middlesbrough Corporation. It makes you feel that you do not want to join with people like that." We believe that we are better satisfied working with the North Riding County Council than we would be with the South Teesside Town Planning Committee. If we joined that it would be case of being thrown to the butchers and finished off." (55)

The Owners of the Middlesbrough Estate expressed concern about the
probable cost but also added, "We are going to have our liberties seriously interfered with when there is not the slightest necessity for the scheme". (56)

The Inquiry showed that in many ways the objection to the inclusion of Nunthorpe stemmed from a fear of being an adjunct to the large menacing urban area to the north. A subsidiary reason from the Owners of the Middlesbrough Estate and the few other objectors was probably due to the worry that they may not have been able to sell their land or develop it as building land, therefore failing to realise a growth in values which was undoubtedly occurring. On the other hand it seems likely that the motives of the North Riding and some of the rural representatives on the Joint Committee were genuinely to prevent a loss of amenity due to haphazard and poor quality development.

The Minister agreed to the inclusion of Nunthorpe Parish and overruled the local objections. There is no doubt that the position of the County Council was vital. Had the County objected then the Ministry of Health might have been less inclined to agree with the proposal. But, it is worth noting that this dispute was one of the very few on Teesside when the Ministry of Health came down in favour of the local Joint Committee.

(c) Crown Lands

The last example concerns the position of central government as landowners and whilst it doesn't illustrate a strong theme of conflict it is a rare instance of genuine consensus on land-use. The scheme area of the new Hartlepool Joint Committee of 1928 sought to include a significant area of land on its southern boundary that was either reclaimed estuarine land or land that might in the future be reclaimed but was still covered at high tide. (See Map F). Part of the
area was also used by the War Office. It was clear to the Committee that this area might be significant in the future for industrial purposes. Seal Sands, in the adjacent North Tees Scheme area was in the process of being reclaimed and had been included in the North Tees scheme as potential industrial land. Historically, industry was moving downstream. Grays had developed a new shipyard on Greatham Creek in 1918 and there seemed every prospect of new developments.

Because the scheme area included territory of an authority not included in the Joint Committee, namely Easington Rural District Council, it was necessary to obtain the approval of the Minister of Health before proceeding to the Preliminary Statement. The Minister therefore scrutinised the Map No.1 and noted that the scheme area included Crown Lands. This area was the reclaimed or tidal flats of Seaton Sands and Greatham Creek. However, the Minister decided to approve the scheme area 'in toto' because, although Crown Lands were strictly speaking not subject to the provisions of a town planning scheme, the matter was under national consideration. The normal practice was to exclude such lands and to seek an agreement that the Government Department concerned would develop or dispose of the land in question in conformity with the scheme proposals.

**Consensus**

In the event the issue did not become a major area of conflict. The Crown Commissioners at a later date insisted that the Crown Lands were excluded in order that an agreement could be entered into. But, there was never any problem over the industrial designation of the lands. The only problem was that they were not prepared to consider any zoning of foreshore land.

The War Office were also agreeable to the Joint Committee's proposals.
noting though that a proposed road would cut across shooting ranges and that this road would have to be closed during range practice.

The Tees Conservancy Commissioners also had a stake in tidal land since they acted in concert with the Crown Commissioners to reclaim the land and helped to administer the reclaimed lands. They also owned freehold land in the vicinity. But, they too were agreeable to an industrial zoning. (58)

This area is now the subject of intense concern among planners, the Tees and Hartlepool Port Authority and Conservationists. The area is a major breeding ground for birds and both town planners and conservationists have been keen to retain the area as wild open space and a bird sanctuary of national importance. The Tees and Hartlepool Port Authority have, however, maintained a consistent approach and still insist that it should ultimately be developed for industrial purposes.

**Town Planning & the Consensus Approach — The Local Evidence**

Chapter 14 argued that the notion of consensus was an essential ingredient in the developing ideology of town planning in this country between the wars. The consensus philosophy worked at different levels. On one plane it was seen as essential to the very purpose of the activity which was to reconcile competing claims to land-use by harmonising and maximising outcomes. At another level it was applied to town planning procedures in order to deal with potential conflicts arising out of objections to town planning proposals.

The extent to which such a consensus approach was achieved can only be gauged by studying what happened in practice. This Chapter has sought to undertake that task by looking in detail at the way conflicts were
resolved in the local town planning areas of Teesside and Hartlepool. Local conflicts arose over many issues and also over the means to addressing the issues. The former occurred between the planning authority and landowners, the latter between the planning authority and the local authorities and the Ministry of Health.

This Chapter has identified different conflicts primarily in terms of the type of landowners; large, small, public and private. All were at some stage objectors to local statutory town planning schemes. Ideally, according to the consensus ideology of town planning, endorsed by Government, all such conflicts should have been resolved harmoniously by a process of 'give and take'. The outcome should have been a balance between the public and the private interest – a 'middle way'. In fact the evidence presented in this Chapter lends weight to the view that the town planning authority invariably yielded to the private interest and rarely achieved a compromise or consensus. Additionally local authorities were often in dispute amongst themselves and many conflicts surfaced which were not resolved. This issue is also identified in the next Chapter.
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Chapter 21 - The Success & Failure of Town Planning - The Teesside & Hartlepool Experience

This Chapter seeks to explore the theme of success and failure of town planning in the context of Teesside and Hartlepool. It was possible to follow three different routes to statutory town planning during the study period. In the early 1920s there was a good deal of pressure on local authorities to obtain an Advisory Plan before embarking on statutory schemes. Such a plan, resting on a detailed survey, prepared by experts, was seen to provide an invaluable basis for statutory planning particularly for local authorities not readily equipped with town planning expertise. The Ministry of Health urged this course within the context of their campaign for 'regional' planning. Local authorities were encouraged to join together in Joint Town Planning Committees and commission an Advisory Plan for their region. Such an approach was adopted by South Teesside and their success will be analysed.

A second possible approach was for individual local authorities to get on with the job and prepare Town Planning Schemes for their relevant areas. Two examples will be studied here relating to Thornaby Municipal Borough and West Hartlepool County Borough. Both did not succeed, in that their schemes were never completed. But important lessons were learnt in the process.

Finally, the approach increasingly favoured by the Ministry of Health, especially after 1929 was that Joint Town Planning Committees should seek delegated powers and prepare their own statutory scheme, with or without expert help. Eventually all three areas, North and South Teesside and the Hartlepools adopted this approach. Various problems occurred and some of these will be highlighted as well as the successes.
Within this framework other issues can be studied. How far did unemployment affect progress in town planning? What part did local antagonisms and parochialism play in delaying statutory schemes? Such factors can be more clearly identified at the local level, although they were reflected in the broad national picture.

Before embarking on a study of the different approaches used locally in pursuing town planning, there is a brief study of the local pre-1919 tradition in town planning and a more detailed description of the way the Teesside and Hartlepool areas reflected the national mood of optimism and reconstruction just after the First World War.

Pre-1919 Town Planning

Experience of statutory town planning was very meagre on Teesside and Hartlepool prior to 1919. This was not unusual but it meant that most authorities were starting from scratch after the First World War. Only West Hartlepool County Borough had any real practical experience and this has been briefly described in Chapter 5. Middlesbrough County Borough made a brief incursion prior to the First World War, as did Stockton-on-Tees, but neither made much progress.

In the non-statutory field the main activity concerned the beneficent or necessitous employer. The shipping and steel magnate, the second Lord Furness, was in fact both. As already noted he embarked upon the construction of a new shipyard at Haverton Hill in 1917 in response to the wartime demand for more shipping. To ensure an adequate supply of labour in a peripheral location, Furness decided to build a new village along model design lines. It was known as the Belasis Garden Village, after the old hall that was originally on the site. The 531 cottages were built to a high standard and the overall density of 11 dwellings per acre conformed with Unwin's dictum of 'Nothing more than 12 houses to the acre'. Open spaces and other amenities were provided. (1)
South of the river the Dorman Long Company were similarly expanding during the war. Using government financial assistance the Company planned and built the model village of Dormanstown, to which reference has been made in earlier chapters. The design of Dormanstown was the work of Abercrombie, Adshead and Ramsey. Its geometrical layout and non-Georgian style arguably did more to influence local authority housing than any other model settlement in this period. Dormanstown, like Haverton Hill, was built during and just after the war.

It could not be said that Teesside and Hartlepool were especially different from other areas in their tradition of town planning before the First World War. Most areas of the country could point to a similar patchy experience of local experiment and brief encounters with statutory town planning. The lack of a greater tradition certainly did not appear to dampen local enthusiasm for new ventures in town planning after the war.

(i) Post-war Hopes & Town Planning

The role of housing and town planning in Lloyd George's post-war programme of reconstruction, and the political role of such a policy, has already been discussed in earlier chapters. The extent to which the Ministry of Health would be able to capture at the local level the mood of hope and the desire for progress, always prevalent after a major war, was unclear. In this following study the problems and potential are outlined. The early hopes expressed at the Thornaby Conference can be clearly seen, as can the local reservations. Then in 1921 it is possible to examine the way the local area reacted to the sudden slump and the swift rise in unemployment.
The Thornaby Conference, 1920

Two years after the armistice, in November, 1920, representatives of local authorities on Teesside and Hartlepool, together with regional ministry officials, gathered in Thornaby Town Hall to listen to George Pepler outline the advantages of setting up a single joint committee to oversee town planning in the region. This was the fifth such conference Pepler had convened on behalf of the new Ministry of Health since the 1919 Housing, Town Planning, Etc., Act had become law in July of that year. (3)

Pepler began what was to be a twenty year odyssey in the pursuit of sub-regional town planning in Doncaster in January, 1920. From there he had returned to London to secure the joint working of local authorities in the development of principal roads proposed by the Greater London Arterial Road Conference. Moving north again, conferences were arranged at Manchester (September, 1920), Deeside (October, 1920), and then at Thornaby, Teesside. In between these initiatives a committee had also been established to prepare a regional report on South Wales (February, 1920).

George Pepler recounted this progress to his Teesside audience concluding,

"The growing practice of the setting up by neighbouring local authorities of large joint Town Planning Committees suggests that similar action might, with advantage, be taken in regard to the Teesside area, where such large industrial developments have taken place and may be expected." (4)

He went on to point out the obvious dangers in local authorities proceeding with their own schemes when, for instance, contrary road
schemes may be 'mutually destructive'. In a careful attempt to gain the confidence of the participants he pointed out that the individual councils would not be losing their town planning powers, but, 'merely delegating them to a body appointed from among themselves powers to prepare a general scheme for their several consideration.'

From the concluding resolutions of the conference it was apparent that such arguments proved quite acceptable. However, when it came to specific recommendations over representations and cost, the local area sought to assert its own individuality. The main dispute revolved around the question of whether there should be one joint committee or two. Pepler was in no doubt. He proposed one relatively small committee, covering north and south of the Tees and including Hartlepool (very similar to the present Cleveland County area). Overall he advocated a committee of 19 with representation roughly equivalent to the financial contribution of the authority based on the rateable value of that authority. All told he suggested that they plan for an expenditure of £1,000.

A Split Teesside

Councillor Lee from Durham County Council (later to become immortalised in the new town, Peterlee), moved an amendment that there should be two committees, one for the south and one for the north side of the River Tees. He further proposed extending the north committee to include Easington District in order to make the two committees of similar size. Peter Lee recognised the need to agree the position of a bridge over the Tees but thought that this was the only issue requiring joint consideration. Mr. W.A. McArthur, the Clerk to Stockton Rural District Council, seconded the amendment. It is interesting to note that both officials and members took an equal part in the debate, with an equal
say in its outcome. Opposition to the idea of a split committee came principally from Middlesbrough. Aldermen A. Mattison and J. Calvert, argued that parochialism had prevailed for too long - a broader vision was required. Stockton's Town Clerk, Mr. J. Downey, adopted the north Tees view and thought that regional considerations could prevail even with two committees. In the event the age-long barrier of the Tees proved too substantial to bridge and it was resolved to set up two committees. (7)

The North Tees Joint Planning Committee would comprise, West Hartlepool, Hartlepool Town, Hartlepool Rural district, Easington Rural District, Stockton-on-Tees Borough and Stockton Rural District. In all a committee of 20 representatives. The South Tees Joint Town Planning Committee would comprise, Middlesbrough, Middlesbrough Rural District, Thornaby Town, Eston Urban District, Redcar Urban District, Saltburn Urban District, Guisborough Urban District and Guisborough Rural District, comprising in all 24 representatives. (8)

In terms of finance, the local authorities proved rather less cautious than Mr. Pepler. They proposed that each Joint Committee should seek to prepare an outline plan and preliminary statement for £750. The contributions of each constituent authority would, as originally suggested, be based on the rateable value of the authorities as at October, 1920. In the case of rural districts their contributions would be proportional to the number of parishes included within the Scheme area. (9)

The Conference also recommended that each local authority pass the necessary resolution to constitute the Joint Committees and invest them with the appropriate powers. Early priority, so conference averred, would be given to the question of improved north-south communication.
Finally, Mr. Pepler was asked to summon the first meeting of each Joint Committee.(10)

The Local mood for Town Planning in 1920

From the available records there seems to have been little objection to the principle of forming joint committees, although not every authority subsequently agreed to join in. Local government at this stage appeared to be prepared to experiment and adopt new procedures. It is probable that statutory provisions in the new town planning legislation created an awareness among local authorities that this was an area of responsibility that had to be faced up to. They were, therefore, possibly more receptive to the approach of the Ministry of Health than might otherwise have been the case. But in reading the minutes, documents and press coverage of this episode, the overwhelming impression is gained of the need to embrace a new era of expansion and hope. In South Teesside, it was taken as read that the area would now grow and develop in a way that had been lacking in pre-war days. It was essential in this event to co-operate in providing the means whereby new areas could be opened up and old areas linked together more effectively.

But this renewed sense of optimism did not extend as far as removing all the old prejudices and loyalties. In opting for two committees instead of one, Teesside still showed that it was essentially two counties. It is significant that the largest and most powerful authority was in favour of unity. The north side, in particular, probably thought that they would have to play second fiddle to this weighty south bank influence in a unified committee.

The local press chose to highlight the positive features of the conference. The North East Daily Gazette headed its report 'Greater
Teesside Scheme for Unity of Action by Local Authorities. Important Conference. No more Haphazard Selection of Sites for Houses and Works.' (11) George Pepler was no doubt pleased. In his tireless espousal of town planning ideals he would have found this a good summary. His own words to the conference are worth quoting as they illustrate the way town planning was conceived at this stage, particularly in the context of industrial areas.

"Not only should the scheme result in great economy and efficiency with regard to securing the route of arterial roads etc., and the selection of the best strategic sites for industry, but also it should ensure pleasant surroundings for the homes of the people by placing them to the best advantage and reserving food-raising and health-giving land close to their doors." (12)

With these fine principles ringing in their ears the local authority representatives broke up to return to their respective councils to try and gain their support in this new town planning venture.

Unemployment & Town Planning

Toward the end of 1920 and at the beginning of 1921, political and economic events moved sharply away from the hopes of reform and growth to give way to slump and retrenchment. The programmes of social reform launched with such a fanfare by Lloyd George in 1919 had seen his essentially Conservative, Coalition Government through its most difficult period of demobilisation and immediate post-war militant mood. The slump in world trade and consequent rising unemployment caused enough demoralisation in the ranks of organised labour to allow the Government to halt its spending programmes and generally alter course. Against this background the South Tees Joint Town Planning Committee began its first steps in preparing a scheme.
Following the November Conference the various local authorities considered their position. After three months the first Joint Committee meeting took place in February, 1921, to hear the results and prepare the way for progress. George Pepler took the chair until a chairman could be elected. In an interesting introduction to the work of the Committee he was able to turn the slump to his advantage. He pointed out that the financial crisis was holding up development thus giving the Committee,

"a golden opportunity to prepare plans and by town planning schemes, fix and reserve the sites for traffic routes and other public services and safeguard and make provision for amenities so that when the present financial crisis has passed the development of this important region can proceed on the most economical, efficient and comfortable lines for the benefit of the whole community." (13)

Rising local unemployment coloured every aspect of local government at this time. The concern of several authorities to use road schemes as relief schemes was given a more generalised flavour by the local press. In reporting the initial meeting of the South Tees Joint Committee the North Eastern Daily Gazette, stated:

"Whilst the present crisis in trade and industry becomes more acute about Tees-side it is gratifying to note that there has been an acceleration of activity on the part of neighbouring local governing authorities appointed to deal with unemployment problems. Yesterday, on both banks of the Tees conferences whose primary object was to consider ways and means of absorbing in some useful public capacity, the labour left suddenly at a loose end, met and explored the town planning and extension
possession of coping with unemployment distress...what is considered of primary importance is the rapidity of preparation for threatened emergencies." (14)

That report contains a number of inaccuracies but is speaks volumes for the way the unemployment problem was perceived by the 'powers-that-be' in Teesside. There was clearly only one main problem and that was to prevent the unemployed getting out of hand and challenging the established order. Everything had to be subordinate to that end - even Joint Town Planning Committees. Certainly this mood promoted a great sense of urgency in the plan making process.

(ii) Advisory Planning : The South Tees Experience, 1920-29

The experience of advisory planning in South Tees can be divided into two sharply contrasting periods. The first comprised a fairly intensive and controversial few years during which the Plan, by Abercrombie and Adshead, was drawn up. The second was a period of inactivity and seeming apathy in which the main idea of Advisory Planning to use the Plan to encourage co-ordinated local statutory schemes, did not materialise. As we have seen in Chapter 19 the South Tees Committee commissioned Abercrombie and Adshead to prepare a Plan in 1921. The first two years were dominated by disagreements over the two key proposals, the Middlesbrough-Redcar Trunk Road and the new River Tees crossing. Until these issues were resolved the town planning experts could not finalise their draft plan.

Agreeing the Key Proposals

The River Crossing issue exposed a conflict of interests that the new Joint Committee was unable to solve amicably. The Trunk Road question revealed the problem of costs and in so doing raised the level of
parochialism once again. For many local authorities seeking to
undertake or influence development in the inter-war period, the main
problem was usually that they could not afford to do it. In
particular, low rated authorities with heavy poor relief burdens, such
as in South Teesside, found that many projects were beyond their means
unless substantial help was forthcoming from either County Councils or
the Ministry of Transport. Many were forced to take cheap
alternatives. In the case of Teesside such difficulties meant that
the new Tees Bridge, even when the line was finally agreed, would take
a further ten years to complete and in the case of the Trunk Road,
expediency overtook proper planning leading to different widths in
different authority areas.

The Draft Plan

With all these tensions and difficulties far from resolved, the Joint
Committee met in September, 1924, to consider the final draft of the
Plan for South Teesside. With just a few minor amendments the
Committee accepted the Report and plans and agreed to circulate it to
the constituent authorities with the recommendation that they should
incorporate its proposals into their several town planning
schemes. (15)

It was made clear in the foreword to the report that the document was
essentially an advisory scheme whose primary purpose was to guide
development, either public or private, and did not involve the
immediate 'execution of costly works'. The role of the Joint Committee
in town planning was explained thus:

"In dealing with the problem of the proper development of the
Region, members of the Joint Committee have endeavoured to
consider the interests of the Region as a whole rather than of
any particular district. Therefore, in approving the report they do not in any sense pledge the Council's that they respectively represent, but simply offer it to them jointly as the result of their best endeavours to provide for the future development of the whole Region on the most economical, efficient, healthy and attractive lines." (16)

The foreword went on to hope that the Joint Committee might continue so that the local authorities could exchange their experiences and co-ordinate their individual proposals.

The main proposals of the report were accommodated under six separate headings: zoning, density, open space, roads, Tees crossing and seaside resort. In introducing the zoning proposals the report stated what was to become accepted town planning wisdom in these words:

"The indiscriminate mingling of houses and factories is to the serious disadvantage of both; therefore, broad areas, allowing room for expansion should be assigned separately for each in the most serviceable positions. Broadly speaking the land north of the proposed east to west arterial road should be reserved primarily for industry and that south for residence. Particular care being taken to preserve the amenities of the seaside frontage between Redcar and Saltburn." (17)

With a few exceptions, this broad pattern of zoning reflected what was already on the ground, although there was a degree of sophistication in zoning. It allowed for two sections in the Industrial Zone, 'unrestricted' reserved solely for industrial building, and 'clean', reserved primarily but not exclusively for industry which was essentially what we now call 'light' industry. The Residential Zone included some areas which should be developed as focal points of
residential communal activity, separated and defined by some form of open space. The Commercial Zone was to be reserved for office business or shopping areas for the industrial zones whereas the Civic and Shopping Centres would relate primarily to the residential areas. Three new centres were suggested, strung out like beads along the new Trunk Road. The density recommendation was quite simply undiluted 'Unwinism' of a maximum of 12 houses to the acre.

The vision contained in the section on Open Space was a far sighted one. The Professors proposed to link up the old, heavily industrialised parts of Teesside to the pleasant countryside of the Eston Hills to the south and the seaside to the east. This was to be done by making the principal roads from the north into parkways and creating green wedges along the several streams or becks that run from the hills to the Tees. The new Trunk Road was also to be made as a parkway to speed the traveller in pleasant surroundings to the coast. The Eston Hills it was suggested should be reserved as far as possible as a nature reserve, while the coast between Redcar and Marske and Marske and Saltburn should be kept open as sea front.

The road proposals contained several new roads as well as many improvements. Following the salutary experience of trying to implement the arterial Trunk Road the report was careful to point out that it did not expect all of the schemes to be put into hand immediately, nor to the specifications suggested. But it urged the authorities to reserve the necessary land so that ultimately the full road proposals could be implemented.

The section of the Tees Crossing shows four eventual routes, clearly reflecting the several aspirations of the various councils. There was in effect, a crossing for every council with a Tees frontage. This was
most diplomatic. In the original draft the Professors had indicated an order of priority with Newport first, a bridge just south of Thornaby second, a third at Lackenby in Eston and a fourth line in Redcar Borough at the mouth of the Tees. The final version omitted any reference to priority. The concluding section stressed the necessity to ensure that the seaside was both exploited for its pleasure and preserved as an amenity.

The Committee agreed to print the report and to apportion costs between them. (18) The response to the Plan was generally low-key. The local paper supported the basic proposal on roads and bridges but ridiculed the Professors' suggestions for Parkways, Walkways and Nature Reserves as dreams unrelated to the harsh facts of industrial life on Teesside. (19) Local councils appear to have scarcely discussed the matter, while the professional journals either ignored its publication (Town Planning Review) or merely gave it a brief, factual review (Garden Cities and Town Planning Magazine).

The Joint Committee met for the last time in this phase in February, 1925, to finalise details on printing the report and to settle the financial arrangements. It was reported to the Committee that the total expenditure including the experts fee of 500 guineas, came to £692.10.0d. Interestingly the meeting more or less coincided with the public inquiry into the Thornaby Town Planning Scheme which led Preston Kitchen, secretary to the Joint Committee, to express the view that every Council should prepare such schemes. (20) The Committee resolved that before finalising such schemes the constituent authorities should submit the drafts to the Joint Committee for comment, thus enabling a proper Regional approach to be adopted throughout south Teesside. Despite such a positive note it was the last pronouncement of the Joint Committee for four years.
During the four and a half years hiatus no town planning activity can be readily discerned on South Teesside. Such a period of inactivity is difficult to explain. Perhaps there were no deep causes. The authorities had been urged to undertake the Advisory Planning exercise by the Ministry of Health and it was not, therefore, derived from local social or political pressures. Once the Plan had been completed fresh activity would probably have needed the missionary presence of Pepler to ensure progress. No doubt Pepler was well involved elsewhere and so local initiative floundered. It is perhaps surprising that Middlesbrough, under the stern guidance of Preston Kitchen, their Town Clerk, did not undertake a Town Planning Scheme. He later gained a reputation as a keen advocate of town planning. Under the 1919 Act, Middlesbrough and Eston as authorities with over 20,000 population, were obliged to prepare statutory town planning schemes.

There are no clear links between the lack of planning and economic conditions. The years 1927 to 1929 were relatively good ones for iron and steel and shipbuilding so that unemployment was not so bad as other times in the 1920s. However, there was no major no investment either and the level of development never lived up to post-war hopes. Much of the early enthusiasm for town planning on Teesside, both within the area and in Whitehall, lay in the expectation of major new works and accompanying housing developments. Enthusiasm for town planning in the early twenties was sustained partly in the belief that the good times were simply delayed and partly by switching the justification for town planning to the validation of schemes that might be used to alleviate unemployment.

There may too, have been some disenchantment with the town planning
system. Having discharged, what might be seen as their minimum duty, under the promptings of the Ministry and commissioned and produced a Regional Plan, the local authorities might have been unconvinced of the value of further effort. The lack of a direct benefit caused continual problems. Without either a clear government guarantee to help local authorities implement development proposals or a more definite commitment of the County Council with regard to undertaking road improvements under town planning scheme, the Boroughs and Districts could well have decided enough was enough. If this was the case, such a view persisted until local government reorganisation enhanced the role and responsibilities of County Councils in 1929.

(iii) The Statutory Planning Experience of Boroughs, 1920-27

Two examples are considered in this section, Thornaby Borough's attempt at statutory planning between 1920 and 1926 and West Hartlepool County Borough's experience in statutory planning up to 1927. Thornaby's record illustrates the practical and technical problems to be overcome in tackling an activity which was beset with procedural obstacles. West Hartlepool's case shows how other local authorities reacted with suspicion and hostility, seeing town planning as a vehicle for the County Borough's expansionist ambitions.

(a) Thornaby & Statutory Town Planning

Within the South Tees area Thornaby was the first local authority to commence statutory town planning. Why this should be so is not clear. Perhaps it was the result of enthusiastic local officials or it represented a political desire to get certain schemes accepted for unemployment relief. In any event Thornaby Council were considering the issue as early as 1922 and secured acceptance of their Preliminary Statement by December, 1926. It is worth retracing the process of that
undertaking to illustrate the problems facing local authorities tackling the statutory town planning procedures of the 1919 Act.

The First, Faltering Steps

The regulations governing the preparation of a town planning scheme was laid down by the Ministry of Health in March, 1921, in Circular 145 and in a subsequent set of model resolutions, advertisements and notices. The three main stages were: firstly to pass a resolution to prepare a scheme and show the intended area to be covered in a map, called Map No.1; secondly, to submit to the Minister a set of preliminary proposals for the development of the area and to show these on a map called Map No.2; thirdly, to prepare the final scheme and submit it to the Minister. Within each of these different stages there were many points of detail to follow, notices to advertise and consultations to effect. Public inquiries were allowed for in stages 2 and 3. Thornaby's first hesitant steps into the statutory town planning process illustrate how many other local authorities must have begun. In January, 1922, the Plans and Works Committee recommended to Council that a resolution be passed to prepare a Town Planning Scheme in respect of the whole of the land in the Council's area. It is clear from this that the procedure was not fully appreciated. In the first place, as noted before, Town Planning Schemes could only apply to the undeveloped land of the Council (with certain exceptions). Secondly, the Committee ignored the need to prepare a Map showing the area of the intended scheme. For these reasons the Town Clerk was obliged to report to full Council the following week that the matter would have to be further considered by the Plans and Works Committee before they could carry out the recommendation.

In February, 1922, the Town Clerk outlined the procedure of Town
Planning to the Plans and Works Committee and it was agreed to receive a full report from the Borough Engineer, including an estimate of the probable cost.

The following month, March, 1922, the Borough Engineer duly reported. His report is interesting not so much for the setting down in detail of the steps required in following out town planning procedures, but for the sections on the reasons for undertaking town planning. The Engineer concentrated his argument on the practical and economical results rather than the reforming and more visionary elements. An important part of his report was headed, 'Does Town Planning Pay?' Such an approach was in line with much of the planning propaganda of the period. The Committee had already shown that they wanted to proceed with Town Planning, but perhaps it was felt necessary by the officers to make members fully appreciate the 'why' questions as well as the 'how'. The Committee, in any event, agreed to establish a special Town Planning Sub-Committee.

Delays

The dark silences that punctuate the printed minutes of Council business can be frustrating when no other obvious source of light exists to illustrate them. In this case 5 months elapsed before the officials requested permission to purchase the necessary maps and mountings as laid down by the Ministry of Health for the preparation of Map No.1. The Committee agreed. Then followed over 6 months silence and seeming inactivity before it was brought to the attention of the Committee that the Town Planning Sub-Committee had not yet met! It is hard to furnish explanations for so much delay. Both members and officials seemed keen to proceed and yet over a year had elapsed from the time Committee had first agreed to prepare a Town Planning Scheme.
Possibly events were overtaken by more pressing business. Certainly the issue of the new Tees Crossing cropped up in the latter part of this period. But the evidence for this is slim. Perhaps there were difficulties among the officers of the Council. The Borough Engineer was to leave Thornaby for another job the following summer and so may have been out of sympathy with his colleagues. But this is speculation and the delays remain a mystery.

When the Town Planning Sub-Committee finally met in late February, 1923, they resolved to recommend to the main Committee that they approve the appropriate suburban zones as the areas for which they should resolve to prepare a Town Planning Scheme. The following month full Council passed the necessary resolution and Thornaby had thereby jumped over the first main fence.\(^{(24)}\)

Under the Ministry Regulations the Council now had 6 months to prepare and submit their Preliminary Statement. Apart from certain technical hitches connected with unfamiliarity with the procedures, the main obstacle to progress was deciding on the scale of development to adopt in the scheme. When the initial proposals were costed out the Council reluctantly conceded that they couldn't afford all of them. In June, 1923, it was agreed to proceed on the basis of a reduced scheme of £4,674 and to apply to the Ministry of Transport and the North Riding of Yorkshire for grants towards this cost.\(^{(25)}\)

Objections and Consensus

By September, 1923, Thornaby had not completed its proposals and had to apply to the Ministry of Health for a time extension. In agreeing to a further 6 months extension the Ministry urged the Council to co-operate with developers and to refuse only the most obvious and exceptional proposals. Just before Christmas 1923 the Council considered and
agreed a draft Preliminary Statement and Map No.2. The main feature of the Statement rested on its new road proposals, principally for an extension of the Middlesbrough to Redcar Trunk Road and the suggestion for another River Tees Crossing to eventually link up with the Darlington Road.

It is clear from a further appeal for an extension of time in September, 1924, (the third such extension appeal) that Thornaby had received many objections to its proposals. It had been the intention of the Ministry when drawing up the regulations that stage 2 should be a period when, through a process of give and take, the broad features of the plan could be agreed by all the parties. The various objections, however, seemed to cause Thornaby a number of headaches.

In January, 1924, they wrote to the National Housing and Town Planning Council asking them to suggest a suitable book to guide them. Henry Aldridge, Secretary to the NHTPC, recommended Professor Adshead's recent book, *Town Planning and Town Development* (26). Two months later the Council were again seeking advice. This time they wrote to the Municipal Corporations Association asking them to obtain Counsel's opinion on whether or not they could, in their proposed Scheme, override layout plans which they had approved prior to commencing their Town Planning Scheme. Counsel's opinion was that they could do so but they would be liable to compensation unless the Minister invoked Section 20 of the 1923 Housing Act.

**The Public Inquiry and Approval**

In September, 1924, the Ministry agreed to another 6 months extension. By the end of the year it was obvious that agreement could not be reached with certain objectors and so a Public Inquiry was arranged for February, 1925. The main issue to arise out of the inquiry was the
confusion about a further Tees Crossing. A North Tees Joint Town Planning Scheme was underway on the other side of the river and the position of the proposed Thornaby/Stockton bridge was slightly different in the two schemes. A Conference was hastily convened and County and Borough Engineers asked to agree the proper position for such a bridge if and when it was ever constructed.

Throughout 1925 correspondence flowed between Thornaby and the Ministry of Health on the issues raised at the Public Inquiry into the Thornaby Preliminary Statement. By the end of the year there were still several outstanding items. The main problem lay in insistence by the Ministry of Health that the Statement should adopt certain minimum widths for new and widened roads. The Borough were unprepared to do this unless they could either get an assurance of Ministry of Transport help or County aid. A Ministry of Health Circular issued towards the end of November, 1925, was directed at precisely this point. It sought to get the County Councils to co-operate with Boroughs in preparing town planning schemes and asked them to bear costs where appropriate. (27)

Yet another year was to pass before Thornaby felt able to accept the Minister's modifications. Finally on 17th December, 1926, Thornaby's Preliminary Statement received approval and a Town Planning (Interim Development) Order was issued as a legal basis for controlling future development. Thornaby, like many other authorities, decided to go no further. What, strictly speaking should have taken 7 months had taken yearly 4 years!

Conclusions

The experience of Thornaby in undertaking statutory town planning between 1922 and 1926 illustrates some of the difficulties involved in the procedure and practice of the 1919 Act. They show not only the
problems of implementing the various stages of a Town Planning Scheme, but indicate the lack of a clear relationship to the advisory work of the regional body, the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee.

One of the advances of the 1919 Act over the 1909 Act was the simplification of procedure, particularly at the first stage when permission had been required from the Local Government Board to proceed with a Scheme. Nevertheless, as the example of Thornaby shows, the ending of this requirement did not necessarily lead to a swift conclusion of the first stage. For authorities new to town planning, like Thornaby, there were many pitfalls and problems. Inexperienced officers, unversed in the legislation and administrative requirements could, and did, cause delays. Such delays could be compounded by a lack of interest by members of the Council. A combination of such circumstances may have contributed to the fact that Thornaby took about 12 months from the time they expressed a desire to pursue a Scheme to the date when they actually passed a formal resolution to do so.

The struggle to carry out stage 2 of the town planning process, the preparation and final agreement of a Preliminary Statement, is more interesting in that it involved a three-way relationship between the Council, Central Government and local landowners. The philosophy underlying this relationship was that there should be a minimum of coercion. As Circular 145 put it:

"Any objections are to be carefully considered and conferences arranged with a view to securing, so far as possible, agreement on matters covered by the Statement." (28)

The original intention was that this attitude should relate to the relationship between the local authority and the local landowners as part of the consensus approach, but it was carried through to the
relationship between the local authority and the Ministry of Health. This meant that in the case of Thornaby, for instance, the sorting out of local objections, prior to a Ministry-held local inquiry took some two years, followed by a further year or more of discussions with the Ministry of Health over their proposed modification. There seems little doubt that such long drawn-out procedures sapped the spirit and interest of both local authority officials and councillors. Almost inevitably the process of planning by agreement meant a watering down of the authority's proposals. Most of the objections related to land required for new roads and widenings or land allocated for allotments. Where these were likely to have a fairly immediate impact the local objections were strongest, and often the local authority was forced to alter or modify its proposals. On the other hand, longer-term improvements, usually with financial implications for the local authority, were 'beefed-up' by the Ministry. To some extent then, the local authority was 'piggy-in-the-middle' between the landowner and central government. It may be that by subjecting the local authority to differing pressures the resulting scheme was the most effective compromise that could be reached by agreement. On the other hand, the results were less than startling and clearly in the case of Thornaby, a disappointment to the councillors and officials. There seemed to be little incentive to proceed to the even more complicated third and final stage of the process.

A key element in the theory of regional town planning as outlined by George Pepler to the assembled authorities at the Thornaby Conference of 1920 was that it would provide a framework within which the statutory plans of the individual authorities would operate. The closest analogy to subsequent town planning practice is probably the regional plans produced in the 1960s and 1970s which had no statutory
basis but were intended to inform the lower tier Development Plans. The scale was very different but the relationship similar. The relationship of Structure Plans to Local Plans presents a closer scale of plans but statutory responsibilities underlie both.

A further difference between the post Second World War planning process and that of the post First World War was the control of development. During the 1920s there could be no effective control of development until a resolution to prepare a Development Order had been approved and an Interim Development Order obtained. This did not provide a 'carte blanche' to the local authority to do all that it wanted, since compensation provisions could still present difficult problems. But if an authority wanted to exert an influence on the way its area was to develop, it had to embark on the first stages of the planning process. It was this fact, rather than the desire to put flesh on to the general regional proposals that impelled authorities like Thornaby to undertake town planning. The setting up of the South Tees Joint Town Planning Committee provided encouragement and created a more informed and aware background in which the local councillors and officials operated. It was perhaps, the trigger for Thornaby to engage in a town planning scheme, but as the subsequent history of the Thornaby Scheme and the South Tees Scheme illustrate, their interdependence was limited and their interests divergent.

The prime, if not the sole, value of the Regional Scheme to Thornaby lay in the establishment of main communication lines. In this instance this included the extension to the Middlesbrough/Redcar Trunk Road and a possible future crossing of the Tees. On this latter issue the Regional Scheme failed to avoid a mistake, whereby the line of the bridge, implied by the approach roads, was presented in slightly different positions in the Thornaby and Stockton Schemes.
Collaboration between the Regional team, under Professors Abercrombie and Adshead and those preparing the Thornaby proposals appear, from the evidence to have been lacking. The Regional proposals were, in fact, not finalised when Thornaby drew up its draft Preliminary Statement. No doubt the Borough officials were well informed as to the effects of the Regional proposals on Thornaby but one might have expected more formal discussions between the two areas to have taken place. Instead each operation appears to have ploughed its own furrow.

(b) The Anti-West Hartlepool Front

The West Hartlepool Town Planning Scheme was undertaken against a background of considerable opposition. As we have seen, the Council sought permission to embrace a scheme area much wider than its own boundaries, including substantial parts of the adjacent Rural District and some areas of Hartlepool Town Council. West Hartlepool justified the extent of the scheme on the grounds that industrial developments over the previous ten years were likely to continue and much land, currently used as agricultural land, would be developed over a thirty year period. (29)

As noted in Chapter 19 the reaction of the other local authorities was hostile. The Rural District Council pointed out that the scheme was opposed by many large landowners as well as themselves. The County Council response was also very guarded and behind the scenes there was a view that West Hartlepool was using the town planning scheme to prepare the way for future extensions to its boundary. The Local Government Board took some of the objections on board in 1917 and reduced the scheme area to 3,800 acres, leaving out much of Greatham Parish in the south of the area, bordering the Tees estuary. (See Map F).
Reaction to West Hartlepool's Preliminary Statement

Little progress was made to the scheme for nearly ten years. When details of the West Hartlepool scheme were finally prepared and circulated for comment, many of the old antagonisms and oppositions reappeared. Hartlepool Town Council, in particular, responded by deciding to undertake their own town planning scheme. Durham County, on the other hand, were noticeably restrained. The County Clerk circulated West Hartlepool's proposals to all County departments. The Director of Agriculture was reasonably positive despite the scheme containing proposals to zone two County Smallholding estates for housing and suggesting new roads across these sites. The Director said he would not object provided that the County were not called upon to pay for the roads. This contrasts markedly with the stance taken over the North Tees proposals for the Stockton Grange smallholdings and lends weight to the view formed in Whitehall that Durham County's reaction owed more to a built-in hostility to anything Stockton wanted to do rather than a measured, objective view. The County Engineer made a number of critical comments about the scheme generally but was at pains to point out that his observations were made in a friendly spirit. The only antagonistic note came from the Medical Officer of Health who not only objected to the inclusion of such a large area for future industry but saw the whole exercise as 'an excuse for an application to extend the County Borough boundary'.

Another light is shed on the Director of Agriculture's attitude when he was asked for his comments on the Hartlepool Town Scheme area. The Director pointed out that the overlap area of the two schemes was partly owned by the County Council, i.e. Throston Grange and Middle Warren Smallholdings. He said he was keen to support town planning in this area as there was a virgin block of land there which was costly to
work from an agricultural point of view. This area was being thrown open for development by the East Coast Road. He thought it was highly desirable that this prospective development should be on appropriate town planning lines. (33)

Conflict comes to a head

A conference between all the parties in October, 1927, brought the matter to a head. Hartlepool Town Council began by insisting that they should be allowed to proceed with their scheme and should have precedence over the County Borough. They claimed that the area was the only one where they could build and that any sewage system and drainage would have to come through their area. West Hartlepool stated that their scheme had started in 1913. The County Council acted as 'honest broker' and suggested that what was required in the situation was a Joint Town Planning Committee. As an incentive to the County Borough the County Council suggested that a much larger scheme area be applied for. The Rural District Council expressed their desire to act in a spirit of co-operation with West Hartlepool but that it was immaterial to them whose scheme their land fell in. (34)

The Move to Consensus

At this delicate stage the Ministry of Health in the person of Mr. Pepler, intervened. Shortly after the conference of local authorities he met the Town Clerk of the County Borough. At this time the County Borough were still concerned to maintain sole town planning power. The Town Clerk told George Pepler that the scheme would be prepared much more expeditiously by West Hartlepool alone than by a Joint Committee. But if it were not possible to obtain the agreement of Hartlepool Town and the Rural District then West Hartlepool were prepared to accept co-opted members from these two authorities onto its Town Planning Committee.
A further conference, with Pepler in attendance, was arranged to thrash the matter out. The County Council had sought to impress on the Ministry of Health, behind the scenes, the need for a Joint Committee with County involvement. In a letter to the Ministry the County stated that "at the earlier conference the position which impressed them most strongly was the very marked dissatisfaction which was exhibited by both the Borough of Hartlepool and the Rural District Council at the manner in which the West Hartlepool scheme was being developed." A reply from the Ministry stated their agreement with the County that what was needed was a Joint Committee. Pepler's persuasive powers succeeded and there was an agreement to form a Joint Committee. (35)

West Hartlepool's Scheme Fails

With the County Council and the Ministry of Health ranged against West Hartlepool's 'go-it-alone' policy, the County Borough was more or less forced to yield its position. There is little doubt that the County Council's tactful and positive approach was a crucial factor in resolving this conflict. Their motives were to obtain the maximum influence at a time when County Councils had no legal right to town planning involvement. They had pioneered an active role alongside the local authorities in their work with the South Tyneside Joint Town Planning Committee. The Ministry of Health had sought to encourage a degree of participation for County Councils by urging Town Planning Authorities to consult the Counties particularly on the issue of Main Roads. But Durham County had gone much further in the case of South Tyneside where they took places on the Joint Committee. To get around the legal position, Durham had made a contribution to the finances of the Joint Committee by a one-off payment to meet the cost of the experts' preliminary report. However, the Ministry of Health questioned Durham's position with regard to the Hartlepool Joint
Committee and pointed out that the County could not become a constituent member of the Joint Committee under present legislation. The County cleverly replied that they understood this and would not be agreeing to pay a contribution on the basis of Rateable Value, as the other authorities were, but might consider a lump sum payment should the Joint Committee find themselves in need of money. (36)

The way had, therefore, been created to end West Hartlepool's bid to dictate the process and content of town planning in the Hartlepool area. The event illustrates the difficulties facing large authorities who naturally sought a wider context for town planning. The logic of Joint Town Planning on a sub-regional basis is borne out most clearly in this case study.

(iv) Statutory Planning : The Executive Joint Committees, 1924-1933

If the 1920s had been characterised, in town planning terms, by the Advisory Regional Plan, produced by consultants, the 1930s were dominated by Statutory Regional Schemes produced by executive Joint Town Planning Committees. By the end of the 1920s over 30 Advisory Plans had been produced. By the end of the 1930s there were over 100 executive Joint Committees actively pursuing statutory schemes. In the Teesside and Hartlepool area three such committees were at work and their general success and failures are recorded below. The South Teesside experience was relatively short and this is reflected in the material presented here. By contrast North Tees covered 10 years of activity and can demonstrate completion of all stages, although not the implementation of schemes. Hartlepool's experience lies between the two in terms of period of activity.
In the brief period covered by this survey town planning activity became much more vigorous and purposeful. The appointment of a Professional Town Planner and two Assistants meant that the activity was pursued as part of the regular process of local government administration. Geoffrey Knowles, the Town Planner appointed by the Committee, not only undertook the preparation of the town planning scheme but also instituted development control procedures across the area. Every month Knowles held meetings with the Engineers or Surveyors of the local authorities to examine all building and layout plans submitted to the authority for approval. He sent standard Ministry Planning Application Forms to each authority which introduced a standard procedure throughout the area.

The establishment of a Technical Sub-Committee to the Joint Committee meant that the Engineers and Surveyors of every constituent authority were involved in the technical details of town planning on a regular basis. Between February, 1932, and the end of 1933, much more detailed progress was made on the whole range of town planning matters than ever before. Proposals covering roads, open spaces, aerodromes, density issues, character zoning, petrol filling stations were all discussed in some depth and recommendations approved. Updating the Ordnance Survey Maps was also undertaken.

Success cannot be seen easily in terms of roads built or ribbon development prevented – the time-scale of this period is too short – but what can be charted is the building up of local knowledge and expertise in an activity which hitherto had been only sketchily dealt with. By 1933 and the start of the new Town and Country Planning Act, town planning practice was firmly lodged into the time-table and the
minds of both local authority officials and Members. By undertaking a statutory scheme the local authorities became locked into the procedures and regulations laid down by the Ministry of Health. Standard procedures and Model Clauses for inclusion into the planning scheme became a familiar diet of Borough Engineers and Surveyors. Arguably this spade work laid an essential basis for the future development of town planning in the South Teesside area.

(b) North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee, 1924-1933

The story of the North Tees Joint Town Planning Committee has been sketched in Chapter 19. This section examines the general success and failure of the work of that Committee. The Committee was given delegated powers and as the first executive Joint Committee in the country can be seen of something of a pioneer. It succeeded in gaining approval for its scheme in April, 1933, nearly ten years after commencing work on it.

The success or failure of the activity can be assessed in terms of the content of the scheme, success in implementation and the degree to which town planning activity became an accepted feature of the constituent local authorities' work in this period.

Proper assessment of the North Tees planning proposals is difficult because, as we have seen, so many of the key proposals were defeated by opponents of the scheme. The buffer zone idea, the main road improvements and the many other road schemes were either excluded altogether or altered out of all recognition. On this basis much can be seen as decided failure. But what of the agreed proposals?

When Lanchester gave his evidence at the Preliminary Statement stage he indicated that the strategy of the plan was to seek a broad east-west
division of land use. To the east, which was low-lying and bordered the River Tees, industry would predominate and to the west on the higher land would be situated the main residential districts with only minor areas of industry. Communications, as in South Teesside were seen as a crucial aspect of the scheme. There was perceived to be a need for improved road communications between the east and west to link the industry and residential areas as well as much better communications with Middlesbrough, Hartlepool and Darlington.

The division of overall land use between east and west parts of the area was reasonably successful. But, as in the case of South Teesside, the division was largely a natural one. Only the development of Haverton Hill cut across the scheme proposals so far as this policy area is concerned and that was largely begun before the scheme was underway. The Haverton Hill estate had been built by the Furness Company to provide housing for their shipyard workers. But Billingham had added houses there in the 1920s to alleviate the pressure for housing caused in part by the rise of the chemical works. The prevailing westerly winds meant that conditions of life on the Haverton Hill estate were always appalling. The situation was not rectified until the 1970s when the estate was finally demolished. The relationship of the area to ICI Billingham can be seen on Map G.

The road proposals were generally not very successful. Many were never built. Links to the chemical works at Billingham were notoriously difficult and a cause of much dissatisfaction throughout this period. Newport Bridge and associated roads to the north side were not built until the 1930s. A Billingham by-pass was proposed and eventually built, but not in the period under consideration here. No doubt the lack of resources available to Stockton played its part. The County Council's hostility to Stockton and initially to the Joint Committee
also hindered any new road building efforts. Crucial links between the developing residential areas of North Stockton and the industrial zones to the east did eventually materialise but not always in accord with the planning proposals of the North Tees scheme. Similarly the areas to the south of Stockton, for which a major new road was envisaged, had to make do with an inadequate road system.

The record of how far the individual authorities in North Tees developed an expertise and understanding of town planning matters is less well documented than in South Teesside. Evidence is given below that the Stockton-on-Tees Engineer was not very enthusiastic about town planning and he was the lead officer for the North Tees scheme. The assessment by Major Lockhart, who made the remark about the Stockton Engineer may not have been accurate but there does not appear to have been the same detailed involvement by the Borough Engineer in the scheme as in South Teesside. Perhaps the failure to adopt a Technical Sub-Committee in North Tees was a contributing factor. Billingham officials were involved in detailed considerations because theirs was the one area that was in receipt of massive industrial and housing developments. They were therefore obliged to maintain a close involvement in all town planning matters and were in constant dialogue with the Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Company.

The Issue of Antagonism Between Durham County and the North Tees JTPC

The issue examined here is the more general one of the attitude to the Joint Committee of Durham County and vice versa and the opinion formed in the Ministry of Health about the Joint Committee. The matter was referred to a number of times in the course of the last chapter. The records of the Ministry of Health are invaluable in breaching the rather stolid atmosphere of Local Authority Minutes and correspondence.
Whilst there are some indications of tension between the County and the local authorities from local records, the main information is contained in the Report of Major Lockhart after the public inquiry of 1930 and some appended comments of George Pepler. Prior to this date the main evidence for tension has already been discussed in the context of the Main Roads issue and the Smallholdings issue.

**Major Lockhart's Report**

Major Lockhart deals with some of the problems of the North Tees scheme and the role of the Joint Committee with considerable frankness, although we have no way of knowing whether his judgement was sound. On the question of the relations between the County Council and the Joint Committee he noted:

"The County Surveyor complained that Stockton had not consulted him on roads in the Stockton area. This may be an exaggeration but there is unfortunately no doubt that the County Council and Stockton Corporation are at daggers drawn." (37)

Major Lockhart was less than impressed with the work of the Joint Committee.

"It is somewhat disquieting however, to find that the lines (of roads, D.G.) as shown on the Preliminary Statement have not proved to be workable in practice." (38)

Lockhart then details a number of instances when road proposals were found to be unworkable due to swampy ground or poor levels for sewers. In another instance he accuses the Joint Committee of 'slackness' and 'faults of draughtsmanship'.(39)

On the issue of consultation Lockhart says that he felt the Joint
Committee should have had more meetings with owners. He accuses Stockton officers of being "inclined to take a somewhat lighthanded attitude which does not tend to amicable negotiation" and suggests that 'Stockton Rural District are mere shadows who automatically follow where Stockton Corporation Lead.' (40)

He is also scathing about H.V. Lanchester:

"Mr. Lanchester, eminent though he undoubtedly is in his own sphere, is lost when up against people of the calibre of the Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited and serious difficulties have only been avoided by the tact of the Billingham officials." (41)

Lockhart concludes that the Joint Committee have tried to do the work with inadequate staff and says,

"This has been a very unsatisfactory and disheartening case to deal with, and I am far from satisfied with the final result. I have, all through, had the greatest difficulty in obtaining any information either from Mr. Lanchester or the Borough Surveyor. The Borough Surveyor has no knowledge at all of the subject and openly expresses the opinion that town planning is unnecessary." (42)

Only Billingham comes in for praise from Lockhart. According to him the Billingham representatives on the Joint Committee were often so incensed at the way the Joint Committee was run that they refrained from attending.

Much of Major Lockhart's comments should be treated with caution. On the issue of Billingham for instance, the Joint Committee was chaired from its inception until 1929 by Mr. Gilhespy from Billingham Urban
District. He must, therefore, take some of the blame if the Joint Committee was being run as badly as Major Lockhart suggests. But George Pepler in a handwritten memo does add some credence to Lockhart's views by saying that Major Lockhart 'has straightened out a most awkward tangle'. (43)

**County Council Antagonism**

Further evidence also comes from the County Surveyor in a report to the Works Committee in 1931 concerning the proposed affiliation of the County Council to the Joint Committee. In his report the Surveyor sets out the history of the Joint Committee and suggests that the County Council was not welcome to the Joint Committee.

"I must point out that during this time (i.e. 1922-1929) the County Council was not a party to the scheme, and had no representation on the Joint Committee, notwithstanding the views expressed by the Minister in his Circular Number 646 dated 23rd November, 1925, and with the withdrawal of the Main Roads from the scheme, the Works Committee had no further interest in the Town Planning Scheme." (44)

The Surveyor also conveys the impression that even after the 1929 Local Government Act when the County Council could legitimately become involved that this was on sufferance.

"This was agreed to (i.e. the County's representation on the Joint Committee D.G.) by the statutory Joint Town Planning Committee on condition that the County Council were only interested as from the 1st April, 1930, and had no power whatever to interfere with anything which had happened prior to that date." (45)
Quite a lot of the Surveyor's report would appear to be misrepresentation and it is not clear whether such statements stemmed from a genuine mistake or were designed to stoke-up anti-Joint Committee feelings among County councillors. In any event, they do illustrate the degree of antagonism between the two parties. This is mirrored in the other parts of Teesside and Hartlepool and suggests that suspicion between certain tiers of local authorities was a general tendency, and one might add, something which has not by any means been eradicated. There is also evidence that these tensions were fuelled by a greater degree of parochialism than exists today, although here too there are grounds for the view that parochialism remains a potent force among local communities.

(c) Hartlepoools Joint Town Planning Committee, 1928-1933

The new Hartlepoools Joint Committee, formed in 1928, comprised the three Hartlepool authorities together with the active support of Durham County. The Committee was given delegated powers and moved very quickly to assemble a draft Preliminary Statement. The scheme area was enlarged from West Haratlepool's scheme to embrace areas to the north and south of the main Hartlepool settlement. The scheme area, apart from the built-up zones, is very similar to the extent of modern Hartlepool District. The area was 14,593 acres, nearly five times the extent of the old scheme. (See Map F).

Although the Joint Committee declined to appoint a professional advisor they did establish a Technical Sub-Committee comprising the Engineers of the local authorities and the County Engineer. This Committee met regularly and as in South Teesside this meant that the techniques and procedure of town planning were disseminated throughout the district. But since Durkin, West Hartlepool's Engineer, was chairman of the
Technical Sub-Committee and the lead technical officer, the County Borough dominated proceedings. There is no indication from the records that Interim Development Control processes developed as they did in South Teesside. Large developments however, were considered by the Sub-Committee, as in, for instance, the proposed layout of the new Stranton Estate in West Hartlepool.

The draft Preliminary Statement was prepared within a year of the Joint Committee setting up. (46) Over 44 schemes for new or improved roads were included. Of these proposals five were described as Main Roads. There were two sea coast roads, described as 'promenades' which were designed to protect the sea coast amenities. The growth of leisure pursuits and particularly day tripping to the seaside were expected to increase pressure on the attractive sea coasts north and south of Hartlepool. The several ring roads proposed in the old West Hartlepool scheme were not put forward in this scheme except for an outer ring designed to take north-south traffic out of Hartlepool. The other main road proposals included links from Hartlepool to Durham and to the Stockton-Sunderland road.

Most of the new industry was seen as developing around the existing areas or to gravitate to the south, near to the River Tees and Greatham Creek. Some of this latter area was reclaimed estuarine land.

The plan included an attempt to protect the amenity of the sea coast and Crimdon Dene, a local beauty spot comprising a deeply incised valley running to the sea. The fear was that the Dene and the nearby sea areas would come under pressure from shack development and other poor quality building.

The success of the Preliminary Statement as a strategy for future developments is mixed. Many of the proposed roads did not get built.
The north promenade was not built as envisaged, but its successor may have been sited so that development along the coast was prevented rather better than if the original plan had gone ahead. A promenade along the sea edge might have attracted ribbon development that would, under the powers available at the time, have been difficult to prevent. A southern promenade was built at Seaton Carew using unemployment grants. Main link roads to the west and north were not built as originally intended, nor was the ring road, designed to reduce through traffic.

Industrial development tended to concentrate in the south, near Graythorp and the Greatham Creek. Areas around the existing steel works just to the south of the town centre came under intense pressure for expansion. At the draft scheme stage, after 1933, expansion plans of the South Durham Steel and Iron Company were blocked by the plan which had zoned the Company's land for residential use. The Joint Committee was forced to amend its proposals in the face of the powerful company's pressure.

Protection was afforded to the vulnerable Crimdon Dene and the sea dunes of North Hartlepool and very few disfiguring shacks or bungalows were built there, unlike other similar coastal areas in Britain at this time.

The overall impression is that planning in Hartlepool as in the other town planning areas was a mixed success so far as effective proposals were concerned. The lack of money delayed many road proposals to the point where events altered their validity. Powerful business interests as in North Tees, were able to secure industrial land where they wanted despite the wishes of the Joint Committee. The plans provided useful experience and laid the basis for future post-war developments in
strategic planning which together with the practical and technical knowledge gained in undertaking town planning in this period was an essential bedrock to build upon.

**Success & Failure - An Overview**

The local balance sheet of success and failure in town planning between 1919 and 1933 is, as might be expected, a mixed one. In many ways the experience backs up the observations made in an earlier chapter which considered success and failure in national terms. Given limited sets of objectives for town planning it was relatively successful. Whilst only one statutory scheme was completed on Teesside and Hartlepool the level of local authority engagement was considerably enhanced and eventually embraced every local authority. Less positively, the quality of planning proposals was considerably reduced through successful objections and the planning control mechanism was perceived to be weak and ineffective. Nevertheless the activity at local level persisted and grew. In the process much was learned about statutory land-use planning and a considerable fund of knowledge and expertise accumulated in a period previously considered to be lacking in useful experience. Taking the three main routes to town planning identified in this Chapter a brief summary can be offered for each.

The Advisory Planning route adopted by the South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committee in the 1920s did not lead, as expected to individual authorities undertaking individual schemes within the Advisory Plan framework. In this respect it failed. But it did spur on two major schemes, the Middlesbrough-Redcar Trunk Road, and the new Tees crossing. It was also a valuable benchmark for all future plans and in its basic principles has never really been superseded.

Statutory town planning by individual authorities made relatively
little progress. It might be argued that much practical experience was gained by the likes of Thornaby and West Hartlepool. But there was little to show for much effort and frustration.

The executive Joint Committees proved the more lasting vehicle for local town planning. They did provide a valuable collaborative approach and helped overcome local objections to cost and lack of experience. But in terms of achievement they reflected the continuing weakness of planning legislation, the obstacles to completing schemes quickly and the lack of power of resources to implement proposals.
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This, the final chapter in this Part, considers the problems of agreeing and then implementing specific town planning proposals. Two case studies, the Thornaby to Redcar Trunk Road and the River Tees Crossing, are chosen to illustrate the difficulties facing local authorities seeking to get schemes off the ground during the period 1919 to 1933. Whilst much of the early controversy occurred during the early 1920s, both schemes continued to cause concern throughout the study period.

In many ways the material presented here provides additional evidence for exploring the theme, success and failure. For many local people the only way of judging town planning was the extent to which it achieved change on the ground. The ability to deliver new improvements to the area was, therefore, a vital test of the activity. But the studies also point-up the other theme, consensus, not in terms of competing uses of land but in terms of agreement between authorities about how best to proceed on specific initiatives. Finally the studies also illustrate in greater detail than before what it was like for local authorities, planning advisors and the Ministry of Health to undertake practical schemes of improvement.

1. The Thornaby - Saltburn Trunk Road

The centrepiece of town planning on South Teesside after the First World War was to be a major road running west to east from its western boundary in Thornaby, through Middlesbrough and then running parallel to the River Tees and about two miles from it, through Eston, South Bank, Grangetown and thence through the Dorman Long landholding past Dormanstown to Redcar. The line of the road then continued to link the coastal resorts of Redcar, Marske and Saltburn. The total length of the road was to be 16½ miles. (see Map I)
The Purpose of the Road

The purpose of the road was outlined by Professor Abercrombie and Professor Adshead in their Report on the South Teesside Scheme, published in 1925. They said,

"It is a road which has two main functions, firstly, that of being an east to west connection brought as near up to the southern boundary of the built-up areas as possible, secondly, as before mentioned, it serves as a line of demarcation between industrial and residential districts in the portion of its length that extends from Thornaby to Redcar. Indeed the function of the road may be said to change its character from Redcar onwards. Up to this point it is largely of an industrial nature, providing a long felt connection by road for existing communities and as a means of opening up new areas. From Redcar onwards, it is a seaside road, destined to provide easier access from not only the industrial areas of South Teesside but westwards from beyond Stockton and Darlington. The road must therefore vary in width and character in accordance with the requirements of different types of areas through which it passes."

Early Planning

It is possible that such a road had been projected for some time. Mention is made of it in the Middlesbrough Borough Minutes in 1920 and prior to that Abercrombie and Adshead had incorporated part of it in their plan for Dormanstown, which they designed in 1917. Certainly within weeks of Abercrombie and Adshead being appointed to prepare a scheme for South Teesside they were in discussion with the relevant local authorities to discuss the line of the road. The advisors had
been appointed in February, 1921 and by September of that year the Joint Committee had approved both the line of the road, its basic functions and the various widths and component parts. But not without opposition. There was a desire to proceed quickly so that the individual councils could make applications to central government for approval to undertake the scheme with the aid of unemployment grants and thereby assist their local unemployed. But in this haste the objections of Middlesbrough and other local authorities to aspects of the scheme were overridden. However, the history of this road shows that it was to be dogged by problems and controversies. Its early success belied a long drawn out struggle to achieve the full proposals of Abercrombie and Adshead. In fact the road was never built to the original specifications.

The Parkway Concept

The wise statement, quoted above, that the new road must vary in width according to the type of area through which it passes, was written in 1925 after a great deal of difficulty in getting a uniform width. The original proposal of Abercrombie and Adshead had envisaged a road for the new motor car age based on the latest ideas from America. These wide, attractive roads were called 'parkways' and sought to introduce a concept of the linear green wedge to link urban and recreational areas. The plan for the Trunk Road was not a full-blown parkway, although that term was used on occasions. The width of the road was to be 120 feet comprising a dual carriageway, grass verges, footpaths and a central tree-lined area in which trams would run.

Middlesbrough oppose plans for the Trunk Road

In the face of opposition from Middlesbrough, who wanted only a 40 foot width road in the built-up areas, a concession was agreed and a 60 foot
width agreed for the built-up zones of Middlesbrough. The Chairman of the Joint Committee, whilst welcoming the road scheme sounded a cautionary note saying,

"...he would hesitate to ask the ratepayers to contribute very much towards the road, but if the Government came forward in a generous spirit the authorities would not be lacking. It should be a national scheme." (2)

But Middlesbrough remained highly cautious and for a period refused to back the new road. By way of contrast Eston were the first authority to give it official support and were very keen to get on with the work in order to relieve unemployment.

Middlesbrough's decision to oppose the road is interesting. In the same month, September, 1921, that the Joint Committee resolved to recommend the new Trunk Road proposals to the constituent authorities, a major deputation from Middlesbrough went to London to press on Government ministers the need for more assistance. The deputation included Borough Councillors and Aldermen, members of the local Boards of Guardians and M.P's. They met the officials of the Ministry of Labour and stressed that what Middlesbrough required was work and not dole. Despite a number of unemployment schemes there were still 13,000 men out of work. There were two roads currently under construction in the Borough and another three had been recently completed. They pressed for permission to proceed with a further six roads and received assurances that they would be allowed to go ahead with these roads on the basis of a 60% grant of the labour costs. However the Ministry was unable to sanction any expenditure beyond the end of the year. On the issue of the 120 foot Trunk Road the delegation pressed upon the Ministry that it should be a national scheme and not a burden on local
Authorities. They received a promise that this would be looked into but were left with the impression that no assistance would be forthcoming immediately and then only at the normal rate. At a special Council meeting in October, 1921, to consider the recommendations of the Joint Town Planning Committee, a move to reject the Trunk Road Scheme so far as it affected Middlesbrough, was passed by 17 votes to 16. No doubt the general mood of disappointment at the failure of the deputation to secure any definite assurances from Whitehall for more help contributed to this vote. Also there was a general sense of unease that the line through the Borough was inappropriate as well as the width and that the benefit of the new road fell more obviously to Eston and Redcar than to Middlesbrough. Later Middlesbrough rescinded their decision and did endorse the need for such a road but maintained an opposition to the proposed width and its western line through their Borough to Thornaby.

The Thornaby Section

The position of Thornaby, the adjacent urban authority to the west of Middlesbrough, was somewhat mixed. Whilst they did not take the same hostile position as Middlesbrough they were less than enamoured with the proposed route. Thornaby wanted to see the new road cut through their area to the River Tees at a point a few miles below the existing bridge with a view to providing a new link across the Tees to the Darlington road. This line of the road was eventually agreed but not before a considerable amount of debate as to the position of a new Tees crossing. Indeed Thornaby's pressure for a scheme to include a new crossing west of Stockton prompted a new urgency in the general question of a new Tees crossing and this discussion seems to have overtaken the Trunk Road as the major issue of 1922/3.
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The Joint Committee had agreed the Abercrombie-Adshead Trunk Road proposals and, while not all the constituent authorities could agree to lend their full support, progress was still made. Eston, Redcar and Middlesbrough, also began to construct sections of the road in their districts, with the assistance of the Government's unemployment scheme grants in 1922/23.

The Experts' Protest

In July, 1923, Abercrombie and Adshead reviewed progress and were horrified to find that, notwithstanding the Joint Committee's agreed position, the road was being constructed contrary to that agreement. Of course, in reality, there had been no such agreement except at the Joint Committee level. The main difficulty as might have been expected, was the expense of providing for a 120 foot road to the standard described by the town planning advisors. The two professors wrote to the Joint Committee,

"We have to report that we have recently made a careful examination of the whole of the work carried out in connection with the construction of the new road as between Marske and Middlesbrough.

We find that the general line that has been actually adopted, after negotiation with the various owners, is the one which we are pleased to find is almost identical with the provisional line laid down by us, and which was naturally subject to slight deviations due to difficulties of ownership.

We regret to say however, that we are surprised to find, as far as can be seen from the portions constructed, that the general section agreed by your Committee at your meeting of 24th
September, 1921, has nowhere been adopted; not only do different sections of the road, as it passes through the areas of different authorities, vary considerably, but also no section bears any reference whatever to the section which you, as a Committee, agreed." (6)

In the same letter the professors recounted how on a visit made early in 1923 to the area they were concerned to find that the construction work seemed to be different to the agreed section but had been informed that what appeared to be the main road was in fact the side road for local traffic as a first instalment to meet immediate requirements. They followed this up with an inquiry to the Ministry of Transport who informed the professors that details of the road were being settled by the local authorities on the spot. Later visits confirmed their worst fears and they made a detailed examination of the road and found that at Redcar only 49 feet of land had been acquired and a 24 feet road built with two 5 feet paths and 15 feet of grass. In Grangetown a 30 foot road had been adopted, including paths. In Middlesbrough the section adopted appeared to be a 40 feet road and two 10 feet paths. Abercrombie and Adshead concluded,

"We feel that the way the work has been commenced is very regrettable; not only have all the advantages of amalgamation and co-ordination been to a large extent nullified; but also a road is being carried out which is no credit to the area, but which in years to come will be regarded as a great opportunity lost. Moreover, we feel that the Joint Committee and we, as your consultants, ought to have been informed of the changes that have been made when they were proposed." (7)

The letter ended by recommending that the Joint Committee investigate
the matter as a question of urgency. This they did and a month later the Joint Committee met with their consultants, and Mr. Pepler and Colonel Bressey of the Ministry of Transport. Prior to this a degree of recrimination between the local authorities had set in.

Middlesbrough had considered the matter shortly after being notified of the consultants' concern and were reported in the press as being in favour of a 120 feet road provided that the Ministry of Transport would adequately subsidise the project. This was a modification of their earlier stance and as the paper said, should dispel doubts that had gathered in the minds of the community as to the local authority's intentions. The newspaper report noted that the road was not being built according to the original specification and suggested that 'if a thing's worth doing it's worth doing well' and urged the local authorities to act in harmony. (8)

Eston Respond

This drew a response from Mr. Trew, the Chairman of Eston Urban District Council, who wrote to the newspaper the following day endorsing the views of the report but pointed out that Eston were not the villains of the piece,

"When the scheme was first mooted both Middlesbrough and Redcar representatives gave it very little support, because they thought the width of the road was excessive or the scheme too costly. It was owing to the persistence with which Eston U.D.C. pursued the idea as an unemployment scheme that eventually Redcar joined hands with Eston in making a joint application to the Ministry of Transport to proceed with part of the scheme." (9)
Mr. Trew then went on to explain that because the Government were not very liberal with grants and because they did not wish to inflict too heavy a burden on local ratepayers, they decided to compromise by building a 30 feet road as the first instalment of the larger scheme.

Mr. Trew then said,

"I believe I am right in saying that when Redcar and ourselves started our first portions of the work two years ago Middlesbrough had not then made up their minds as to whether they would have a road or not. In any case, it is only within the last few weeks that our Engineer was informed by the Middlesbrough Engineer that Middlesbrough intended to proceed with their first portion of the Trunk Road eastwards to our boundary at a width of 60 feet and that was to be the limit as far as they were concerned for all time. ....and we now learn from the press that Middlesbrough intends to proceed with a 120 feet road....

I venture to say at the moment neither Middlesbrough nor Redcar has purchased any land beyond the respective widths as stated above for the making of the road 120 feet whereas Eston has negotiated with the abutting owners for the reservation of land up to that width, and on one section of the road has actually bought land up to the full width of 120 feet."(10)

Eston's indignation carried on through the November, 1923, meeting of the Joint Committee. This meeting voted to exclude the press but the Eston representatives provided the press with their version of events after the meeting. The official record simply reports that the authorities could not see a justification for spending money on a 120 feet road when a 60 feet road would be sufficient for several years to
come. It was decided that if a wider road was required then the Ministry of Transport should be willing to pay for the extra cost. Since this was the majority view it was agreed to press this position with the Ministry and for the Surveyors to calculate the extra cost to make the road up to 120 feet. (11) Eston agreed with this view to a certain extent but since they had already bought or held reservations on land to enable a 120 feet section to be built they felt aggrieved at the other authorities acting out of line and placing them in a difficult position. More significant than the approach to the Ministry of Transport, that was unlikely to succeed, was the decision to order the various Surveyors to get together and get the scheme into some harmonious form.

Compromise

Eventually an uneasy compromise was agreed. The Ministry would not support the immediate objective and so the local authorities agreed to aim for 120 feet only where it was feasible and in other areas to lower their sights. When Adshead and Abercrombie came to write their final report the formula was adopted that where the road acted as a dividing line between industrial and residential zones, passing through undeveloped land, the road was to be ultimately 120 feet in width, accommodating the ideal section they first put forward. Where the road passed through partially built up areas, as in South Middlesbrough, and where bridges occurred it was recognised that there would inevitably be temporary reductions in width, though nowhere should the main carriageway be permanently reduced below 40 feet. Between Redcar and Marske and Marske to Saltburn the recommended width was to be 50 feet. (12)

The main problems regarding the line of the road occurred in the
built-up zones of South Middlesbrough, Thornaby, and Redcar and the entrance to Saltburn. The solution arrived at for the Middlesbrough section was to try and utilize existing roads with a minimum of demolition. The idea was for a two stage proposal. In the first stage the road would form a ring road to link in the west to the proposed new River Tees Crossing, with a spur to link into the existing road to Thornaby and Stockton. In the longer term a new route was earmarked to cut through southern Thornaby to a new western Tees crossing and thence to link up with the Stockton – Darlington Road, as proposed by Thornaby Council in 1921. (13)

The route through built-up Redcar had to be altered half way through the scheme due to Redcar allowing development over the route first chosen. This illustrates the hazard of planning without compulsory development control powers. As far as Saltburn was concerned the scheme envisaged an expensive bridge over a deep gully. This was the only difficult piece of engineering in the whole scheme. To secure the proposal Saltburn embarked upon a small statutory town planning scheme.

Progress up to 1929

The Abercrombie/Adshead Plan, written in 1924 and published in 1925, set the guidelines for the constituent authorities. When these same authorities met in 1929 to consider revitalising Joint Town Planning they reviewed progress. On the Trunk Road they reported as follows; Middlesbrough stated that they were carrying out the scheme and that the Trunk Road in their Borough would be complete by February, 1930; Redcar reported that the main road had been made in accordance with the scheme but then reiterated their disapproval of the 120 feet width and their preference for 50 feet unless the Government paid for the rest;
Eston had maintained their support for the original 120 feet road and had purchased all the land necessary and had built three miles of the road at a reduced width in the meantime; and Saltburn had reserved land for a 50 feet Trunk Road in accordance with the plan. (14)

**Assessment**

The experience of implementing a major planning scheme in the 1920s was, therefore, decidedly mixed. On the one hand the road was gradually built but on the other it was neither built to the grand specification of the original idea nor did it achieve a conformity at a lower standard. It might be said that in this instance neither the 'New Teesside' nor the 'Efficient Teesside' was achieved. The authorities themselves had quarrelled and had been less than united in their work. But they were probably more disillusioned with central government who exhorted them to plan constructively and imaginatively but were not prepared to provide additional resources.

The concept locally of a job badly done was not the universal view. The local paper reported in 1929 to a headline, 'Tees-side's New Road - Solving a Traffic Problem - 'Death Trap' Avoided',

"The authorities of Middlesbrough and Eston Urban District are wide awake to the great possibilities of this new artery, which it is expected to be completed by the end of this year. It will relieve the congestion of heavy traffic on the present Middlesbrough to South Bank Road. At the same time the road will give an impetus to the building of works and dwellings in the likely event of Middlesbrough's future growth." (15)

This optimistic report did refer to some of the problems Middlesbrough had been having obtaining grants from the Government to complete a
difficult section in the built-up part of town. This was to be a problem that dogged the completion of the remainder of the scheme in the 1930s.

Progress in the 1930s

The main problems to be sorted out by the South Teesside Joint Committee once they had decided to become an executive Committee to carry out a scheme was to tackle the issue of uniformity and to overcome bottlenecks at bridging points. The main issue on uniformity was the refusal of Redcar to construct beyond 50 feet despite the fact that Middlesbrough had built to 60 feet and Eston had acquired sufficient land to build to that and beyond. The Eston representatives did not mince their words, they described it as a 'fiasco' and said it was futile if they move recommendations to local authorities who just did as they liked. Pepler agreed saying,

"The road is satisfactory to some extent but it was a pity Redcar had decided to make a 50 feet road instead of maintaining the continuity of a uniformly wide road." (16)

The inclusion of the North Riding was looked upon as an opportunity to overcome some of the problems. But this hope soon turned to bitterness when in the climate of financial restraint brought on by the national crisis of 1931 the County Council declined to complete a missing link in the Trunk Road that came under their jurisdiction. The Ministry of Transport also came in for a good deal of criticism.

In October, 1931, Eston reported that they had been forced to suspend work on the construction of a bridge for the Trunk Road owing to the Ministry of Transport cutting their grant. A strong letter of protest was sent off to the Ministry by the Joint Committee. It may have been
this issue that led Eston representatives to try and suspend the activities of the Joint Committee for at least six months.\(^{(17)}\) The move failed but it is an interesting local sidelight on the atmosphere created by the national 1931 financial and political crisis.

In December, 1931, attention turned to the North Riding when it was reported that the North Riding did not intend to proceed with the construction of the main Trunk Road at Grangetown due to the lack of Government support. This decision was roundly attacked. Alderman Scott of Eston pointed to the disgraceful state of the existing roads and expressed his great concern. He was backed by the Town Clerk for Redcar who said it was false economy to save threepence and spend sixpence to do it. He also thought that there was a danger to life in the present diversion of traffic. It was generally felt that even in view of the economy campaign the scheme should have preferential treatment. Thornaby also reported that they too were victims of the Government's cuts and that they were convinced that the Ministry was definitely against proceeding with the Thornaby section of the Trunk Road. It was agreed to press the Ministry for a grant on that section too.\(^{(18)}\) Other problems related to the Trunk Road rested more with local factors. The coastal section from Marske to Saltburn had not yet been started. A new line had to be agreed due to the building of seven bungalows on the original line, but it still involved acquiring properties. In fact the road was never to be built as intended in this section.

Further anger occurred when the Ministry of Transport revealed to the Joint Committee in March, 1932, that the decision to stop work on the Grangetown link of the Trunk Road was due to the North Riding County Council. The Town Clerk of Redcar remarked,
"It seems that we have been concentrating upon the enemy afar and have overlooked the enemy at our doorstep." (19)

Apparently the County Council had offered up the Grangetown scheme in response to the Government's request to take all practicable measures to effect savings in view of the urgent need for economy in public expenditure. Opinion was split but many thought that the scheme should have been given priority by the County Council. Others accepted the County's decision since the route was safeguarded.

Abercrombie/Adshead's ideal finally abandoned

A Technical Sub-Committee comprising the various engineers and surveyors to the constituent local authorities, discussed the Trunk Road at a meeting in July, 1932, and came to the conclusion that the 120 feet road was neither desirable nor feasible. It was pointed out that only one authority had secured land for a 120 feet width and one was definitely against such a width. The adjacent Joint Committee, North Tees, had provided in their scheme for a continuation of the Trunk Road westwards on the other side of the River Tees, but at 60 feet. The Thornaby Preliminary Statement also only provided for a 60 feet road and a new loop road constructed by Middlesbrough to link into the Trunk Road as it joined the new bridge road was to be 60 feet. The Sub-Committee concluded that a 60 feet width should now be adopted, with 25 feet building lines. Later Knowles recommended that the building lines on 60 feet roads should be 20 feet except the Trunk Road which should stay at 25 feet. But Middlesbrough, mindful of the compensation problems in seeking to implement 25 feet building lines to a 60 feet road in a built up area were strongly opposed, and argued for 15 feet. The Joint Committee supported the Sub-Committee's recommendations on building lines and Middlesbrough were asked to reconsider. (20) By 1933 Middlesbrough had agreed to step into line.
It remained only to decide what to do with those areas of land lying alongside the Trunk Road that had been bought to extend the scheme at a later stage. The North Riding wanted to dispose of their portions but the Joint Committee agreed with Knowles that the land should be zoned as open space.

Eventually most sections of the road were completed but the experience had not been a smooth one nor one to engender much confidence in the ability of town planning to overcome problems of parochialism and public expenditure restraint.

2. The New Tees Crossing

Between October, 1922, and September, 1924, five joint Conferences of the North and South Teesside Joint Town Planning Committees were held to try and determine the appropriate point of a new Tees crossing. The bridge finally agreed upon - the Newport Lift Bridge - was eventually built in 1934 following a private Act of Parliament enabling Durham County and Middlesbrough to construct it. The saga of the Tees crossing, like that of the Trunk Road, illustrates the problem of obtaining, firstly, joint agreement of the local authorities on the actual line and design and secondly the appropriate funding. Map J shows both existing and proposed crossing points.

Despite assurances given at the founding Conference of the Joint Committees that early priority would be accorded to the question of a new river crossing, it took two years before representatives from both Committees gathered to discuss the matter. The Conference was called at the request of the South Tees-side Committee, following their meeting in May, 1922, when they had before them a draft plan from their experts, Professors Abercrombie and Adshead. It was apparent that clarification was needed on the issue of the new Tees Bridge before
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finalising their scheme. Accordingly, they wrote to Mr. Pepler to ask him to arrange, through the Ministry of Transport, a joint Conference of interested parties. This was duly accomplished and the various representatives, Ministry officials and the Town Planning advisors assembled at Thornaby Town Hall in October, 1922.

The First Conference

The first meeting was deceptively simple. With Mr. Pepler in the chair, the Conference quickly resolved to set up a small committee of experts, comprising the Ministry of Transport's Divisional Road Engineer and the two County Surveyors. They were required to consult with the various Borough Surveyors and with the advisors to the South Tees-side Joint Town Planning Committee and report back to a reconvened Conference. (22)

The Experts' Report

The expert committee of three duly reported back after three months consideration. Their recommended line was in the vicinity of Newport Ironworks, linking Middlesbrough with Billingham and beyond to Hartlepool and Sunderland. (23) (See Map J).

This line was the one eventually adopted but not before considerable dissent had been articulated and several more meetings arranged. For the press at this stage, the line of the crossing appears to be less interesting than the form it might take. 'Bridge or Tunnel?' questioned the Gazette. From the ensuing article there was no doubt what they had in mind.

"...the possibility of burrowing below the Tees.... has much to recommend it. Such a plan at first glance is daunting in its immensity, but it is the kind which the course of economic
events often compel men and cities to face... The cheaper course is not always the wiser; where the aim is high it is a true economy to spend a sufficient sum on the powder and shot." (24)

Such sentiments contrasted with the more frequent pleas for holding back rate increases which appeared regularly in the pages of the paper. The report of the experts, however, made no reference to the type of crossing, confining themselves to a consideration of the best route between Middlesbrough and Billingham. Other crossing points in say Thornaby or further east, were not apparently considered though an appended note by the Professors pointed out that such possibilities might well recommend themselves to these authorities. Despite this observation the Professors backed the experts' recommendation and the report was duly sent out for consultation. Although not mentioned by name, the fact that I.C.I. were fast developing at Billingham must be seen as crucial.

**Opposition Develops**

Thornaby were the first to express disappointment with the recommended line. They had long entertained the hopes that the next crossing of the Tees would be in their Borough. The proposed Trunk Road extending as it did westwards into Thornaby strengthened these aspirations. Thornaby sought the support of Stockton for such an alternative but to no real avail. All Stockton would agree to was to request that more information on traffic flows and the link be gathered before a final decision was taken. (25) Eston were also building up their case for a more easterly crossing.

**The Third Conference**

When some six months or so after the second joint conference, the
various bodies gathered again the experts were faced with considerable dissent. Mr. Pepler, as Chairman, presented the comments of the various local authorities insofar as he had received them. Eston had presented a well argued counter case for a crossing between Middlesbrough and the mouth of the Tees. Such a crossing, it was suggested, would help to open up large areas of potential industrial land on the North Bank and provide a useful link up the coast to Hartlepool. Sunderland and Newcastle. Such a scheme related well to the 20 year programme of land reclamation undertaken by the Tees Conservancy Commission by Act of Parliament at Seal Sands. West Hartlepool also favoured a more easterly crossing point but not so far as Eston's proposal. The North Riding, informally favoured a more westerly crossing. Thornaby, Stockton and Billingham all favoured seeking more information about traffic flows and the like. In the ensuing discussion several representatives expressed concern at the likely cost. But George Pepler insisted that until a position had been decided then costs could not be estimated. It was finally agreed to circulate the various views of the authorities to one another together with any more information that the Ministry of Transport could obtain and then meet again. (26)

The Fourth Conference

The stalemate was finally broken at the next meeting held in Middlesbrough in November, 1923. Mr. Lyddon for the Ministry of Transport had, prior to the meeting, circulated a paper setting out the function of the proposed bridge and some estimates of the likely cost (£250,000) and how such costs might be met. He expressed the view that the Ministry were likely to make a substantial contribution and further aid may be forthcoming if the works could be adopted as an unemployment relief scheme. It was apparent in the following discussions that a
consensus was not going to materialise. Eston, Redcar and West Hartlepool all favoured an easterly crossing. Middlesbrough, Billingham and Durham favoured the recommended line. Stockton Borough and Rural District and Thornaby were still holding out for more information. When it came to a vote, the Conference was split down the middle, half the representatives supporting the original recommendation and half the more easterly suggestion. To resolve the impasse Mr. Pepler used his casting vote as Chairman to support the original proposal for a crossing in Middlesbrough at Newport. In order to try and assuage the defeated parties he pointed out that further crossings would undoubtedly be needed and he proposed that the expert committee investigate the question of the more easterly crossing. Although this was accepted as well as other resolutions seeking Ministry of Transport contributions of 75% of the costs, the defeated authorities were most unhappy and accused Pepler of acting unconstitutionally in casting a vote. (27)

Pepler's action at this Conference rankled with several representatives. Eston tried to get the support of other authorities in making a formal protest. Councillor Trew of Eston was quoted as saying,

"...the casting vote by a Government representative was taking the power from local authorities and giving it to Whitehall." (28)

But attempts to arraign Pepler on the matter came to nothing, despite several letters of protest from several Councils to the Ministry of Health.

The Fifth and Final Conference

The next meeting took nearly a year to come about. The reason for this
long delay is not immediately apparent. The Ministry of Transport had been charged with investigating the problems of effecting an easterly crossing and this may have taken some time. Problems over Pepler's action at the fourth conference may also have held up progress. In any event, by the time the fifth meeting took place the acute division that had marked the previous conference was less noticeable. The report to the Ministry of Transport was in effect, a sop to the easterly crossing protagonists. It accepted the view that important industrial developments would take place in this area in the longer term and that a further crossing would then be justified. This hardly met Eston's point that such a development could stimulate industrial development. On the issue of the Newport crossing, the Tees Conservancy Board, who were responsible for the navigation and maintenance of the River Tees, pointed out that they could not accept any bridge which placed structures in the river. They favoured a design similar to London's Tower Bridge.

Eston were determined that another vote be taken on which crossing should have precedence, the easterly, (Eston) or the westerly, (Middlesbrough). The subsequent vote was hardly conclusive but it did serve to settle the question. Five votes were cast for the westerly crossing at Newport with two against and four abstentions. With the line now settled it was agreed to ask the Ministry to prepare a detailed report and plans for such a crossing together with estimates of cost. It was further agreed that if the Ministry suggested an apportionment of costs only those authorities referred to should be invited to subsequent meetings or failing that only those authorities who voted for the Newport crossing.

Four Tees Crossings

To reconcile the competing claims of the local authorities for a Tees
crossing in their area the Abercrombie/Adshead Report of 1925 put forward four positions; a line south of Thornaby; in Middlesbrough in the vicinity of Newport; between Grangetown and Redcar, near the Lackenby Ironworks; and a longer term possible crossing at the mouth of the Tees. The report recommended that the Newport crossing should be adopted as the first priority but that the routes for the other three should be kept open and land earmarked.

Lack of Progress 1923-1929

Once the decision to give priority to the Newport site had been agreed in November, 1923, most local authorities lost interest. Only Middlesbrough and Durham County Council continued to try and get the scheme off the ground. But progress was slow chiefly because the costs were inhibitive and Government support lacking.

Interest was revived in 1928 when Ellen Wilkinson, M.P. for East Middlesbrough, asked a question in the House of Commons and a series of meetings ensued between Durham, Middlesbrough and the Ministry of Transport. A fresh impetus was provided locally by a strong Editorial in the local newspaper, the North Eastern Daily Gazette, which is worth quoting at length.

"We commend to the special notice of the local authorities the complaint of a working man regarding 'the appalling congestion of traffic' at the Tees Transporter which appears on page 7 of this issue. There are no new disclosures in the letter. That, indeed, is the most damning indictment of the present system. Nobody with the slightest claim to knowledge of transport conditions on Tees-side can plead ignorance of the subject which has been frequently ventilated, and if past experience be repeated, the publication of a single letter will fill our
mailbag with a mass of written testimony from the multitudes of workers who suffer daily discomfort and delay in the tedious journey to and from their employment on the north bank of the Tees. ... The stream of cross-river traffic is not likely to diminish. The great factories at Billingham are still growing, and will continue to absorb more and more of the workless army of Tees-side. Other big enterprises are afoot, which, if they mature, will impose a further tax upon traffic facilities already inadequate. The inescapable conclusion is that were an immediate decision reached to span the Tees by a permanent bridge the project could not be brought to completion before its urgency had still more forceably impressed itself upon the industrial and business community on both banks of the Tees. Such a decision, it must be confessed is still remote.

Middlesbrough is for progress, the Durham County Council hesitant, and other authorities either indifferent or frankly hostile..... a new bridge across the river is a necessity. There are vast spaces on the north bank ripe for development. Tees-side has long sought to impress upon industrialists the advantages which the district can offer as a site for new industries... But communication must be adequate. The river must be made an artery of commerce not a barrier. Tees-side has reached a point when a bridge has been transformed from a desirable acquisition to a positive necessity."

The Tees (Newport Bridge) Act, 1930

This editorial together with other pressures led to new moves to bring the project to fruition. The election of 1929 may also have assisted. Labour made gains locally and Ellen Wilkinson was again returned for Middlesbrough. A new Labour Government was elected in June, 1929, and
by September, 1929, the Ministry of Transport had agreed to contribute 75% of the cost. The estimated cost was £600,000 for a scheme agreed some time before by Middlesbrough, Durham and the North Riding, the Tees Conservancy Commissioners, the L.N.E.R. Company, Dorman Long and Company and the Ministry of Transport. The bridge was to be a vertical lift bridge so as to allow the passage of river traffic. Its construction would involve clearing housing involving 294 people. It was necessary to promote a Bill through Parliament and at this stage it was envisaged that both County Councils would join with Middlesbrough in promoting such a Bill. In the event North Riding dropped out and it was left to Durham and Middlesbrough to press for the Bill and to meet the 25% of costs that would fall to the local authority side. The Tees (Newport) Bridge Act received the Royal Assent in 1930 and a Joint Committee was established to see it through.

The contract was awarded to Dorman Long and work began in 1931. The scheme was operated as an unemployment scheme, priority of employment being given to the long-term unemployed. The Bridge was opened in 1934 by the Duke of York with much civic pomp.

As in the case of the Trunk Road, a major town planning proposal had been built but the long drawn out process had proved a source of local irritation. High cost and lack of government support had played their part in the delays. Newcastle had forged a path by obtaining substantial central government support for the new Tyne Bridge. The case for a new Tees crossing was overwhelming and the rapid growth of I.C.I. at Billingham meant that the opening was not a minute too soon.

Implementing Schemes: The Practical Town Planning Experience

Both case studies have illustrated two interlocked features: the lack of proper resources to implement schemes and the tension between local authorities seeking to act in co-operation.
The lack of resources within local authorities for capital projects was a major problem inhibiting further developments in the 1920s and 1930s. From the outset town planning Acts had never been linked to notions of implementation of proposals and no additional funding or special financial arrangements had been made. This fundamental weakness for promoting positive planning has been a recurrent feature of modern British town planning. In the case of authorities on Teesside and Hartlepool the problem was compounded by the low rateable value of the area and the high cost of unemployment. Local authorities bore much of the cost of poverty and unemployment during the 1920s and 1930s through the Poor Law system. Changes to the system under the 1929 Local Government Act moved much of the burden on to County Councils but the pressure was still largely locally borne.

Local authorities were able to borrow money for roads and bridges, with Government sanction but this was expensive. Additionally, grants were available for capital projects from central Government. But these were generally limited to 50% of costs or 60% for unemployment relief schemes. Thus the local authority was still required to find 40%-50% of costs.

These financial pressures helped to expose fragile alliances and attempts at local co-operation, envisaged through town planning. Road and bridge schemes, such as those described in these two case studies, required the joint action of several authorities. But the problems of finance could and did reveal sharp parochial attitudes. Local interests quickly surfaced in Teesside to prevent the necessary co-ordination of building a uniform Trunk Road or to hasten the construction of a much needed Tees Bridge.

The surprise is that in spite of all these difficulties the two schemes
described in this Chapter did eventually get built - even if not as originally envisaged - and are an integral part of modern Teesside's communications system.

REFERENCES

3. Ibid.
4. Middlesbrough Borough Council, Special Council Meeting, 11th October, 1921.
7. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Minutes of South Teesside Committee, 21st November, 1923, CCA, DC/TT. 11/57
17. Minutes of South Teesside Joint Committee, 8th October, 1931, CCA, DC/TT, 11/62
18. Minutes of South Teesside Joint Committee, 29th December, 1931, CCA. DC/TT, 11/62
20. Minutes of South Teesside Joint Committee, 25th July, 1932, CCA, DC/TT. 11/62

489

22. Minutes of the first conference on River Tees Crossing, 24th October, 1922. CCA. DC/TT. 11/57

23. Minutes of the second conference on River Tees Crossing, 18th January, 1923. CCA. DC/TT. 11/57


25. Minutes of Stockton. Thornaby Joint meeting on Tees Crossing, 11th May. 1923. CCA. DC/TT. 11/57

26. Minutes of third conference on River Tees Crossing, 18th May, 1923. CCA. DC/TT. 11/57

27. Minutes of fourth conference on River Tees Crossing, 21st November, 1932. CCA. DC/TT, 111/57


29. Minutes of the fifth conference on River Tees Crossing, 30th September, 1924. CCA. DC/TT, 11/57

30. North Eastern Daily Gazette. 15th January, 1929
CONCLUSION

* Aims & Hypotheses Reviewed
* The Role & Purpose of Town Planning
* Town Planning in Practice
* Contemplations on Contemporary Linkages
The central thrust of this thesis has been to try and locate the state practice of town planning, during the period 1919 to 1933, within both a national context of changing government orientation to social and economic issues and a local context of developing experience. This was expressed at the outset of the study in terms of the following aims.

Aim A: To assess the role and purpose of Town Planning in Britain between 1919 and 1933

Aim B: To examine the progress of Town Planning in Britain between 1919 and 1933 at both national and local government levels.

The broad conclusion reached by this study, presaged in Part 1 and confirmed in successive Parts of the thesis including the empirical material, is that the role of town planning was limited by the outlook of dominant class interests reflected in successive Governments. Such forces were in the process, during the 1920s and early 1930s, of adopting a more managed and planned approach to a whole range of national affairs, including land-use, but had not yet legitimised this change of course or secured the support of all sections of commercial, industrial, financial and landed interests. The result was that town planning's purpose was only seen in narrow terms of providing a more rational framework for local investment on the periphery of towns and cities. Wider aims of providing a rational and efficient land-use system in general and of aiding a broader social reform were never really on the political agenda. Yet, as the case studies and empirical work revealed, town planning did make progress and became much more widely adopted than is generally recognised. Between 1919 and 1933 a considerable degree of experience of preparing statutory planning
schemes and operating development control mechanisms was achieved by local authorities.

These general observations, however, cover a number of more detailed observations and conclusions which provide the texture and grain of the general statements above. As was indicated at the outset, two important themes ran through the aims of the study. One theme relating to the role and purpose of town planning was seen to be the relationship of the ideology of town planning to the broader philosophical currents operating within society generally. The notion of consensus was central to this process. This theme was studied in a number of chapters and subject to detailed empirical analysis. The other principal theme running through the work and relevant especially to the second aim, of looking at the success and failure of town planning, was the issue of explicit and hidden policy objectives. Whilst such themes act as useful binding agents on the course of the study they do not lend themselves to ready analysis. That requires clearer statements or hypotheses. Chapter 3 sought to establish six main hypotheses which provided direction to the study themes and were meant to reveal a number of answers to the implicit questions posed by the two main aims.

The rest of this Conclusion will seek to address the hypotheses posed at the beginning, relating them to the two main aims of the study. Finally an assessment will be made concerning the relevance of the findings of this thesis to contemporary town planning.
Four of the six hypotheses refer essentially to the first aim concerning the role and purpose of town planning. Each one is now examined in the light of the evidence and arguments brought to bear in the course of this study.

1. Despite the language of hope and challenge embodied in the post-war 'Reconstruction Language', perhaps it was never seriously intended by either Government or 'Whitehall' to use town planning as a radical tool for change. Rather it may have been seen essentially as a regulatory mechanism, applicable to limited areas of land and a co-ordinating mechanism for certain aspects of development to be introduced piecemeal and slowly in order to gain the acceptance of land owners and developers of various kinds.

The second Town Planning Act was born in a highly charged year in British social history. Two months before the second reading of the Act there had been a major strike and series of demonstrations on the Clyde, two months after the Act there were strikes in the cotton industry and the Yorkshire coalfield. Internationally the Treaty of Versailles was being completed and the Third International was being founded by the Communist movement. Official language and rhetoric was, therefore, adapted to meet these extraordinary times. The tempo of events suggested momentous change and after a war of devastating proportions people expected a major re-orientation of the way society was run. Housing, being a basic human need, was subject to an enormous amount of debate and expectation and since town planning was closely associated with housing then it, too, was bound to be invested with such aspirations.
However, as Part 2 demonstrated, the Town Planning Act of 1919 was not a radical departure from what had gone before. The Act was very much within the tradition of Liberal legislation and in its detail built upon, rather than altered, the 1909 basis of town planning. There was, therefore, a dichotomy between the fundamental objectives and traditional purpose of town planning as enshrined in statutory provisions and the language used to introduce the 1919 Act and its associated features on the housing side.

The explanation for this dichotomy lies in the need to portray the post-war package of reforms, within which sat the town planning measures, as radical because of the wider mood of society. It was, in effect, a move of appeasement — a buying of time — until the challenge to the status quo had abated. Much of this can be asserted with the benefit of hindsight and with the knowledge of what happened after 1919. No doubt many of those who spoke the language of 'reconstruction' and 'reconciliation' actually believed in such hopes. A huge collective effort had been required to wage the war against Germany and considerable sacrifice had been called for and given. Debts were owed and, no doubt, offered to be paid for in good faith. But the reality of power in society had not fundamentally altered. Those who really held the reins of power did not want to release them, whatever they said. By calling the 1918 General Election at the time that it was called and in the manner it was conducted belied the language of reconstruction and change and was designed to ensure that the soldier vote was minimal.

Town planning was caught up in a tide of national and international events which, at one level meant that its significance was small, and at another that it would be drawn into wider aspirations. But politically it was never intended that town planning should be seen as
a radical tool for change. As Part 4 sought to demonstrate the key objectives of the 1919 Act were as stated in the hypotheses, viz: to introduce the control of land-use in a careful way, applicable to peripheral urban areas, and to see it as regulatory rather than innovative or initiatory.

Such an outlook was supported by the attitude of the profession. As was shown in Chapters 6 and 7, the town planning profession never envisaged the 1919 Act as a radical measure that could be said to herald a 'new' Britain. Their perspective was bound closely to the notion that town planning was, by and large, unacceptable to powerful interests and therefore needed careful and slow nourishment. Several town planners held key positions within the state machine at the Ministry of Health, and so were in a position to influence the attitude of central government in the way it implemented the statutory town planning provisions.

Thus from the outset the role and purpose of town planning were heavily circumscribed by the reality of power in Britain and the outlook of the profession. Initial statements born in the heat of the moment in 1919 and 1920 were later to be seen as temporary gloss. Once the post-war social and political crisis was over the actual intentions of Parliament and Government regarding town planning, and other social measures, became clearer. This intention was not simply to assert the status quo, since that was no longer tenable, nor necessarily desirable. More control over free market forces were deemed appropriate in the interests of the economy, as well as in the interests of a more stable social system. In town planning terms the 1909 Act was seen as too cumbersome and did not provide sufficient general control and regulation to ensure a more efficient process of development in urban areas.
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2. Town planning can be located within a general movement of increasing state intervention in the period 1919 to 1933. It can be viewed as a prototype of the sort of broader economic and financial management advocated by progressive capitalists and reformist labour leaders. As such, town planning's key words, 'economy', 'efficiency', and 'non-political' may be seen as the precursor of the technical ideology that was to underpin much of the planning ideology of the period 1940 to 1970.

The first part of this hypothesis was addressed in Part 3. In this section it was demonstrated that one of the most significant features of Government in the 1920s and early 1930s was the extension of the role of the state into the social and economic life of the country. Whilst ostensibly upholding the traditional virtues of a free market economy and opposing what were seen as 'socialistic' measures, successive governments nevertheless introduced more and more legislation that increased the role of the state.

Thus town planning, as an example of state intervention, was not an isolated phenomenon. It is not therefore possible to simply explain the occurrence of statutory town planning as due to 'special factors' such as the influence of a town planning movement or the impact of powerful individuals. No doubt the movement and its leaders played important roles in shaping the timing or the style of the outcome. But the underlying current of growing collectivism was the key factor giving rise to more state intervention within the land-use system, as it was to the other aspects of interventionism described in Part 3. Such policies were dictated by the recognition that Britain's economy was not self-rectifying, nor was it able to withstand the pressures of international competition as exemplified in the world markets of the twentieth century without state assistance and guidance.
But there was a major perceptual gap between what was recognised as necessary by the leaders of Britain and what was acceptable to others in important positions in industry and finance. This tension was a continuing feature of inter-war Britain. In order to close the gap it was necessary to construct a new language and ideology that permitted a more open and committed expression of state management within the framework of capitalism. Many captains of industry in the 1920s and early 1930s were caught between the need for state help and the belief that they should operate in a free market.

Town planning is interesting in this respect because it chartered an ideological course that helped to solve the problem outlined above. Because the very activity was founded on notions of management and control, town planning had to possess a much more open and rigorous ideology. Other examples of state intervention cited in the course of Part 3 of this study, such as state subsidies, marketing boards, instances of state ownership and state operations, were introduced piecemeal and without the wider concepts apparent from the start in controlling land-use. Town planning, therefore provides an early instance of the sort of ideology that came to underpin the post-Second World War compromise known as 'Butskellism'. As shown in Part 4 and in the course of the local studies in Part 5, town planning sought to express its legitimacy within a capitalist economy by denying the political character of that economy and asserting its role in terms of neutral, value-free assertions. The adoption of such an ideology was of assistance to both the progressive capitalist and the reformist labour leader. The former needed to convince his more reluctant colleagues that adopting aspects of state planning, management and control, was neither socialist nor a disastrous loss of power to the capitalist interest. By stressing the non-political nature of
'planning' and its role in promoting economy and efficiency such a position could and was eventually achieved. On the Labour side it was necessary to provide a method of reforming the system without provoking opposition from the capitalist interests or seeming to do nothing. When allied to older notions of social justice and improved welfare the language of 'planning' provided a vital ingredient into the labour reformists' armoury. On such a basis the ideology of social democracy could and was built in the inter-war years.

3. Town planning like other forms of physical and economic intervention may be seen as a compromise between laissez-faire or rampant capitalism on the one hand and total state control (and totalitarianism) of fascism and socialism on the other hand. Such a view appears to have emerged in the period under study and added a 'middle road' aspect to the developing ideological package of consensus and compromise.

Notions of compromise and consensus were important aspects of town planning ideology and were enshrined in the procedures accompanying statutory town planning. This is highlighted in Chapter 14 and dealt with in more detail in Part 5 in the context of exploring town planning experience in Teesside and Hartlepool.

The perception of planning as a vital ingredient in a new approach to the governance of Britain became an important part of the thinking of a number of Conservatives, Liberals and Labour leaders during the 1920s and early 1930s. The approach was dubbed a 'middle-way' by Harold Macmillan, indicating that it stood for incorporating aspects of both capitalism and socialism which were seen as extremes in their pure form. One of the values of concepts such as 'middle-way' is that they can mean all things to all men. According to the audience the
'middle-way' was presented as either modern capitalism, moderate socialism or a radical and new form of society. Its weakness lies in the lack of definition and rigour that underlies its meaning. After the Second World War a number of writers sought to add to the idea of a 'middle way' society and built up a legitimation for the period of substantial increased state activity in the economy and in welfare matters. The 'mixed economy' replaced the 'middle-way' as a key concept. The 'mixed economy' was posited as neither capitalism nor socialism but a hybrid in which old class bases of interest were less and less powerful leading to a marked reduction in conflict and less need for sharp ideological differences.

Town planning was a crucible for exploring the notions of compromise and consensus in an important field of Government policy. The distribution and ownership of land was a crucial factor in influencing outcomes involving the control of land-use. Major companies, such as ICI and Dorman Long held important tracts of industrial land, while the smaller business and commercial interests were also important collectively as land owners. Financial institutions were increasingly keen to add land to their portfolios. Large areas of privately held land, mainly agricultural or wilderness, were owned by still powerful landed families. Significant landholdings were also maintained by central and local state agencies. Intervention into the free use of land was, therefore, challenging a powerful array of class interests and sectional agencies within the state machine. For the private landowner in particular, town planning went to the heart of an age-long perceived freedom - the right to do what one liked on land one owned.

The empirical material in Part 5 illustrated the powerful response from most land owners to attempts by town planning authorities to determine land-use. ICI Billingham in particular sought every means to
circumvent these statutory measures. Several large landowners invoked their long-held cherished belief that since the land was theirs that they could arrange it as they saw fit. However, this did not mean that all large landowners were hostile to the ideas of town planning. Several big business concerns on Teesside and Hartlepool built model housing estates for their workers. There was also a self-interested desire to see an improved communication network. But town planning's claim to operate on the basis of consensus and compromise was seen by most of the examples explored in this study to have been something of a sham. The element of sham lay in the fact that the power of the landowner nearly always prevailed against what was perceived as the community interest. Consensus and compromise should mean that opposing views are argued through to a point of agreement. But if that agreement always, or practically always, results in one side getting its way the consensus is merely a cloak to hide that fact. No doubt it could be argued that such a cloak was necessary given the distribution of power in inter-war Britain and the need to entrench the idea of town planning, so that one day, under new power distributions, a genuine balance of decision could arise between the public and private interest in land-use. Whilst there may have been some element of such long-term thinking among professional town planners the evidence is that most practitioners as well as political policy makers came to believe the ideology. Post-Second World War experience tends to confirm that notions of 'in the national interest', and 'town planning consensus', continued to hide a significant imbalance of benefit that derived from land-use policies.

4. In practical terms the need for intervention and regulation offered by statutory town planning may be seen as necessary in the field of land-use and communications because the industrial
system of capitalism could not adjust to growing urban pressures quickly and efficiently (i.e. profitably) through market mechanisms. It is feasible that sections of landowners and industrialists were, therefore prepared to sacrifice long cherished ownership rights for the sake of more orderly development.

From the standpoint of the working class, town planning could be viewed as an extension of better housing. However, some of the more far sighted working class representatives recognised the wider reform benefits that town planning could offer and perhaps for this reason the garden city idea gained a place on the agenda of the labour and trade union movement after the First World War. But the lack of practical achievement and a concentration upon council housing and later slum clearance, may have diverted attention away from the radical potential of town planning.

This hypothesis follows on very closely from the previous one and suggests explanations for a convergence of class interests on town planning. The interests behind both capital and labour forces had their own reasons for abandoning on the one hand opposition to planning and on the other investing radical hopes in it.

Modern urban planning can be seen to have emerged in western Europe during the latter quarter of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth as a response to the perceived shortcomings of competitive market forces, and as a means of securing greater social support for the political system. Growing urbanisation, suburbanisation and the changing location of industry made the need for more regulation and control of development important so as to ensure a
minimum of dislocation and a reduction of an inefficient duplication of services or imperfect distribution. This can also be seen in terms of aiding capital accumulation. This requirement did not diminish after the First World War. Part 3 sought to show how the dynamics of urban change continued in the 1920s and the early 1930s to present real problems to developers of all kinds. Housing developers required infrastructures of water, sewers, electricity and roads, not to mention transport. Industry's needs were similar with a strong emphasis on adequate road access and linkage as bulk transport moved more and more to a road base rather than rail. Co-ordination and regulation of these services was a prime requirement and town planning was seen as a potential mechanism for this. Of course this was not all.

Urban planning was also a vehicle for introducing greater social welfare in the field of housing, education and unemployment. This has been described in terms of assisting the process of social reproduction. In this context town planning was also seen by its supporters to be concerned with creating the 'suburb salubrious', as John Burns had put it. That is town planning was to bring about improved housing layout and appropriate zoning of uses. As standards of living rose among sections of the middle class and the better-off working class consumer, preference would also exert an influence for lower densities and a regulated and harmonious environment. Chapter 15 and the empirical studies in Part 5 tried to assess the evidence for the success of town planning objectives and in this area of creating more efficient and controlled environments for new development it was found to have had some success. Had it not done so, it is argued, then the developers would have been even more anti-town planning than they appeared to be in 1932. The local experience on Teesside and Hartlepool suggests that despite grumbling about their lost freedom of
action large companies and other land owners did not lose out in terms of doing with their land what they really wanted.

The empirical studies also illustrate the two functions of urban planning referred to above. Town planning in Teesside and Hartlepool facilitated the development of an improved road system and enhanced cross-river traffic, thus aiding the efficiency of the local economy. The town planning schemes, through zoning policies and communications also assisted the housing development process and therefore helped bring great social stability.

There were areas of failure that became much more apparent in the later 1930s and, therefore, have not been dealt with in this study. The problem of ribbon development and unwarranted intrusion of poor development and advertising in areas of rural beauty attracted mounting attention from the conservation lobby, such as the Council for the Preservation of Rural England, founded by Abercrombie and others in 1928. The polemic by Clough Williams-Ellis, 'England and the Octopus' (1928) launched the warning sounds and 'Britain and the Beast' (1938), by a number of well known writers, indicated how right had been alarm those ten years before. (1)

Despite these deficiencies the fact remains that large areas of suburban land were controlled to varying degrees through town planning in ways not achieved before 1919. Overwhelmingly housing densities were much lower than pre-war, usually at 12 or less to the acre and housing layouts were less formal and rigid. Road improvement was achieved but often at too slow a pace for developers and the need of industry. The local studies gave graphic illustration of the problems faced in trying to build a major Trunk Road in south Teesside and a parallel problem of the building of a new River Tees bridge.
But, in the end these developments did take place and proved vital ingredients in coping with the rising tide of road traffic. Whilst these examples of assistance to developers and industry may have helped to convince the capitalist interests of the value of town planning, the working class and labour interest needed something much more tangible to them. Some factors clearly overlapped. Better housing layout, improved densities and the separation of home and factory all helped to contribute to a better standard of living for those who moved into the new suburbs. But at a price. As Chapter 10 showed the social condition of Britain still witnessed stubborn problems of poverty and health. The move to better physical conditions for some in the 1920s and 1930s illustrated that without a concomitant improvement in wealth old problems of disease and poor health would return. M'Gonigle and Kirby's study in Stockton-on-Tees was an important landmark in this type of observation. They demonstrated the folly of believing that it was possible to provide a better environment without also securing improvements to other social and political conditions.

The Garden City idea was attractive to the labour movement particularly in the big cities, because it addressed the problem of overcrowding and came up with a radical solution tied to broader notions of social reform. For this reason it found its way on to the national and local agendas and programmes of the Labour Party. But a failure to see progress on the question of either slum clearance or the provision of new towns during the study period seriously eroded mass interest in town planning. It is important to recognise that town planning enjoyed its most popular phase after the Second World War when it entered a vigorous period of clearance, new development and new town building. Whilst this support eventually eroded it can be argued that this was
due to the failure of town planning to reflect ordinary people's aspirations and need to become much more involved in decisions. It is possible to describe three phases in terms of the relationship of the mass of people to town planning since 1909. In the first phase, from 1909-1947 most people were effectively cut off from town planning because it did not address their needs in the large urban centres. This was revealed in the local studies in Part 5. In the second, from 1947-60, there was a period of popular support for what was seen as an attempt to reconstruct both the physical and social aspects of life. The third, from 1960s on, saw an increasing alienation with the cheap and harsh reality of much urban design imposed upon communities who had begun to be treated once more as recipients in a world of scarce public resources rather than partners in a supposed 'new' Britain.

As popular interest in town planning waned in the 1920s so the more practical and less visionary aspects of the activity came to be taken on board by the labour leadership. The 1929-31 Labour Government illustrates the way Labour thinking had changed since the acceptance of the Garden City notion in 1918. Progress was envisaged and achieved. Slum clearance received a major boost and began the first serious onslaught on the Victorian slums and Greenwood's *Town and Country Planning Bill* of 1931 sought to widen the scope of town planning to embrace all land and to recoup 100% betterment. But these were classic reforms of the piecemeal kind, destined to take decades to make an impact and imposed upon a system which denied the comprehensive approach so necessary to improve the lot of ordinary working people in this period. The National Government which followed Labour carried on the slum clearance programmes, possibly with less enthusiasm, and carried through a new *Town and Country Planning Act*, in 1932, albeit with less teeth and reduced betterment. A convergence of a sort had
been achieved even by 1932. The underlying trends in British political life, reflected in class leaderships, were pulling powerfully towards the post-war historic compromise.
The two remaining hypotheses are here related to the second of the two aims of the study – the examination of town planning in practice, its success and failure. This issue was dealt with in some detail in Part 4 and was subject to a number of empirical studies in Part 5.

5. Central and local state bureaucracies can be seen to have strengthened the role of town planning as a regulatory mechanism rather than a radical reforming tool. The view is put forward that this was due to several reinforcing factors. At both central and local level state officials may have seen their role as 'neutral' and 'non-political' in so far as implementing technical services was concerned. Town planning may have been viewed in Whitehall and Town Hall as an activity rather similar to aspects of engineering and as such perhaps they sought to achieve a uniformity of practice and procedure thereby exercising important controls on planning outcomes.

In the political field both local and central government officials were likely to reflect the predominance of Conservative political values and this may have been reinforced by a professional code which tended to eschew radicalism and embody the status quo.

The function and ideology of state officials at both central and local levels was an important influence in the way any state managed activity was undertaken. Both the Civil Service and other public services were founded on the belief that the state was neutral and that the duty for officials was to carry out, in a professional manner, the duties placed upon them by their political masters who expressed the popular will. This was bound to be a profoundly strong influence upon the ideology.
surrounding all welfare and technical services, including town planning. Whilst this issue was not addressed specifically by this study, it was powerfully illustrated in Chapter 14 when examining the political objectives of town planning. Here it was concluded that the role of the Whitehall official, in this case the Ministry of Health officials, in drafting Circulars, Memoranda and other technical papers was very important in establishing the ground rules for town planning.

The local studies also show how local officials were crucial to the practice of town planning and governed its day to day operations, often with only a minimal political presence. Specific values held by these officials therefore imparted particular directions to the practice. It is difficult to be more than conjectural about this factor. It is highly unlikely to postulate that radical or revolutionary officials could have survived in the Civil Service or local government let alone influence policy and implementation. It is, therefore, stating the obvious to say that the personal, political and ideological values of officials were overwhelmingly conservative. The question is more subtle than that. Given that officials were, in general, not likely to desire radical social outcomes, or to subvert political priorities in too drastic a manner, wherein did lie their influence? The answer seems to be located within the more detailed analysis of their ideology. For those officials concerned primarily with administration, such as the Town Clerks and County Clerks there was a self-identity with the authority that they served. In some cases they regarded themselves as the pillar upon which the authority stood. Politicians may come and go but Clerks stay on for ever. Thus the local authority became, like the central state and the Civil Service, a neutral umpire whose standing in the community was unquestioned. Activities of the authority thereby became invested with this power and neutral underpinning. There was also the desire to achieve greater rationality.
within administration. This was probably stronger at national level than locally. But nevertheless, the administrator required a degree of order and comprehensiveness in his approach to his tasks. These factors may help to explain why so many local authorities maintained town planning activities through numerous problems and often without political imperatives to push them on. Town planning was an activity that appealed to those who sought to extend the power of their local authority and who desired to achieve more rationality and order in the way local economies and communities were arranged. A 'greater Teesside' and a 'more efficient Teesside' were banner headlines that were bound to appeal to Town Clerks and other important chief officers.

The professional ideology was also important at national and local government levels. The Ministry of Health and town planning authorities in Teesside, as we have seen, employed several prominent and influential architects and town planners. They brought to bear their particular professional preferences, such as low density development, as well as their more general outlook on power and the state. In addition to the advice of 'experts' much of the local activity of town planning was undertaken by professional engineers and surveyors. Their professionalism was rooted in a technical approach which tended to equate town planning with building roads and bridges and with real estate matters. It was many decades before the slogan 'planning is for people' was able to appear on the professional agenda. Prior to that the assumption that was widely held was that town planning was a technical exercise for which prescribed technical training was required. In practice, of course, difficulties arose with such a perspective. Town planning was not just like building a bridge. Decisions affecting land-use held important social and political implications. Local officials were occasionally forced to grasp this
nettle and found themselves in the uncomfortable position of conflict. The local studies examined this issue and, as in the case of ICI Billingham, noted that officials inevitably found themselves defending the interest of the local community against those of the private company. In such a situation the lack of real power in local government was exposed when the Ministry of Health intervened on behalf of the Company, even though the case on town planning grounds appeared to favour the local authority.

The political values held by public servants in this period is a matter of conjecture. It is unlikely that many were of a radical persuasion, particularly at senior level. Neutrality proscribed many from any open admittance. Indeed many may not have voted and would have stated that they were independent. The values of neutrality and 'independence' means essentially that they stood for the maintenance of the status quo. Given that most councils were overwhelmingly Conservative or Independent then it is likely that most chief officers held similar views to their political masters. This is illustrated in the case of Hubert Thornley, the powerful and feared County Clerk to the North Riding of Yorkshire County Council, who was made an honorary alderman upon his retirement in the 1930s.

6. It is possible that the experience of statutory town planning under the second Town Planning Act demonstrated that it could be embraced without threatening the essential basis of capitalist society and that this helped to cement the foundations of a new local government activity that remained largely unchanged in substance thereafter.

The first part of this hypothesis has been dealt with under earlier statements. The second part relates to many aspects of this study at
both the national and local levels which sought to show how the practice of town planning became embedded into governmental procedures. The 1909 Act laid down certain key legal tenets of town planning but the 1919 Act, later consolidated into the 1925 Act, was the one that really established the foundation of the procedure and methods of modern town planning in this country. Subsequent legislation has made important new extensions and changed aspects of procedure but in many ways the general approach has changed very little. This may be arguable but what is, perhaps, clearer still, is that the 1919 Act introduced most local authorities to town planning practice. As Chapter 16 showed, a very substantial number of local authorities undertook some form of town planning in the 1920s and early 1930s. Within the limited statutory, political and professional objectives for town planning in this period much was achieved. The significance of this achievement is more readily appreciated by studying the rapid extension and acceptance of town planning in the 1940s. Had the groundwork not been laid in the 1920s and 1930s then it is doubtful if so much could have been achieved in so short a space of time. On the other hand perhaps the depth of prior experience also explains the limitations of post Second World War reconstruction. Government was not, by any means embarking upon a new field in the 1940s. Local authorities had been undertaking development control for the best part of two decades and many had started out on the scheme preparation process. Established outlook and routines constrained too many fresh approaches and denied a radical break with the past. But this is supposition. What can be asserted is that town planning practice in the inter-war years was much more persuasive than is commonly recognised and that when the contemporary town planning objectives are studied rather than those derived from a latter day perspective then a more rounded assessment of town planning in those years is possible.
Over the last two decades town planners have experienced two major blows to the legitimation of their purpose. Firstly, public affirmation, so strong in the 1940s and early part of the 1950s, evaporated and was replaced by degrees of public hostility. Secondly, recent governments have removed the very foundations of planning ideology - its consensus politics.

The popularity of town planning in the 1940s and 1950s owed much to the war effort and sense of mutual aid and collective purpose that it engendered. As we have noted in connection with the First World War, the sacrifice and cataclysmic nature of modern war gave rise to the need and a belief in the ability to reconstruct society. As in the First, the Second World War witnessed a significant influx of radical reformers and rational thinkers into the ranks of government and the armed forces. However, unlike the First World War, these new participants in government were given major roles in popular education, propaganda and counter-intelligence. This was partly due to the portrayal of the war as a fight between a free people basing themselves on democracy against a fascist dictatorship and partly because of the need to mobilise a much larger section of the people in the war effort than hitherto. The 'home front' was often as much in the front line with threats of invasion and the reality of nightly bombings, as the 'war-zones' abroad.

In rallying the people of Britain in the war against fascism the images of a democratically planned and rationally managed society, put forward by socialists, liberals and radical tories in the 1920s and 1930s, became popularised. In the reconstructed Britain unemployment and poverty would be eradicated and replaced by full employment, a free
welfare service system, improved education and a new physical
environment built to the highest town planning standards. To underpin
all this, industrial relations and the resolution of conflict and
shortages would be undertaken on the basis of agreement and consensus
rather than class politics and confrontation.

Town planning was seen as much more than simply controlling land-use
and development in an orderly and efficient manner. New towns were to
be constructed, bombed cities re-built, old towns re-ordered and
national parks set aside. All of these things would provide a new
physical framework for the post-war social-democratic man and woman.

Broadcasts by popular figures such as J.B. Priestley, the production of
cheap editions of books on town planning, such as those by Sharp
(1940), Tubbs (1942,1945), Carter and Goldfinger (1945), and the
'Rebuilding Britain' series of Faber and Faber together with the
important work of educationalists in the services helped to achieve a
public acceptance and desire for town planning that had never been
present before. (3)

At the same time the broader concepts of organising social and
political life on the basis of consensus and of economic life on the
basis of extending controls and intervention by the state was
transferred from wartime to peacetime by the election of a Labour
Government in 1945. The mixed-economy ideas of Durbin, Dalton and
Crosland appeared to be in the course of construction. (4) Post-war
attempts by organised labour to secure a larger share of the wealth
were contained and channelled in a way not achieved in the period
1918 to 1920. The new, popular foundation of government helped to
spread its ideas to all main political parties so that when the
Conservative Party won back power in 1951 it did not seriously
dismantle the post-war welfare state nor fundamentally alter the managed approach to the economy.

In this context of post-war reconstruction and the creation of the politics of 'agreement', in which both major parties shared common assumptions about the type of society they were seeking to create, town planning ideology, forged in the inter-war years, came into its own. The status, appeal and confidence of town planners reached a peak. The construction of new towns provided a visible symbol of what the town planner could achieve. They became a symbol of post-war reconstruction and received international recognition for their place in the development of 'democratic' town planning.

The erosion of this high point in the esteem in which town planning was held came from two main directions. Initial damage came from the failure of the Attlee Government to effectively control and expand the economy. In an interesting parallel to what happened after the First World War the national economy nose-dived some two years after the end of hostilities. The 1947 crisis is to the post-Second World War what 1921 was to the First. In both cases the Government's reaction was to move to austerity. In 1921 the 'Geddes Axe' ended post-war reforms. In 1947 the crisis budget similarly spelled the end of the Labour Government's reforming zeal. The chief difference between the two events lies in the socio-political context. In 1921 the crisis revealed the true nature of political power to be the traditional Conservative Party wedded to notions of sound-money policies and eschewing social reforms. In 1947 the social-democratic base was secure and ensured that the main reforms remained intact and that the managed approach to the economy continued. Town planning, therefore, was able to maintain its momentum in a way that was denied in the wake of the 'Geddes Axe' in 1921. But the enthusiasm for the Labour Party
waned slowly but surely after 1947, eroding the firm platform on which town planners were erecting their edifices. The second factor to undermine the popularity of town planning was also long term and began shortly after the crisis of 1947 with the onset of the 'Cold War'. The period after the war had seen a spread of power and influence of the Soviet Union which had a political basis in the alliance of the war and an international swing to the left as a consequence of the defeat of fascism. Such a growth of power posed a threat to the world hegemony of the U.S.A. and tensions mounted in the later 1940s culminating in the crisis over Berlin in 1948 and the McCarthyite witchhunts of the early 1950s. The importance of these events to the prestige of town planning was indirect but important. Considerable attention was given during the war to Russia's achievements in state planning. When the Soviet Union was an ally and Britain was adopting its own form of planning, these links helped to strengthen the image and popularity of planning. In the mood of the cold war when anti-communism became virulent, planning became a more equivocal activity that could be associated in the public mind with the loss of freedom and as a step on the road to totalitarianism. The voice of the anti-planners only dimly heard in the 1930s now assumed a greater strength. Hayek (1944), Jewkes (1948) and others helped to arm a new ideological right wing that was to slowly but surely win the post-war 'planning debate', in the same way that the planners had won the original one in the 1920s and 1930s.(5)

These longer term forces were not readily apparent in the post-war years. The signs were there to be seen in films, comedy and books about bureaucrats and planners riding roughshod over ordinary people's lives. But to many these manifestations of anti-planning appeared marginal and irrelevant. In fact, it was only when the major housing
clearances and redevelopment programmes of the 1960s got underway that the erosion of popular support for planning became evident. The high rise housing solution, the office development boom, the re-shaping of the familiar places and the congestion of traffic all became problems caused in the popular mind by town planners and gave rise to a feeling of beleaguerment among a profession that now was seen to lack legitimacy and credibility.

In the late 1970s these features of post-war Britain came together to provide popular support for a Conservative Party basing itself upon Hayek's anti-planning thesis. New policies aimed at 'rolling back the frontiers of the state' and 'restoring a free market economy' ended the post-war compromise and removed the main ideological underpinning of earlier town planning.

In some ways it might be asserted that town planning today finds itself in a weaker position than in the 1920s and early 1930s. Since 1979 town planning has once again been relegated to the purpose of protecting amenity and regulating development within a supposed framework of a free market economy. But with hindsight one can see that town planning in the inter-war years was moving in the direction of the more general application of planning in society whilst at present the avowed purpose is to reduce the role of planning and control. The Second World War generation of town planners, rooted in the idea of society as essentially classless, the economy as neither capitalist nor socialist, and planning as a value-free, problem solving technical exercise above conflict and politics, have been left high and dry, beached by the high tide of 'Butskellism'.

In this dispiriting and uncomfortable position several alternative stances can be discerned. Some acclimatise to the colder water and
dive back into the sea espousing the virtues of planning in a market economy, providing value for money and all the other associated benefits of the new dispensation. Others can be seen grouping in the dunes under the old banners of consensus and Keynes. Yet others parade with placards proclaiming that the end is nigh! Most, however, pick their way along the beach, looking wistfully out to sea and carry on moving the driftwood about.

A study of the origins of statutory town planning in Britain may assist in restoring a sense of perspective to the profession. This thesis has sought to demonstrate how the role and purpose of town planning, despite the gloss and rhetoric from utopian pasts or immediate post-war euphoria, was geared to the very practical and limited needs of dominant interests in society. These interests required a regulation of development and a framework for private investment. Protection of existing amenity and the heritage of the past also appealed to the increasingly influential middle class. It may be postulated, although this study has not addressed the issue, that after the Second World War the needs of the dominant interests remained as a key purpose of town planning but that the scope was widened to embrace the needs of wider layers of the population as an aspect of the historic compromise between class interests that occurred in several capitalist countries of western Europe in the 1940s. The point is that explanations of town planning that are based upon the activity as being independent of the way power is distributed within society will fail to produce satisfactory answers to why the activity alters in its scope, or fails to change in response to obvious needs. The experience of the last twenty years of British town planning may in the end prove to be a salutary lesson to the profession who may reflect that a popular form of town planning will only be achieved once power is made popular.
APPENDIX 1

TOWN PLANNING PROCEDURE

* Table of Town Planning Procedure, 1921

* Circular 145, 1921

* The Town Planning (General Interim Development) Order, 1922

* Specimen Forms for Planning Permission
**TABLE OF TOWN PLANNING PROCEDURE**

**BASED UPON THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH TOWN PLANNING REGULATIONS, 1921.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE.</th>
<th>Time Required</th>
<th>Ministry of Health Town Planning Regulations 1921</th>
<th>REQUIREMENTS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE I.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution to prepare a Scheme.</td>
<td>Not more than six months.</td>
<td>Art. 3 (1)</td>
<td>Preparation of Map No. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art 3 (1).</td>
<td>Resolution of L.A. to prepare a Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 3 (2)</td>
<td>Copy of Map No. 1 deposited for inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 3 (3)</td>
<td>Advertisement of Resolution, of facilities for inspection and of suggestions to L.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of Map No. 1, Resolution, etc., sent to Minister. (First Schedule).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAGE II.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Statement of Proposals.</td>
<td>Not less than 21 days.</td>
<td>Art. 4 (2)</td>
<td>Preparation of Map No. 2. (Second Schedule).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 4 (2)</td>
<td>Preparation of Preliminary Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 5 (1)</td>
<td>Copy of Map No. 2 and Preliminary Statement deposited for inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertisement of intention to adopt Preliminary Statement and of facilities for inspection and objections to L.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objections and representations considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 4 (1)</td>
<td>Resolution of L.A. to adopt Preliminary Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 6 (1)</td>
<td>Copy of Map No. 2 and Preliminary Statement sent to Minister. (Third Schedule).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 6 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(B, C and D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 7 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notification to owners of land included in Map No. 1 but not in Map No. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(If Minister disapproves Preliminary Statement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>STAGE</td>
<td>Time Required</td>
<td>Ministry of Health Town Planning Regulations 1921</td>
<td>REQUIREMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE III. (continued).</td>
<td>Not more than six months</td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of Map No. 3 and Draft Scheme deposited for inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not less than 4 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertisement of adoption of Draft Scheme, of facilities for inspection and for making objections to L.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 10 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 10 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notices served on Prescribed Persons. [Art 2 (1)].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 10 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of Map No. 3 and Draft Scheme sent to Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 10 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 10 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of Advertisement, etc., sent to Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Objections and Representations [Art. 10 (1)] considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 12 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Submission of Scheme to Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 12 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation of Scheme (with or without modifications).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 12 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 12 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resolution of L.A. finally approving the Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 12 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 12 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of Map No. 4 and Scheme sent to Minister for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 12 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 13 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertisement of submission to Minister for approval, of facilities for inspection and for making objections to Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 13 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 13 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of Advertisement sent to Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 14 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Approval of Scheme by Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 14 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Another Scheme to be prepared and adopted within six months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I) Minister intends to disapprove Scheme).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 15 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertisement of Approval and of facilities for inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 15 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 15 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notification to owners of land of Approval of Minister of facilities for inspection and for making objections to Minister.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 16 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 16 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Approval of Minister, with or without modifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 16 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 16 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advertisement of Order and of facilities for Inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art. 16 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art. 16 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Copy of each Advertisement sent to Minister.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINISTRY OF HEALTH,
Whitehall, S.W.1.
30th March, 1921.

TOWN PLANNING.

1. I am directed by the Minister of Health to forward to you the enclosed copies of revised Regulations governing the procedure to be adopted in preparing town planning schemes. A summary of the Regulations is appended to this Circular Letter. They come into force on the 2nd May, 1921.

2. The new Regulations have been prepared in consultation with persons familiar with town planning, and have been generally approved by Associations representative of Local Authorities. They will supersede the existing ones, and have been devised so as to simplify the preparation of town planning schemes, and also to avoid the “sterilization” of land during the time that a town planning scheme is being prepared, hitherto a serious difficulty and hindrance to development.

The importance of providing for the systematic development of areas cannot be too highly estimated. Now less than ever can we afford the waste which has been the result of the haphazard growth of towns in the past; and therefore, in conformity with the measures which are now being taken for economy, wise action is necessary as regards town planning. For industry, even more than for housing, the gains of proper town planning are great, by locating factories, workshops, and businesses in the places best adapted for them and by providing betimes for proper roads and other communications, and thus avoiding the later necessity of costly street improvements. The works or measures for which provision is made in town planning schemes will need to be carried out, of course, only as and when development makes them necessary. On the 1st January, 1923, town planning becomes compulsory, by the operation of Section 46 of the Housing, Town Planning, &c. Act, 1919, in all boroughs and urban districts with a population exceeding 20,000.

Local Authorities should, at the outset at least, make their town planning schemes as simple as possible, concentrating on the two essentials—settling the principal lines of communication, and allocating areas for the purposes for which they are best suited (zoning), whether industrial, business, residential, or as open spaces; this procedure will make for economy and for efficiency. In order to save time and expense, the Minister has now in preparation a series of model clauses to be used by Local Authorities in their schemes.
3. It will be seen that the new Regulations provide for the preparation of a town planning scheme in three stages—the Resolution to prepare; the Preliminary Statement; the Scheme. It is open to any Local Authority to merge the two former or two latter stages where they are in a position to do so.

The maps required should be Ordnance Maps, and the copies sent to the Ministry should be folded in book form. While maps on a scale of not less than 25 inches to the mile are generally necessary, a scale of 6 inches to the mile will be accepted for maps Nos. 1 and 2, where the required particulars can be shown with sufficient accuracy on this scale.

The Minister has arranged that, if application is made to him by the Local Authority, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue will authorise the District Valuers to supply the Authority with such information as they possess as to the names and addresses of the owners of land included in the Authority's scheme. In many cases this procedure will save time and expenditure in obtaining the necessary particulars.

4. It is desirable that there should be one town planning scheme for the whole of an area forming one economic unit. If, therefore, there is more than one Local Authority in that unit, it is necessary that these Local Authorities should co-operate closely, to the extent, where advantageous, of forming a Joint Committee for preparing a scheme. The Minister will be prepared to help in any cases of this kind by calling conferences of the Local Authorities concerned.

The Minister will be glad at all times to place the assistance of his officers at the disposal of Local Authorities in the preparation of their schemes.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

W. A. Robinson
Secretary.

To the Clerk to the
County Council,
or
The Town Clerk,
or
The Clerk to the Urban
or
Rural District Council.

Note.—This Circular and the Regulations referred to in it will be placed on sale, and copies may shortly be obtained, either directly or through any bookseller, from His Majesty's Stationery Office, at the following addresses:—

Imperial House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2, and 28, Abingdon Street, London, S.W.1, 37, Peter Street, Manchester, and 1, St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff.
APPENDIX.

SUMMARY OF TOWN PLANNING REGULATIONS, 1921.

The procedure to be followed by a Local Authority is divided into three stages.

**Stage I. Resolution deciding to prepare Scheme.**

The Resolution deciding to prepare the Scheme must define by means of a map, known as Map No. 1, the exact area which is to be included in the Scheme. This map must be deposited for inspection and advertisement of the fact given in the local Press. A copy of the resolution and of a map of the area must be sent to the Council of the County in which any part of the area is situated, and, if the area covered by the Scheme includes land under the jurisdiction of another Local Authority for town planning purposes, also to that Authority.

Where the area covered by the Scheme includes land under the jurisdiction of another Local Authority for town planning purposes, the approval of the Minister is required to the resolution; and, when this approval has been obtained, the Local Authority must give notice of the fact by advertisement.

**Stage II. Preliminary Statement of Proposals.**

Within six months of their resolution deciding to prepare a Scheme (or of the Minister's approval of the resolution, where required), the Local Authority must prepare a Preliminary Statement and map, known as Map No. 2, showing their main proposals for the development of the area covered by the Scheme, e.g., the principal new roads to be constructed, open spaces to be reserved, and the restrictions proposed in regard to character of buildings (whether dwelling-houses, factories, &c.), density of buildings (that is, number to the acre and proportion of site to be covered), and height of buildings. (In any restrictions limiting the number of dwelling houses to the acre, each dwelling intended for separate occupation should count as one). In preparing the Statement consideration must be given to any representations from interested persons or any interested Local Authority as to the area of the Scheme or its development.

Before adopting the Statement, the Authority must give notice in the Press of their intention to do so; and they must make arrangements for any interested person to inspect the map and the draft Statement. A copy of the draft Statement and the map must also be sent to the County Council or other Local Authority that may be concerned. Any objections are to be carefully considered and conferences arranged with a view to securing, so far as possible, agreement on matters covered by the Statement.

A copy of the Statement, when adopted, with the map and other particulars must be sent to the Minister; and, where any part of the land is within the area of another Local Authority for town planning purposes, a copy of the Statement and of the map so far as it relates to such land, must be sent also to that Authority. The Minister after arranging for any necessary visit to the area by one of his Inspectors, will inform the Local Authority of his approval, with or without modifications, or of his disapproval of the Statement. If the proposals are approved by the Minister the Authority must advertise the fact and their intention to proceed at once with the preparation of the detailed Scheme.

**Stage III. Preparation and Approval of Scheme.**

(a) Preparation of Draft Scheme.

Within 12 months of the date on which the Preliminary Statement is approved by the Minister, the Local Authority must prepare and adopt a draft Scheme, illustrated by a map, to be known as Map No. 3; and must
advertise the fact in the Press, intimating how objections may be made to the draft Scheme. They must also serve notice on all owners of land interested in the Scheme, as well as on any County Council or other Local Authority or Government Department that may be concerned.

(b) Submission of Scheme to Minister.

After all objections have been considered and within six months of the date of the resolution adopting the draft Scheme, the Local Authority must pass a resolution finally approving the Scheme, modified as may have been found necessary, after considering all representations. The Scheme when so approved and the map referred to in it, known as Map No. 4, must be sealed and submitted to the Minister for his approval and a print sent to any County Council or other Local Authority concerned. The Authority must advertise in the Press the fact that the Scheme has been submitted to the Minister and that any objections may be made direct to him, and must arrange for a print of the Scheme and Map No. 4 to be open to public inspection.

(c) Approval of the Scheme by the Minister.

On receipt of the Scheme, the Minister will first arrange for a public Local Inquiry to be held, and, after considering the Inspector's Report, will inform the Local Authority of his intention to approve the Scheme, with or without modifications, or to disapprove it. The Authority must give notice in the Press of the Minister's intention; and, if it is proposed to approve the Scheme, with or without modifications, must arrange for a print of the Scheme in the form proposed to be approved by the Minister to be open to public inspection. They must also write to the same effect to all owners of land affected by the Scheme as well as to any County Council or other Local Authority concerned. These measures are taken in order to afford any interested parties full opportunity to state their objections, if any, to the Minister, before a final decision is reached on the Scheme.

The Minister will take into consideration any objections that may be raised; and, if satisfied that the Scheme should be approved, will issue an Order accordingly. A notice of the fact that the Order has been made must be inserted in the Press and the Authority must arrange for a copy of the Order to be open to public inspection. Copies are also to be sent to all owners of land affected by the Scheme, as well as to any County Council or other Local Authority or Government Department concerned.
THE TOWN PLANNING (GENERAL INTERIM DEVELOPMENT) ORDER, 1922.*

Order, dated August 12, 1922, made by the Minister of Health, under Section 45 of the Housing, Town Planning, &c. Act, 1919 (9 & 10 Geo. 5, c. 35).
S.R. & O., 1922, No. 927.

In exercise of the powers conferred on him by Section 45 of the Housing, Town Planning, &c. Act, 1919, the Minister of Health hereby orders as follows:—

1. This Order may be cited as the Town Planning (General Interim Development) Order, 1922.

2. In this Order the following expressions have the meanings hereby assigned to them respectively:—

"The Minister" means the Minister of Health;

"Area" means any area in respect of which a resolution deciding to prepare a Town Planning Scheme has been duly passed and (where necessary) approved by the Minister under Section 42 of the Housing, Town Planning, &c. Act, 1919, or for which authority to prepare a Scheme has been given under Section 54 of the Housing, Town Planning, &c. Act, 1909;

"The Local Authority" means the local authority who have decided or been authorised to prepare a scheme for the area concerned.

3. For the purpose of Section 45 of the Housing, Town Planning, &c. Act, 1919, the local authority may permit the development of estates and building operations to proceed in the area pending the preparation and approval of a Town planning scheme, subject to the conditions contained in this Order.

4. A person who desires to apply for permission under the last preceding Article, shall apply to the local authority for permission in writing and shall furnish to the local authority,

19 Edw. 7, c. 44.
THE TOWN PLANNING (GENERAL INTERIM DEVELOPMENT) ORDER, 1922.

together with his application and in the form required by them, a plan in duplicate showing the proposed method of development and proposed buildings and such further particulars as the local authority may require.

5. The development of estates and building operations shall comply with all such requirements as the local authority may reasonably impose.

6. The local authority shall not, except with the consent of the Minister, permit any development or building operations inconsistent with the provisions of any Local Acts, Regulations, or building byelaws in force in the area.

7. The local authority shall, as soon as may be, inform the applicant in writing that his application for permission to proceed is granted or refused, as the case may be, and, if the application is granted, shall state in writing the terms of any requirements which they may impose.

8. Any applicant aggrieved by the neglect or refusal of the local authority to grant permission, or by any requirements imposed by the local authority, may appeal to the Minister, whose decision shall be final and shall have effect as if it were the decision of the local authority.

9. Subject and without prejudice to the power of the Minister to revoke or vary this Order, the Order shall remain in force in an area or part of an area until the date of the approval by the Minister of a Preliminary Statement for that area or part under the Ministry of Health (Town Planning) Regulations, 1921, or, where a Preliminary Statement is not required to be prepared the date of the approval by the Minister of a scheme for that area or part.

Given under the Official Seal of the Minister of Health, this Twelfth day of August, in the year One thousand nine hundred and twenty-two.

(L.S.)

I. G. GIBBON,
Assistant Secretary, Ministry of Health

1 S.R. & O., 1921, No. 373.
FORMS FOR USE IN CONNECTION WITH TOWN PLANNING (GENERAL INTERIM DEVELOPMENT) ORDER, 1922.

Specimen Forms of Permission.

Two forms are annexed.

Form A is suggested as suitable for use where the plan submitted under the byelaws is sufficient also for the purpose of a permission under the Order. The plan submitted under the byelaws should be treated as the plan for the purposes of the Order, unless it is quite clear that this is not practicable.

Form B is suggested as appropriate in cases of more extensive proposals for development, e.g., the development of an estate, permission for which may be sought in advance of the actual development and before the time is ripe for the submission of plans under the byelaws.

A note on the subject of agreements in connection with interim development is also annexed.

FORM A.

...................................................... Council of.........................

Town Planning Act, 1925,
Town Planning (General Interim Development) Order, 1922.

In pursuance of their powers under Article 3 of the above-mentioned Order the Council hereby permit street(s) to be laid out and building(s) to be erected* (on the site shown on the accompanying plan) in accordance with the plans submitted by.................................................. under the byelaws and approved by the Council on the................... day of.................................................. 19... , subject to compliance with the requirements specified hereunder.

Here specify any requirements† not adequately indicated on the plans submitted under the byelaws, e.g.:

(1) No part of the building(s) (except, e.g., bay-windows, porches or other similar projections) and no structure other than boundary walls and fences to be erected nearer to the boundary of the street than.................. feet.

* For use where the byelaw plan does not sufficiently identify the site. It may be possible in some cases to define the site without reference to a special plan.
† The requirements are illustrations only and the Council should not make any requirements which are not really essential.

† These Forms were issued by the Ministry of Health in March 1929.
FORMS OF PERMISSION.

(2) The building(s) not to occupy more than ................................ of its (their) curtilage(s).

(3) The building(s) not to be used for any other purpose than that indicated on the Plan without the consent of the Council or on appeal the Minister of Health.

* [The development may depart from the building byelaws (Local Acts, regulations) in force in the area of the Scheme to the following extent (extent shown in the following cross-section) :-]

Here insert a cross-section showing the lay-out of streets or specify any departure from the byelaws, etc., permitted in respect of the development, e.g., the streets to be of a width of ............ feet, with a carriageway of ............ feet and one footway(s) of ............ feet (each), subject to (specify any necessary provisions e.g., as to turning spaces)

* For use where a departure from the byelaws, etc., is permitted in accordance with the consent of the Minister under Article 6 of the Order (see paragraph 13 of the explanatory Memorandum on the General Interim Development Order 1922). Should any departures under Section 99 of the Housing Act, 1925, be involved, these should also be referred to.

* A specimen plan heading and Schedule of conditions is annexed.

Except as aforesaid, the permission is granted subject to due compliance with the building byelaws (Local Acts, regulations) and general statutory provisions in force in the area, and nothing herein shall be regarded as dispensing with such compliance, except to the extent herein specified.

Dated this ..................................... day of .................................. 19........

(To be sealed with the common seal of the Council.)

Signature of the Clerk to the Council
(or other competent Officer)

---------------------------------------------------------------

Town Planning Act, 1925.

Town Planning (General Interim Development) Order, 1922.

...................................... Town Planning Scheme.

In pursuance of their powers under Article 3 of the above-named Order the Council hereby permit the development of estates and building operation to proceed in accordance with the development plan and schedule of conditions annexed.*
FORMS OF PERMISSION.

†[The development may depart from the building byelaws (Local Acts, regulations) in force in the area of the Scheme to the extent shown in the conditions as to streets specified in the schedule.

Except as aforesaid,] the permission is granted subject to due compliance with the building byelaws (Local Acts, regulations) and general statutory provisions in force in the area, and nothing herein shall be regarded as dispensing with such compliance except to the extent aforesaid.

Dated this.......................................day of................................9...

(To be sealed with the common seal of the Council.)

Signature of Clerk to the Council
(or other competent officer)......................................................

---

SPECIMEN PLAN HEADING

.............................................Council of.......................................

Town Planning (General Interim Development) Order, 1922.

Development Plan referred to in Permission of the Council dated the .......................................day of................................9...

---

SPECIMEN SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS.

.............................................Council of.......................................

Town Planning (General Interim Development) Order, 1922.

Schedule of Conditions referred to in Permission of the Council dated .......................................day of................................9...

Here specify conditions*, e.g.:-

1. No buildings to be erected on the land which is coloured on the Plan and is intended to be reserved for the sites of streets to be laid out in accordance with the following cross-sections:—

Street A..............................................................................
Street B..............................................................................
.........................................................................................

2. No buildings to be erected on the land which is coloured on the Plan and is intended to be reserved for acquisition by the Council for a public open space, and no buildings to be erected on the land which is coloured.................and is intended to be reserved as a private open space other than buildings required for its use for that purpose (i.e., as a private ground for sports, play, rest and recreation, or as an ornamental garden or pleasure ground).

† For use where a departure from the byelaws, etc., is permitted in accordance with the consent of the Minister under Article 6 of the Order (see paragraph 13 of the Explanatory Memorandum on the General Interim Development Order 79(D). Should any departures under Section 99 of the Housing Act, 1934, be involved these should also be referred to.

* The conditions are illustrations only and the Council should not make any requirements that are not really essential. The conditions need only be specified so far as the plan itself does not adequately indicate them.
FORMS OF PERMISSION.

3. No part of the building(s) (except e.g., bay-windows, porches, or other similar projections), and no structure other than boundary walls and fences to be erected nearer to the boundary of the street than............. feet..................

4. No buildings other than dwelling-houses (a dwelling-house being a house designed for use as a dwelling by a single family, with such out-buildings as are ordinarily required to be used therewith) and .......... to be erected, except that .......... (e.g., shops or public buildings) may be erected on the land coloured.................on the Plan.

5. The number of dwelling-houses not to exceed an average of............. to the acre. The average to be measured over the whole of the area excluding ................. [e.g., the sites of shops, public buildings, etc. (separately over each portion of the area edged ...............on the Plan.]

6. No dwelling-house to occupy more than ................. and no................. to occupy more than ................. of its curtilage.

7. No building to exceed a height of ................. measured from the level of the street in front thereof to the eaves or parapet, or half the height of the gable whichever is the higher.

8. No building to be used for any other purpose than that indicated in Condition 4 without the consent of the Council or on appeal the Minister of Health.

NOTE ON SUBJECT OF AGREEMENTS.

It will sometimes be more convenient for the Council's consent and the conditions attached thereto to be incorporated in an agreement to be executed by the Council and the applicant. This will be the case where as a result of negotiations between the Council and the applicant it has been arranged that the applicant or the Council undertake some positive obligations which could only be effectively enforced if they form the subject of a contract between the two parties, as for example—an obligation to contribute to the cost of a street, to give land for a road or open space or to convey it to the Council on specified terms. Moreover it is part of the understanding (as it should be wherever practicable), that claims will not be made for compensation or betterment under the Scheme in respect of any particular matter, e.g., the reservation of a private open space or the fixing of a building line, the agreement should contain provision to this effect.

Where any agreement in respect of land in anticipation of a town planning scheme (whether in connection with a permission to develop or not) involves expenditure by the Council for which a loan sanction will be sought, it should be borne in mind that the Minister will not generally be prepared to sanction loans for sums in excess of the amounts which the District Valuers advise to be reasonable.
TOWN-PLANNING
WHAT IT IS AND WHY IT IS NEEDED

What Town-planning is

TOWN-PLANNING is a means of saving, not spending, money. It aims at preventing disease, and therefore, promoting health; at preventing ugliness and preserving beauty; at preventing the growth of bad industrial conditions, and, therefore, safeguarding industrial efficiency. It is the application to social conditions of the principles of preventive medicine.

Why Town-planning is necessary

The concentration of our population in towns has produced gigantic evils. Lack of foresight has resulted in many beautiful country districts being spoilt by the uncontrolled spreading of factories and houses. Houses have been built in places where factories should be. Factories have been placed in residential areas, which have been ruined by noise, smoke, and fumes. Slums have grown up, which are costly to remove. Streets and roads have been made so narrow that they have repeatedly to be widened at great expense. Insufficient open spaces have been left, so that great masses of people have to live far from contact with nature or opportunities for wholesome recreation. The lack of town-planning has been bad for domestic economy, industrial efficiency, and the health and moral welfare of the people.

How Town-planning works

Town-planning is the art and science of arranging beforehand for the extension of towns and the protection of the country. It does not necessitate buying a single yard of land, but it decides on the broad lines of future development. It surveys the district and decides where houses should be built, where factories should be placed, what roads will be wanted and what width they ought to be to meet the needs of future traffic, what ground should be reserved for parks and sports grounds, and what features of historic or artistic interest should be preserved.

The Present Position of Town-planning

In 1909 an Act was passed giving power to any local authorities, which wished to do so, to make a town-plan for all parts of their areas which had not already been built over but were likely to be developed. In 1910 it was made compulsory for Urban Districts of over 20,000 population to prepare a town plan before January 1st, 1926, and smaller local authorities, i.e., mainly Rural Districts, were given permission to town-plan their districts.
The Reasonableness of Town-planning

The procedure laid down by Parliament gives every opportunity for all who are interested in, or affected by, the town-plan to be heard. Everyone who wishes to secure better conditions for the future, to prevent the spoiling of their districts, or the addition of new mistakes to those already made, should take an active and personal share in promoting a town-plan, and bringing to bear on it intelligent and constructive criticism.

He should first see if his Council has begun the preparation of a town-planning scheme. Secondly, he should take steps to secure for the Council the support and stimulating influence of public opinion, so that the town-plan may provide for the best interests of the district’s health, industry, and social life.

Points particularly to be watched are:

1. The separation of industrial and residential areas.
2. The limitation in residential areas of the number of houses to be built per acre.
3. The scheduling of areas best served by natural advantages, communications, power-supply, etc., for industry, and of areas of sufficient size and suitably placed for commercial use, shopping and public buildings.
4. The reservation of land for roads. If roads are properly planned great economies may be made in the construction of roads in residential areas, and heavy through traffic can be diverted from narrow streets and office districts. For the wise planning of roads co-operation with adjoining Councils is essential.
5. The proper placing of schools, churches, theatres, public buildings, etc.
6. The earmarking of land for playgrounds and open spaces. Small children need small recreation grounds near their homes, boys and girls space for tennis, football, cricket, and other games, and all ages require parks and gardens.
7. The preservation of beauty spots and places of historic interest.
APPENDIX 3

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHANGE INDICES

* Growth Rates

* Regional Imbalance

* Regional Population Changes

* Occupational Structure
Growth in the Inter-War Economy

Economists have different opinions about the relative performance of the economy during the 1920s and early 1930s. To some extent the issue is about relativities. Most indices expressing economic growth, such as G.D.P. or National Income show that over the period as a whole growth did occur, when compared both to previous long-run periods in Britain and when compared to other countries. The table below shows the percentage growth per decade in terms of industrial growth for a variety of decades from 1855 to 1938.

The Rate of Growth of U.K. Industrial Production, 1855-1938.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855/94-1895/1904</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>1895/04-1905/1914</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880/99-1900/1909</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>1900/09-1910/1919</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890/99-1900/1909</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>1905/14-1915/1924</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890/99-1900/1909</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>1910/19-1920/1929</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895/04-1905/1914</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>1915/24-1925/1934</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895/04-1905/1914</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>1920/29-1930/1938</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the longer run none of the growth rates above compare to those of 40-50% experienced in the first half of the nineteenth century but as can be seen the inter-war years were the best for a quarter of a century. Similarly, on the basis of the Gross Domestic Product the growth trend for the inter-war years is at least as good as the period 1870-1913 (Alford, 1972). Alford, however, offers a cautionary note pointing out that certain statistical anomalies tend to distort the growth rates in favour of the inter-war years and against those before the First World War. He also notes that the overall performance of the economy in terms of National Income, rather than the narrower measure of Industrial Production, shows the inter-war years in a less favourable light.
The picture then is that whilst the UK economy was not the unmitigated disaster between the wars it has sometimes been depicted, it nevertheless had grave structural problems. Throughout the whole period one can see a pattern of uneven development between industrial sectors, reflected in territorial disparities.

The Regional Imbalance

The 1920s and early 1930s saw the emergence of a severe regional problem which was to remain throughout the inter-war years. Structural unemployment within the 'depressed' regions, as they came to be called, resulted in unemployment rates far in excess of the national average as can be seen in the table below:

Percentage Rates of Unemployment, 1922, 1927, 1929: By Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>1922</th>
<th>1927</th>
<th>1929</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Within the depressed regions particular blackspots, often referred to
as 'distressed areas', suffered much higher levels of unemployment which persisted throughout the period. The table below shows the percentage unemployment figures for particular industries which gives an indication how those communities that often had a heavy reliance on one such industry suffered.

Percentage Unemployed in Selected Major Industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>July 1923</th>
<th>July 1927</th>
<th>July 1929</th>
<th>July 1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average for the whole country</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal Mining</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel melting, iron puddling, iron and steel rolling etc.</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton Spinning &amp; Weaving</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen &amp; Worsted</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: N. Branson, opt.cit. p.149 (statistical abstract for the UK No.78)

The more prosperous regions witnessed growth in both factory building and in suburban housing. The number of factories established in the Southern Division of the Factory Inspectorate between 1920 and 1928 was over 3,000. In the Action/Slough area in west London the number of factory workers grew from 60,000 to 150,000 between 1923 and 1928. (3) The regional shift in population can be seen in the Table below:
Regional Population Changes, 1911–1931

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1931</th>
<th>1911–1921</th>
<th>1921–1931</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London &amp; South East</td>
<td>11,703</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>13,502</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West counties</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern counties</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>4,307</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Riding</td>
<td>3,128</td>
<td>3,305</td>
<td>3,443</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern rural belt*</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire &amp; Cheshire</td>
<td>5,722</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>6,128</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland &amp; Durham</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; Central Wales</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
<td>36,070</td>
<td>38,885</td>
<td>39,888</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>4,761</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>40,831</td>
<td>42,767</td>
<td>44,831</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cumberland, Westmorland, Yorkshire East Riding, Yorkshire North Riding.


In overall terms the population of Great Britain rose by just over 2 million between 1921 and 1931, a 4.8% increase. Of this London and the South-East accounted for 1.3 million or 63.6% and the Midlands (east and west) 488,000 or 18.8%. By way of contrast Wales, Scotland and Northern England could only manage a growth of 28,000 between them, and within this figure Wales and Scotland suffered a net loss of population of 107,000. In the industrial regions of Britain only the West Riding of Yorkshire recorded a growth pattern resembling the national average.

**Occupational Structure**

In general terms the structure of the workforce in Britain changed in the period to reflect two main trends, the growth of service industry...
at the expense of productive industry and an increase in female employment. Job opportunities expanded for shopworkers, clerical staff, professional and managerial positions. A high proportion of these 'white collar' jobs were taken by women. On the debit side the traditional industries, dominated by men, lost labour. The following table illustrates the changes occurring among wage earners during the 1920s.

### Number of Wage-earners Employed in Selected Industries, 1920, 1929

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1929</th>
<th>Increase or decrease 000</th>
<th>Per cent increase or decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coalmining*</td>
<td>1,203</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>- 271</td>
<td>- 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron &amp; Steel</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>- 175</td>
<td>- 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipbuilding</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>- 130</td>
<td>- 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>- 343</td>
<td>- 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>- 56</td>
<td>- 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woollen &amp; Worsted</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>- 15</td>
<td>- 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docks</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>- 33</td>
<td>- 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>- 149</td>
<td>- 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railways#</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>- 75</td>
<td>- 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building, Bricks, Cement</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>+ 123</td>
<td>+ 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; Publishing</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>+ 30</td>
<td>+ 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>+ 18</td>
<td>+ 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle manuf. Motors etc.</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>+ 52</td>
<td>+ 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram, Omnibus Service &amp; Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Transport</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>+ 88</td>
<td>+ 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Trades#</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>+ 266</td>
<td>+ 15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wage earners on colliery books.
# Including salaried staff

As can be seen in this table, considerable employment losses occurred in all the traditional manual occupations that tended to be associated with the heartlands of British industry. Of the loss makers only the docks, railways and agriculture could be said to have a more
generalised impact throughout the country. The growth industries centres around motor vehicles, in terms of manufacture and as a means of both public and lorry transport. The largest growth is shown in the distributive trades, which includes shopworkers. This reflects the increasing affluence of sections of the population, a trend that was more noticeable in the South and the Midlands, but occurred everywhere.

The proportion of women entering the labour market had leapt during the First World War. The end of the war saw a massive laying off of women workers as soldiers returned, but there was a gradual return in the study period to different types of employment. During the war many women were employed in factory occupations, especially armaments. After the war the pattern altered back to the pre-war situation where domestic service and textiles dominated female occupations. Domestic service actually increased between 1921 and 1931 from 19% to 20% of all female occupations. Textile working continued to decline. The key growth areas were in clerical jobs which rose to 10% by 1931 and in shop assistants. In terms of economic activity, female employed showed a rise from 70.7% to 74.8% for single women aged 25-54 and from 8.9% to 10.7% for married women of the same age group, all between 1921 and 1931.(5)

REFERENCES

4. In this table the salaried sections, which were increasing in numbers in most industries, have been omitted, so as to show the impact on manual workers alone. However, for the railways the salaried staffs which comprised about one fifth of the total have been included. For the distributive trades salaried staffs have also been included, since shop assistants who comprised nearly half the total were classed as salaried. The figures are estimated.
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'PLANNING & NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION', 1932
Planning and National Reconstruction.

MR. NEVILLE CHAMBERLAIN.

"On the basis on which we are working now it is not safe to leave any corner of Old England unplanned, however remote it may seem to be from development to-day, and we shall not be content until every square inch of the country from Land's End to John o'Groats is the subject of a town plan of some kind.

"An appeal has been made to me that something should be done to extend built-up areas the powers which are now entrusted to local authorities in respect of undeveloped land. You are preaching to the converted."—(Mr. Neville Chamberlain, Minister of Health, in an address to the Manchester and District Joint Town Planning Advisory Committee, October, 1927.)

SIR HILTON YOUNG.

"It is a very grateful and lively pleasure to me to have the privilege to introduce for the second time into this House a Bill which has the consent of supporters of all three parties, and which, I may claim, has awakened in the lives and the hearts of the whole country a measure of real enthusiasm."—(Sir Hilton Young, on the Second Reading of his Rural Amenities Bill, 23rd January, 1931, the main provisions of which are incorporated in the Bill now under discussion.)

SIR LESLIE SCOTT, K.C.

"The mind of the whole country and of the Government and the majority in Parliament was concentrated on one task—to restore the nation's prosperity by re-establishing its credit and restoring its earning power. . . . The Town and Country Planning Bill is a measure which would bring directly and indirectly substantial and in some ways even powerful aid in the economic task."—(Sir Leslie Scott, K.C.).
The Town and Country Planning Bill

as introduced, sponsored by Sir Hilton Young, Minister of Health, provides for the preservation of rural amenities, and the planning of built-up areas on the lines advocated by Mr. Chamberlain.

Planning a Non-Party Question.

Town Planning is one of the few subjects which Governments and Parliaments have treated on non-party lines.

The first Town Planning Act was sponsored by Mr. John Burns, a Liberal, as a non-party measure in 1909.

The next Act, considerably extended, became law under the Coalition Government of 1919.

Mr. Neville Chamberlain in 1925 was responsible for a further amended and consolidated Act. Mr. Chamberlain also introduced the Local Government Act of 1929, under which new powers in relation to town planning were conferred upon County Councils and the Minister of Health. He promised further legislation and had hoped to carry into effect the recommendations which he made as Chairman of the Unhealthy Areas Committee, which investigated the problem in 1919-21, and came to the conclusion that comprehensive planning of whole towns is essential to health and efficiency.

Sir Hilton Young's Rural Amenities Bill, which was supported by all sides of the House and passed its second reading unanimously, embodied some of the main provisions in the present Bill. It was withdrawn on the Labour Government undertaking to bring in a comprehensive Town and Country Planning Bill on the lines which Mr. Chamberlain had forshadowed, but was prevented from introducing it in consequence of the General Election of 1929. The promised Bill passed its second reading, without a division, as a non-party and non-contentious measure in March, 1931.

The Bill was considered by a Standing Committee, with a majority of Conservatives and Liberals, for twenty-one days in the summer of 1931, and emerged from this ordeal after some amendments as a non-party measure. Again political events interrupted its progress, but it was reintroduced this year as it left the Committee.

The Bill now under discussion is Mr. Neville Chamberlain's vindication of his promise to the last Conservative Government, and is a realisation of the reforms which he has advocated for many years. To him, more than any other statesman, the credit belongs for directing the various proposals into practical channels and preparing the way for legislation.

The Prime Minister has expressed his keen sympathetic interest in the Bill, regarding it as an instrument for enabling reconstruction of unhealthy areas, safeguarding national economy, and for preserving the beauties of the countryside.

It is highly fitting that the National Government should pass the Bill into law, as no reform in its evolution has more completely overcome party politics or is more entitled to be accepted as a truly national measure.
'PLANNING & NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION', 1932 - A SYNOPSIS OF ARTICLES

Surrey County Council Act 1931, by Sir Edward Holland (Chairman of the Central Valuation Committee for England & Wales, ex-Chairman of Surrey County Council & High Sheriff of Surrey in 1931).

The Landowner & Town & Country Planning, by Colonel Sir George Courthorpe, (President of the Central Landowners' Association).

Why Builders should support the Bill by F.A. Minter (Councillor of the London Master Builders' Association).

Need of Planning in a Metropolitan County by G. Marlow Reed (Chairman of the Middlesex County Council).

Common Sense in Planning by W.R. Davidge (Prominent Architect & Town Planner).

Building Societies & the Bill by Sir Harold Bellman (Managing Director, the Abbey Road Building Society).

Town Planning in Lancashire by Sir George Etherton (Clerk of Lancashire County Council).


Local Authorities & Planning by Professor Adshead (Professor of Design, University of London).

Aims & Ideals Behind Planning by Sir Patrick Geddes (Pioneer of Civic Surveys & Planning).

Why Town Planning is Necessary by The Earl of Haddo (Chairman of Town Planning Committee of the LCC).

Planning in Other Countries, Great Britain behind Commercial Competitors by R. Maxwell (President of the Town Planning Institute).

Interest of Owners in Planning by Raymond Unwin (President of RIBA, Technical Advisor to the Greater Regional Planning Committee).

Planning & the Countryside by Sir Lawrence Chubb (of the National Playingfields Association; Commons, Open Spaces & Footpaths Preservation Society; & Scapa Society).

Interspersed with these articles are snippets of statements or quotes from the following: Recommendations of the Committee on Unhealthy Areas which had reported to Neville Chamberlain in 1921; from the speech by John Burns earlier in 1931, his first public speech since the war; from
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a broadcast speech by Sir Hilton Young and from his speech to Parliament in moving his Rural Amenities Bill in 1930 and in 1931; and also from Sir Kingsley Wood also speaking in the 1931 debate; and resolutions from certain bodies.
APPENDIX 5

THE ORIGINS & EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF ICI BILLINGHAM
This Appendix details the early history of a vital part of what came to be called, Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI). This crucial element in the great combine started out as a subsidiary of Brunner, Mond. It was known as Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited (SA & N). To the locals it was, and still is among the older inhabitants, known as 'The Synthetic'. Its history is so important to the Teesside area that this Appendix is devoted to describing the genesis of the company from 1918 to 1920 and then its subsequent progress during the 1920s and early 1930s. (1)

The use of the nitrates was an essential element in the production of explosives and hence central to any government's war effort. In 1914 Britain relied on the import of natural nitrate from Chile and was, therefore, vulnerable to attacks on merchant shipping. In the middle of the war Germany stepped up her attempts to dislocate Britain's supplies by mounting a sustained U-boat attack on the main shipping routes. This threat led directly to the government setting up a Nitrogen Products Committee to urgently look into the possibility of manufacturing nitrates synthetically via ammonia. The technique of manufacturing ammonia by 'capturing' nitrogen from the air had been developed by German scientists Haber and Bosch before the war. This factor is often cited as a primary reason for Germany's ability to prolong the way beyond 1916, since it afforded them with an internal supply of nitrates to sustain the explosives industry. Germany's lead in this type of chemical engineering was without parallel. The British Government accepted the recommendation of the Committee that it should set up its own synthetic ammonia plant and seek to emulate the Haber-Bosch process. A site was recommended near Billingham on Teesside. Although the site commended itself because of its proximity to the necessary resources of coal, water and salt, together with the
existence of good communications and the nearby supply of a skilled industrial workforce, the deciding factor was the nearby location of a vast, new electric power station. The valuable deposits of anhydrite, directly underneath the site itself, were not then appreciated. (2)

The Ministry of Munitions was charged with the responsibility to build and staff the factory. Work began on the 271 acre site in 1918. At the same time a team of scientists were assembled to try and develop the mystery process.

By the end of the war very little plant had been built although large sums of money had been expended on ordering materials and equipment. The inclination of the Government at the end of the war was to fold the whole scheme up. State run industry was only idologically acceptable in a war context. However, several officials at the Ministry of Munitions were reluctant to see the project disappear. They prevailed upon the Government to try and sell the site and buildings to a private company and to encourage the continued efforts to produce synthetic ammonia. It was argued that the war had illustrated the national significance of such a process and they warned of the danger of Britain's continued reliance on foreign imports of essential explosives material.

Brunner, Mond and Company were the most likely buyers of the Government site. They were one of Britain's largest heavy chemical companies and one of the few capable of mustering the necessary resources. After initially declining the offer, Brunner, Mond were persuaded to make the Government an offer after being allowed to visit the German synthetic ammonia plant in Oppau. There, scientists and officials of the Ministry of Munitions and Brunner, Mond sought to gather the secrets of the Haber-Bosch process. The French occupying forces insisted that they take no notes and Germans followed a policy of obstruction and non-co-operation. Nevertheless, Brunner, Mond felt sufficiently encouraged
to try and repeat the process at Billingham. An agreement with the Government was drawn up in 1920. Under this agreement a new company was to be formed with authorised capital of £5 million. Brunner, Mond felt unable to enter the project by themselves and cast around for support. Eventually, Explosives Trades (Nobels), agreed to help launch the new company, only to withdraw at the last moment. Brunner, Mond agreed to act alone as agents for a new company to be launched to buy all the Ministry of Munitions interests at Billingham for about £715,200. The Government was to approve the first directors and the company was always to remain under British control. Brunner, Mond undertook to put up a factory capable of producing not less than 20 tones of ammonia a day, and an oxidation plant capable of dealing with not less than 10 tons, to produce nitric acid for explosives. Licenses were to be granted under government patent and the Minister was to help Brunner, Mond acquire the German-owned patent. (3)

The new company was launched as a wholly owned subsidiary of Brunner, Mond in June, 1920, and known as Synthetic Ammonia and Nitrates Limited (SA & N). Apart from the Government site the company bought large adjacent areas of land including a considerable length of river frontage. The first objective of the company was to produce synthetic ammonia and to covert it into sulphate of ammonia, an agricultural fertilizer, and nitrates for explosives. The perfection of the process and the construction of the necessary plant took three years. Production of ammonia was achieved for the first time on Christmas Eve 1923. The company had been aided considerably by the timely defection from Germany of two scientists in 1920 who proceeded to offer the secrets of the Haber-Bosch process to Brunner, Mond. After a brief pause to consider the ethics of such a transaction the company decided to engage the two men for a considerable sum of money. No doubt this transaction was amply rewarded in the future balance sheets of the company, even if the ethical balance sheet had dipped into the 'red'.
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By the end of 1924 the production of ammonia had risen to 30 tons a day, thus more than meeting the 'agreement' with the Government. The company energetically expanded the works and increased the range of products. The very rapid planting of such a large and modern industry on its doorstep produced reactions of awe and pride in Billingham as witness this extract from the official guide in 1928.

"The vast enterprise is equipped with the most perfect and complete chemical and engineering laboratories in Britain, where over 400 chemists are constantly at work. Secret processes are employed, which are guarded so carefully that it would be easier to effect an entrance into Buckingham Palace than into the laboratories and technical departments of these mystery works at Billingham." (4)

The dependence of the locality on the developing works is illustrated in the same handbook which points out that the rateable value of the district nearly doubled in five years from £90,859 in 1923 to £167,517 in 1928, of which 80% represents the rateable value of industrial undertakings. The guide also recognised the debt it owned on the job front.

"Expansion is constantly going on, and although the existing works have cost about £6,000,000, an additional £3,000,000 will probably be spent before they are completed. The number of workers is growing in proportion. Seven thousand are employed at present, and during the next two or three years extensions and developments will probably result in this figure being doubled. The Synthetic Works are, in fact, a striking illustration of how a combination of brains, capital and scientific experiment can create new industries and provide a comfortable livelihood for the workless." (5)
In fact the 'Synthetic' was clearly a dominant factor in pressing the local authorities to co-operate in Town Planning. It may also help to explain the readiness of the local authorities to delegate their town planning powers to a joint committee capable of responding with one voice to the mighty combine growing in its midst. By 1926 the three largest chemical concerns in the country including the Brunner, Mond Company, agreed to merge to form ICI. SA & N however, continued to operate under that name throughout the rest of the 1920s.

During the latter half of the 1920s SA & N began to diversify. In 1928 production of methanol began; in 1929 a new fertilizer, Nitro-chalk was developed; and then towards the end of the same year a new plant to make phosphate fertilizer came 'on stream'. Expansion in other directions was aided by the formation of ICI. Certain operations were transferred to Billingham from Glasgow and Wallsend. This led to new plant being built to accommodate the manufacture of sodium and cyanide. An adjacent cement works was also acquired and used in the manufacture of sulphuric acid.
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