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Abstract

In the light of increasing interest in new settlements through the 1980s and early 1990s, this thesis examines the development of three existing private sector new settlements. The study examines the development of three case study sites, East Goscote in Leicestershire, Bar Hill in Cambridgeshire and Martlesham Heath in Suffolk. It assesses what new light the development of such sites can shed upon existing understandings of the development of place and community, and the changing nature of urban form in the context of the modern to post-modern transition noted by geographers over the past thirty years. It also aims to place new settlements in a wider historical context, examining the theoretical assumptions they inherit from earlier attempts to create new places, notably the garden cities movement, and the state new towns programme.

The case studies examine the origins of each of the three sites, and follow their physical development to the present day, analysing what events, personalities and assumptions shaped their final form. They address the extent to which the development of each site was a response to local contingencies, or to wider forces, and draw out both the similarities and the differences between each site. The study also looks at the way in which community organisations have developed in each of the three sites, and to what extent each community has developed a sense of its own identity and cohesion. In doing so, it determines the extent to which concepts of place and community are relevant in the context of new settlements, and in the context of contemporary urban forms.

The thesis illustrates that these three new settlements were primarily local, contingent responses, but also indicates that there are common patterns to their growth. The study also shows the considerable similarities new settlements share with early garden cities, and the extent to which they were also affected by the state new towns programme. In addition, it illustrates that notions of place identity and community are shaped by a small number of individuals, and concludes that such concepts remain valid, though subject to constant change and renegotiation.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Defining new settlements

Private sector new settlements, sometimes known as 'new villages', have emerged over the last thirty years, and especially during the last ten, as one solution amongst many in providing for the increasing spatial needs of cities and towns. They have, by and large, been a rare solution, and, depending on definition, there exist about twenty in the country as a whole, and many more which never made the transition from speculative proposal to physical reality.

Defining what constitutes a private sector new settlement is difficult, and various groups and authors have, for their own reasons, tried to extend or contract the boundaries of definition. However, for the purposes of this study, some parameters need to be drawn. New settlements are, in a physical sense, separate from surrounding or adjacent building or other urban land uses, so that they are, at a minimum, separated from the bulk of the adjacent urban mass by a green corridor of some description, usually in agricultural or other rural use. It is this physical separation which establishes the key difference between new settlements and suburban additions to urban forms. This is somewhat arbitrary, since new settlements share much with many private sector suburban developments, including elements of their built environment and architecture, and, to some extent, their modes of development. As will be noted later, the functional role of new settlements also shares much with that of suburbs.

The issue of physical separation from the main urban mass also divides new settlements from large urban redevelopment schemes, such as those in the Docklands of London, and from the 'urban villages' initiative to which the Prince of Wales has lent his high profile support1. They are primarily residential in nature, though they may have substantial areas of retailing or industrial activity attached, which may cater for more than immediate local

1For example, the Poundbury development at Dorchester, discussed in Turkington (1994), and Baxter, Alan & Associates (1991).
need. Developments with the primary purpose of sport (for example, golf courses), which also have an element of residential development within the site, have attempted to masquerade under the new settlements banner. Their right to be considered as such would seem to be doubtful, given that the residential function is merely an adjunct of their primary one. Only where the residential development begins to equal the scale of that in a primarily residential development would such sporting villages have a case for consideration.

The scale of new settlements varies widely. The smallest of the ‘proper’ new settlements consist of some five hundred houses, which is about the minimum capable of supporting its own primary school, and some local retail and community facilities. This is a somewhat arbitrary cut-off point, but it is the effective lower limit for some functional self-containment; at this scale shops and small communal leisure or social facilities can be supported, as well as a primary school. At the larger end of the spectrum, the parameters of new settlements extend beyond the scale of the village, to what have been referred to as ‘new country towns’, of which South Woodham Ferrers, with something around 15,000 population, is the most well known completed example. The most common scale, however, is in the range of 800 to 1500 houses, giving a population of somewhere between 2500 and 5000 people, depending upon the size of the houses. It is upon this scale of settlement that this study concentrates, for several reasons elucidated later, where the parameters of study are outlined.

---

2Nigel Moor (1990a) reports a typology by David Lock (from his Historic Houses Association Ibstock 1989 Lecture) which suggests a lower limit of 750 houses for a primary school. However Tircoed was planned for 500 houses with a school, and thus this lower figure seems a reasonable lower threshold for a primary school.

3Recent regional planning guidance (Department of the Environment, 1992b) suggests settlements of around 10,000 dwellings (25,000 to 30,000 population) might be appropriate, lifting the scale of new settlements firmly into that of small towns.

4David Lock’s typology of new settlements (reported in Moor, 1990a) also uses 1500 houses as the boundary between new villages and country towns. The latter are then defined as being between 1500 and 6000 houses, thus placing Lock’s upper size limit for new settlements substantially below that suggested in the latest regional guidance, or the size of garden cities or new towns completed in earlier years.
The work of Chris Amos\(^5\) has dealt in great detail with the development processes of new settlements. For the purposes of defining terms here, it is necessary to establish the aspects of their mode of development which mark them out from what has gone before, particularly the state new towns programme\(^6\). The most common mode of development for new settlements is one led by the private sector - that is, the private sector have taken the initiative in the development process, having identified a site and developed a scheme for a new settlement. However, it is sometimes the case that the private sector has taken over the initiative from the public sector (usually the local planning authority) at some stage, or has worked in partnership with them for some part of the process. This may put the initiative for selecting a new settlement solution, and often site selection, into the hands of a public body, after one or both of which stages, a private sector company or consortium of some nature will take over responsibility. This draws a distinction between the new settlements and the state new towns, developed under the auspices of the 1946 New Towns Act. For, whilst the largest new settlements may begin to approach the scale of the smallest new towns, new settlements are, by definition, private sector undertakings, and have nothing to do either with the 1946 Act, or any sort of New Town Development Corporation. This implies another crucial difference - that initiative for new towns was national and policy driven, and for new settlements has been local and, to a greater extent, contingent. The borders become blurred in the latter comparison, as in situations such as Bar Hill, the decision to build a new settlement was part of a wider planning policy (though significantly, the new settlements route was only chosen when the general thrust of the policy - for the restriction of the urban sprawl of Cambridge - proved seriously flawed). It was therefore a contingent response justified as policy. Moreover, in the 1980s, new settlements were the results of policy decisions made by national developers, argued on a case by case basis as a response to local demands and markets, mostly in the south-east. Many of these applications were, however, put forward by Consortium Developments Ltd (CDL), primarily on sites on green belt land in the south east region. There was, in their approach, a significant regional element, with an intention to breach green belt policy, and hence national planning policy, by obtaining permissions for individual new settlements. This was the nearest that new settlements have come to any form of national or regional


\(^6\) A fuller discussion of the relationship between garden cities, the state new towns and new settlements is conducted in Chapter 2 of this study.
strategy, and even in this case, they are clearly distinguished from the state new towns
programme by their private sector initiative. In the 1990s, in the context of plan led
development, the partnership approach\(^7\) which emerges, whereby a local planning authority
identifies a need, and the private sector provides solutions to that need, is still essentially
local in nature, even if it involves national development companies, and is in the context of
regional guidance and county structure plans.

Thus there are a series of parameters with which to define the subject of study, private
sector new settlements. They are physically separate from the main body of the urban
fabric, they are predominantly residential, they are within certain parameters of scale, they
are the products of the private sector, either in initiative, or at least in taking the main role
in the development process, and they are largely a local response to local contingencies
(with the exception of CDL, which can be argued to have been a regional strategy to
breach national policy, though conducted locally at the scale of individual sites).

**The new settlements movement**

The introductory paragraph of this chapter makes reference to a thirty year historical
timescale for new settlements, and their particular relevance to the last decade or so of
planning history. New settlements became the subject of considerable professional and
academic interest in the mid and late 1980s, in what has come to be known as the ‘new
settlements movement’. The first new settlements, as defined within the parameters
discussed in this study, were initiated in the early years of the 1960s, and thus by the time
of the new settlements movement in the mid-1980s, there were several such sites either
completed, or well advanced in construction. Thus it would not be true to say that the new
settlements movement invented new settlements, rather it was the movement which

\(^7\)The shifting political context of planning policy in the 1980s and early 1990s has changed the balance of
power, and thus the relationship, between planning authorities and developers with regard to new settlements.
Currently, developers adopt a strategy of working in partnership with a local planning authority through the
development planning process. This is different to the antagonistic relationship which existed in the mid-
1980s, when developers (notably Consortium Developments Ltd) felt a strategy of subverting the local
planning process, hoping to win approval through the appeal system (operated at a national scale, with final
decisions given by the Secretary of State for the Environment), would be more successful. This changing
context is pursued more fully later in discussing the new settlements movement.
appears to have popularised the discussion of new settlements in planning and development circles, and also to have brought together a number of previously largely autonomous sites under one theoretical 'umbrella'. However, all three sites discussed in this thesis predated the 'new settlements movement'.

The main catalysts for this movement were changes in planning policy, and the way in which that policy was interpreted and exploited, which coincided with conditions in the UK economy particularly favourable to speculative development, both in residential markets and elsewhere. The first key piece of planning guidance in this regard was Circular 22/80, which enshrined the 'presumption in favour of development'. Essentially, it guided local planning authorities to grant planning permission unless there were clear reasons not to do so (rather than only granting permission if there was a good reason to do so). This, along with other guidance from the Department of the Environment which loosened planning controls in the early 1980s, created an environment which appeared to place considerably greater power into the hands of developers, and encouraged them not only to work within the planning system through lobbying and presentations to examinations in public, but also to challenge initial decisions and plan policy through the appeals system.

---

8Entitled 'Development Control - Policy and Practice'.
9The exact wording of the relevant section of the circular read: "Local Planning Authorities are asked therefore to pay greater regard to time and efficiency; adopt a more positive attitude to planning applications; to facilitate development; and always to grant planning permission, having regard to all material considerations, unless there are sound and clear-cut reasons for refusal. They are asked to ensure that their planning policies and practices create the right conditions to enable the house building industry to meet the public's need for housing" (Herington, 1982, p158).
10Which were followed in 1985 by the White Paper 'Lifting the Burden', which was critical of the development planning system, particularly the process of review and updating, which was described as "becoming...too slow and cumbersome" (Cullingworth and Nadin, 1994, p16).
11Cullingworth and Nadin (1994) discuss the changes in guidance and their effect upon the general planning environment.
12Amos (1991b) discusses the role developers played during the late 1980s in this regard.
13As examples, both Stone Bassett and Foxley Wood went to appeal, though the success of such an approach seemed limited, as both were rejected (Amos, 1991b), along with a number of other schemes.
The expansion of the housing market engendered by the boom years of the mid-1980s, and the greater power garnered by developers through a more laissez-faire and pro-development planning system, initiated many challenges to planning policy on the grounds that housing needs were not being met, or that consumer demand for housing was not being met, especially in the south-east. In 1983, Consortium Developments Ltd was founded to ‘promote and implement the construction of new settlements in the South East’. This was quickly followed, in July 1984, by government guidance which suggested that “in a few cases iy regional planning policy with regard to green belts, but also the pro growth, and the additional need for housing, in the south east region.

The companies which comprised Consortium Developments Ltd (CDL) together accounted for 30 per cent of all the private housing built in the UK during 1984, and thus had considerable resources and influence. It was almost certainly the intervention of such a large organisation into the housing market with a number of proposals for new settlements which initiated wider interest in such schemes - thus if any one event could be said to have begun the ‘new settlements movement’, it would almost certainly have to be the launch of CDL, which provided ‘critical mass’ to existing disparate interests in the subject.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{14}}\text{Which Cullingworth and Nadin (1994, p121) suggest was the primary reason for the increase in new settlement proposals.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{15}}\text{Again, Amos (1991b) discusses the grounds on which such challenges were made.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{16}}\text{Consortium Developments Ltd, 1985, p4.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{17}}\text{DoE Circular 15/84, ‘Land for Housing’.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{18}}\text{An analysis of the issues arising from the demand for housing in the south-east is provided by Lock (1989a).}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{19}}\text{CDL comprised nine companies: Barratt Developments PLC, Beazer Homes Ltd., Bovis Homes Ltd., Broseley Estates Ltd., Christian Salvesen (Properties) Ltd., Ideal Homes Holdings PLC, Tarmac PLC, Wilcon Homes Ltd. and Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{20}}\text{Potter (1986) largely concurs with this view, stating that “it was probably Consortium Development’s formation in 1983... that first drew attention to the concept of privately developed new towns” (p304).}\]

6
The CDL plan was for a ring of villages around Greater London, and within the South East region. These included sites at Tillingham Hall in Essex, Stone Bassett in Oxfordshire, and Foxley Wood in Hampshire, which later became a ‘cause celebre’ in the planning world. There are two areas of interest with regard to CDL’s proposals in this context, firstly, what they proposed, because it provides clues as to how new settlements were compared to other urban forms (including new towns and garden cities), and secondly why they proposed their sites, because this underlies the wider argument for new settlements as a strategic option, adopted by the new settlements movement as the decade progressed.

It is notable that the general model adopted by CDL, by the terms of David Lock’s typology of new settlements, and by their own description, was for new country towns, and not new villages, with a proposed size of about 5000 homes, resulting in a population of between 12,000 and 15,000 people. They envisaged that each settlement would take around 10 years to build, thus necessitating a housing completion rate of around 500 units per annum. Whilst the underlying reasons for selecting such a size of settlement were undoubtedly those of development economics (any smaller and the costs of infrastructure and other general provision would have to be defrayed on fewer house sales, any larger and the sites would have had greater environmental implications than they would already have had), CDL also tried to justify their selection of this scale of development with other reasons. They argued that such a size of development would provide “a positive balance between city and village”, would be “large enough to sustain many social and commercial facilities”, but at the same time would be “small enough to offer a real sense of identity”, and finally that country towns were “the most preferred location for people moving out of the cities”. Whether consciously or not, these statements evoke not merely an idealised view of “the most familiar and attractive features of English life”, but also older ideas in planning, which hark back to Ebenezer Howard and the garden cities movement, notably

---

21 This should be compared with the timescales and per annum housing completion rates achieved at the three sites selected for study in this thesis, as discussed in Chapter 3.
23 Consortium Developments Ltd., 1985, p6 (in a section entitled “Communities in an English tradition”).
the notion of a ‘third way’ between urban and rural life, self-containment, and the possibility of place identity and communal belonging\textsuperscript{24,25}.

The practical argument for new country towns put forward by CDL also explains much about why their development proposals emerged in the time and place that they did. Much as population projections made in the 1960s\textsuperscript{26} produced scenarios which made it seem that a second generation of new towns was required, and subsequently provided the impetus for the designation of fourteen New Towns between 1961 and 1971, so the argument for building new country towns was also based upon an impending crisis because of the mismatch between the need for housing and the rate of its production. Using government forecasts, CDL suggested that housing needs in the south east region would exceed supply by 250,000 during the decade 1981 to 1991\textsuperscript{27}. Their argument was that land was not being allocated in county structure plans to provide these extra homes, and that this land shortage would both price many potential purchasers out of the housing market, and inhibit growth\textsuperscript{28}.

\textsuperscript{24}Chapter 2 of this thesis examines the history of ideas from Howard, through the garden cities movement and the state new towns programme, and places new settlements into this historical context. These ideas of the third way, self-containment and place identity are crucial to this history, and also form the basis for much of the discussion chapter (Chapter 7).

\textsuperscript{25}Housebuilders did not enter into plans for new settlements out of any planning ideals, however, whatever arguments they may have used to support their approach. Hall (1991, p291) notes that Graham Pye, past president of the House Builders Federation, had suggested at a conference that no more than 10\% of the South-East’s housing needs should be provided in new settlements. Hall suggests that this was because most house builders already had options to build on land around existing settlements and that “the last thing they want to see is most of the demand diverted elsewhere to land designated for new settlements”.

\textsuperscript{26}In 1960, the population at the end of the century was projected to reach 64 million, and by 1965, this projection had risen to 75 million. Migration and ‘household fission’ increased the apparent need for development (Cullingworth and Nadin, 1994, p13). These projections were revised rapidly downwards by the early 1970s, and have, of course, proved to be considerably greater than that which actually occurred.

\textsuperscript{27}CDL cited a Government-projected increase of 720,000 households in the region between 1981 and 1991, and the estimate that only 600,000 new homes would be provided in the region during the same period. Adding in existing housing shortages in London, replacement of old dwellings, and vacancies to allow labour mobility, brought CDL to the figure of 250,000 (Consortium Developments Ltd., 1985, p14).

\textsuperscript{28}Substantial growth in the number of households in England continues to be an issue, especially the growth of single person households. The latest projections suggest that there will be an increase of 4.4 million
Thus the CDL proposals addressed the apparent shortfall in housing supply in the south­
east region in the 1980s, and were, therefore, both time and geographically specific. Their
argument was influential, and became one of the main strands of the more general case for
new settlements. For example, David Hall\(^29\) argued that the need for 570,000 new
dwellings in the South East of England between 1989 and 2000 had been “widely
accepted”, whilst for the ‘Greater South East’, which he defined as including
Cambridgeshire, Suffolk and Wiltshire, the figure rose to 750,000. Nationally, he
suggested, there would need to be a million new dwellings by 2000, and 2 million by 2010.
Hall, like others in favour of the new settlements option, argued that “the scale of the need
is such that it must be out of the question to continue indefinitely adding one onion ring of
development after another to our already overgrown market towns and villages, and even
less to persist in the damaging practice of town and village cramming”\(^30\). Again, Hall cites
a regional justification for the building of new settlements, and begins to extend the
analysis to the national context. One of the effects of CDL, and the wider new settlements
movement which it engendered, was not only to move the issue into a greater prominence,
but also to build a justification for new settlements which built upon a wider regional and
national issue, namely the rising projected demand for housing, the impact this was likely
to have upon the demand for housing land, and hence upon the wider built environment of
the urban fringe.

The argument for new settlements, therefore, held within it the assumption that the land
use planning system was failing to deliver either sufficient land for development, or to
protect existing urban forms. Rather, it was delivering insufficient parcels of land in
inappropriate places, in a manner that was unsustainable to the existing built environment.
The new settlements movement gained so much momentum because it allied powerful
(and well-resourced) development interests and those within planning who saw the need
for a radical solution to the problem of housing land supply. The argument was so resonant
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30 Hall (1991) op. cit. p291.
within planning circles because, as this thesis discusses, the idea of new settlements drew upon a longer history of building new places, including Ebenezer Howard’s garden cities and the state new towns programme. It seems that new settlements offered planners a strategic vision, which contrasted with an existing system which increasingly appeared to fail the profession’s ideals, and to be merely reactive, not proactive and creative.  

Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, the interest in the concept of new settlements produced many articles and other publications, mainly in trade journals, rather than those of the academic sector, and hence whilst the discussion had considerable breadth (the architectural, planning, building, surveying and environmental press all took an interest), but limited depth. The Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) took an early role in the renewal of interest in new settlements, continuing their interest in a subject which they had long championed. Within a year of CDL’s formation, on the 20th May 1985, the TCPA held a seminar entitled ‘New Settlements or New Suburbs? - Current Private Sector Initiatives’. A paper on Martlesham Heath was presented at this seminar by Roy Jackson, then working with Bidwells, the Cambridge-based company who were the managers of that site. At the same time (May 1985), almost certainly for the seminar, the Oxford Polytechnic Department of Town Planning reprinted two papers written by Carl Bray in 1981, one concerning New Ash Green, the other South Woodham Ferrers. The study of these existing villages at the seminar is interesting because it points to the understanding, even at the time of CDL’s launch, of the existence of new settlements of a
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31 Grove (1990), one of the partners involved in the development of the Tircoed new settlement argued that new settlements gave planning “a genuine opportunity to be constructive”.

32 Existing new settlements at Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath had already been the subject of discussion in the trade journals in the 1960s and 1970s, as Chapters 5 and 6 indicate, but this predated the 1980s expansion of interest in new settlements.

33 The TCPA’s predecessor organisation, the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, was originally founded by Ebenezer Howard and his supporters to propound his ideas, and was active in the pre-war years in campaigning for garden cities, amongst other planning issues.


form similar to that being proposed by CDL and others, and the need to place these new proposals in a historical context. However, Jackson’s paper, though instructive, is a technical description of the development of the site, rather than a critical academic study. Bray’s work formed part of a wider study towards a Masters Thesis in Urban Design, and thus was conducted within a critical academic framework. Although his two case studies did provide comprehensive case studies, his primary interest was in the role played by design professionals in creating complete new settlements, and to examine the validity of the village as a contemporary urban form. Moreover, his selection of case studies and his assessment of them owed much to the anarchist writer Peter Kropotkin, with the result that he excluded many new villages from his study on the basis of these theoretical criteria, whilst the particular selection of the two English case study sites seems rather arbitrary despite his clearly elucidated criteria (a third overseas site, Christiana, was also included in his thesis, though this, as he admits, is more correctly termed an urban village, as it forms part of a larger city, Copenhagen, and was established by squatters on a deserted military site). 

The monthly magazine of the TCPA, Town & Country Planning, provided a platform for much of the discussion about new settlements throughout the 1980s and early 1990s. By 1991, David Hall (director of the TCPA) suggested that more than 180 proposals had been put forward since the mid-1980s (providing some indication of the scale of activity which was occurring during the period in relation to such sites), and Town & Country Planning published three lists of potential new settlement sites, the first compiled by
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36Bray (1981a) op. cit.
37Indeed, those promoting particular schemes were quick to use the planning press to promote both the general argument for new settlements, and individual sites (for example, Lloyd Roche (1986), Grove (1985)).
38The definitive list of the eighties new settlement proposals, published as part of the DoE Planning Research Programme report Alternative Development Patterns: New Settlements (Breheny, Gent & Lock, 1993, pp83-93), suggests that there were a total of 184 individual proposals between 1980 and 1992, many of which had been refused permission or abandoned at some point. A substantial proportion of the others were either still being considered within the planning process, or were alternative sites in an area of search where only one proposal would eventually be pursued.
39Hall (1991) op. cit.
Stephen Potter in 1986\textsuperscript{40}, the second by Chris Amos in 1991\textsuperscript{41} and the third by myself in 1993\textsuperscript{42}. Potter's article refers to new settlements as 'private new town developments', thus making the clear link between new settlements and the state new towns programme, and lists both completed and proposed sites. At that point in time, most of the proposed sites were those of Consortium Developments, with only half a dozen other sites which could truly be said to be new settlements, rather than mere suburban extensions of existing towns.

As the table\textsuperscript{43} below indicates, the number of new settlement proposals and applications submitted increased year by year in the latter years of the 1980s, reaching a peak in 1989 and 1990. Following the large number of proposals and applications at the end of the decade, almost no new proposals were made in 1991, as the housing market collapsed in the wake of rising interest rates. Increasingly, the optimism\textsuperscript{44} of the late eighties about new settlements evaporated, and many schemes were either withdrawn, mothballed, or subjected to renegotiation, as falling house price expectations undermined the development economics of many sites.

\textsuperscript{40}Potter, Stephen (1986) - "New towns in the real world" in Town & Country Planning November 1986 pp304-309
\textsuperscript{41}Amos, Chris (1991) - "Flexibility and variety - the key to new settlement policy?" in Town & Country Planning February 1991 pp52-56
\textsuperscript{42}Owen, Chris (1993) - "Over to local processes" in Town & Country Planning November 1993 pp305-309
\textsuperscript{43}Compiled from data in Amos (1992b, Tables 6.1 and 6.2, on pages 151 and 154).
\textsuperscript{44}The 'zeitgeist' of new settlement ideas in the boom years of the late 1980s is well exemplified by articles such as Lock (1989) and Grove (1990). The former stated that "we have...a very favourable climate in which schemes for new settlements can be advanced" (p175), whilst the latter called for a thousand new settlements to meet the need for rural housing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of proposals</th>
<th>Number of planning applications submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 New settlement proposals and applications by year

Source: Amos, 1992b, Table 6.1 (p151) and Table 6.2 (p154)

Nevertheless, even by 1991\(^{45}\), Chris Amos’s review of sites lists 132 potential new settlements. By 1993 my similar list\(^{46}\) had reduced to 57 sites, for a range of reasons, including the collapse of CDL (and hence the removal of their sites), the resolution of some ‘beauty contests’ in certain locations (notably the A10 and A45 sites around Cambridge), and the withdrawal of other sites following the recession. However, other sites were beginning to emerge through the planning system, rather than at the initiative of developers, contrary to policy.

During this period, government guidance developed beyond Circular 15/84, discussed earlier. In addition, key decisions on planning applications and appeals had also changed the context of new settlements planning. The Department of the Environment began to replace existing guidance in circulars with Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) in the late 1980s, and in 1988 replaced Circular 15/84 with PPG3, entitled ‘Land for Housing’\(^{47}\), though the reference made to new settlements in this guidance was limited, with new settlements not being regarded as a conventional growth option, and considered
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\(^{45}\)Amos, 1991c op. cit.

\(^{46}\)Owen, 1993, op. cit.

\(^{47}\)Department of the Environment (1988a).
appropriate in only a few, unspecified, cases. Following a discussion paper\(^{48}\) issued in the same year, and a draft replacement for PPG3 issued in 1989\(^{49}\), a new version of PPG3 was issued in March 1992\(^{50}\), which set a number of parameters to guide new settlement development. The Department of the Environment had also commissioned research in 1991 into new settlements and their practicability, which was published in 1993\(^{51}\). The early 1990s also saw the rising importance of environmental sustainability as a planning consideration, and this issue was extensively addressed in the research as it pertained to new settlements\(^{52}\).

PPG3 pertains, of course to the whole of England and Wales, and hence provides an explicit context for new settlements at a national level. Nevertheless, in contrast to the rationale put forward for new settlements by CDL and others, and discussed above, the guidance is keen to place new settlements back into a largely local context, and to remove consideration of the issue from wider issues operating at a regional or national level. The guidance makes it clear that new settlements should be considered on a site by site basis, rather than justified generically. Significantly, the opening clause of paragraph 33 talks of “a proposal for such a settlement”, with the use of the singular rather than the plural form of words. Moreover, the same paragraph goes on to indicate that that a proposal should only be contemplated where it is “a clear expression of local preference supported by local planning authorities”, whilst paragraph 34 opens by stating that “the need to respect local preference means that specific proposals for new settlements should normally only be promoted through the district wide local plan or UDP\(^{53}\). The clear intention of the guidance is to refer the consideration of new settlement proposals back to local authorities, where they are to be considered on local issues, and within the local context of housing land supply. The Department of the Environment seems, on the basis of this guidance, to

\(^{48}\)Department of the Environment (1988b).

\(^{49}\)Department of the Environment (1989).

\(^{50}\)Department of the Environment (1992a).


\(^{52}\)Indeed, the guidance contained in PPG3 relating specifically to new settlements raises issues of environmental sustainability, for example in paragraph 35, where it commends combined heat and power systems, and in paragraph 36, where it asks planning authorities to take account of the travel patterns associated with new settlements, and the consequent generation of vehicle emissions.

\(^{53}\)Both quotations are taken from Department of the Environment (1992a).
be concerned with limiting the number of new settlements which might be considered (the guidance considers that new settlements should only be contemplated where the local context fulfils a number of demanding criteria), reaffirming the inviolability of Green Belt policy (in response to the attack upon this policy which CDL’s proposals represented), and passing the often difficult decisions about new settlement proposals down to the local planning authority (again, in contrast to the situation which pertained in the mid and late 1980s, where the decision about individual sites often ended up with the Secretary of State). However, on this issue of local control, the DoE themselves appeared to be slightly uncertain, partly because of the scale of new settlement proposals required both to make such sites economic, and also to fulfil criteria about sustainability in relation to vehicle emissions. Paragraph 34 of the guidance suggests that a new settlement might be promoted by a group of districts in order to meet part of the housing supply target of each one, whilst regional guidance, such as that for the West Midlands\textsuperscript{54}, suggested settlements of 10,000 dwellings, for reasons of sustainability. Whilst this remains an enabling policy, rather than a prescriptive one, it seems somewhat contradictory to talk of new settlements being decided at local level, but then to suggest settlements of such scale that they would have to be the responsibility of a number of authorities, and merit discussion in regional guidance because such a development must have impacts which extend potentially at a regional level, and certainly at a sub-regional level.

Essentially, the 1992 guidance still saw new settlements as an exceptional planning option, to be pursued only when other solutions were not possible, or would be less acceptable. This guidance, combined with the extended recession in the housing market, could have been seen as the end of new settlements in all but a very few situations. However, the rise in interest in private sector new settlements had placed them on the agenda of potential planning options in the minds of many public sector practitioners. Thus, in addition to those locations where a new settlement option was already actively being considered\textsuperscript{55},

\textsuperscript{54}Department of the Environment (1992b).
\textsuperscript{55}Examples include Cambridgeshire, where alternative proposals were considered for two separate areas of search, on the A10 and A45, resulting in the granting of planning permission for at least one site at Monkfield park, eight miles west of Cambridge on the 20th April 1994 (Hussell, 1994) and York (Davies, 1994).
further development plans also proposed new settlements. In addition, a few of the many new settlements proposed during the 1980s boom had gained permission (either in outline or detail), and had even seen the beginning of development work on site, thus providing further examples to add to those already in existence. New settlements are thus an established planning option in many areas of the country, have planning approval on specific sites in other locations, and are under construction elsewhere. Whilst they may never achieve the *pre-eminence* suggested by some advocates at the height of the 1980s boom, or the *numbers* suggested by others, new settlements are now an established part of the urban fabric in the UK, and are widely known to planners in a way that they were not prior to the mid-1980s (even though there were already examples in existence).

Another indication of new settlements increasing legitimacy within planning is the inclusion of a clause concerning new settlements in the draft regional planning guidance for the West Midlands. Essentially, paragraph 3.11 of this guidance accepts the case that had been made for new settlements by their proponents over the last decade, stating that “large new settlements can provide a sustainable form of development and will in many cases be preferable to development in the Green Belt or the incremental growth of small settlements”. Although the size of settlement suggested by the guidance (10,000 dwellings) is larger than that promoted by any site through the 1980s, this seems to be the closest to which new settlements have come to the Department of the Environment’s orthodoxy since the heyday of state new towns.

*A wider theoretical context*

Despite their increasing acceptance into the planning mainstream, research about new settlements has been limited. Two major pieces of research exist, both completed within
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56 Examples include Dickens Heath, proposed as part of the Solihull Unitary Development Plan (see Owen, 1995) and the various sites considered as part of the Charnwood Local Plan (Hankin, 1993), though there are many others.

57 For example: Kettleby Magna, Leicestershire (outline permission); Dunstan Park, Thatcham, Berkshire; Marks Farm, Essex; Park Farm, Kent (Breheny, Gent & Lock, 1993, pp83-93).

58 Examples include: Tircoed, outside Swansea; Chafford Hundred, Essex; Church Langley, Essex; Stone Cross, East Sussex; White Court West, Essex; Whiteley, Hampshire (Owen, 1993).

59 Grove, 1990, op. cit.

60 Department of the Environment (1992b), also discussed in Stranz (1994).
the last three years \textsuperscript{61}, and both concentrating primarily on the process of development, and the planning framework in which this occurs. However, the development of new settlements raises a number of interesting themes at the overlap of sociology, planning and geography, and their increasing prevalence means that their study is useful in informing both the understanding of existing new settlements, and the manner in which new ones are developed. Moreover, the study of new settlements in the context of these issues adds to the body of academic knowledge in areas of great current interest.

These issues fall essentially into a number of linked areas, and all reflect to some extent upon each other. New settlements provide a context in which to explore the debate about the nature of urban life, and the extent to which new settlements represent a continuing theme of anti-urbanism, or are one way of resolving the conflicts of urban life and anti-urban aspirations. This draws upon understandings of the nature of the city and the country in social, moral, psychological and physical terms, which have their roots in nineteenth century sociology, but have been part of a continuing dialogue throughout the history of planning. In a more contemporary context, the extent to which new settlements engage with debates about the nature of modernism, and the transition from modernism to postmodernism \textsuperscript{62} also engages with essentially antipathetic views of the city. Furthermore, new settlements involve a process of creating new places where none existed before. They therefore raise questions about how the identity of such places are created and maintained, and give indications as to the nature and significance of the concept of place in the late twentieth century. This discussion engages with geographical understandings of the nature of place, as well as material which has its roots both in sociology and geography which examines the way in which people interact with and understand places, and thereby gain meaning and identity through individual and group association with places. In turn this engages with understandings of the nature of community, and in a similar manner to concepts of place, the study of new settlements should provide insight into the nature of community in a late twentieth century context. Indeed, in this sense, new settlements offer a valuable opportunity to examine, in a contemporary situation, the formation of

\textsuperscript{61}Breheny, Gent and Lock (1993) and Amos (1992b).

\textsuperscript{62}In this context, the work of Harvey (1989) is important to this debate, and he provides both a description of what he considers to be the elements of this transition, and an indication of its temporality, placing the "the post-modern moment" in the early 1970s, but arising from earlier events.
community where none existed before. This discussion of place and community also deals with concepts of boundary, inclusion and exclusion. Following from this, new settlements provide an opportunity to look at the way in which symbols are used to delineate space to create place, to confer ownership and belonging, and to create identity.

**The city and the country**

The advent of mass urbanisation resulting from the industrial revolution, and the transformation from a largely rural population, towards one which was increasingly urban, caused considerable concern about the impact that such changes had upon the way in which people organised themselves, and related to one another. Writers such as Tonnies and Durkheim attempted to rationalise such changes. Tonnies, in his book *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*, published in 1887, posited an essentially bipolar model of community, which had both spatial and temporal dimensions

Tonnies saw society as moving from ‘gemeinschaft’, and towards ‘gesellschaft’, with gemeinschaft community characterised by small scale, relative social and physical immobility, ascribed rather than achieved status, cultural homogeneity, attachment to tradition, and strong links to place, territory or locality. The characteristics of gemeinschaft community were, according to Bell and Newby, “blood, place (land) and mind”, with sociological consequences of “kinship, neighbourhood and friendship”. Crucially, such a community was seen as “the home of all virtue and morality”.

Gesellschaft (generally translated from the German as ‘society’ or ‘association’) was Tonnies’s opposite pole, and was “everything that community (was) not”. Hillery examined a large number of definitions of community, 94 in all, and noted a prevalence for “conjoining community with a specifically rural environment”, whereas the passing of community, in Tonnies’s typology the movement towards gesellschaft, was a product of capitalism and urbanisation, and hence associated with the city. The polarisation of rural-urban, community-society, past-present/future, and moral-amoral led to urbanisation being seen as a negative process by sociology, and urbanity as being destructive to community. As a consequence, the present society was criticised in comparison to past community, or, as Bell and Newby memorably put it, it was a case of

---

63The historical discussion of sociological theory about community largely follows that provided by Bell and Newby (1971).

64Bell and Newby (1971, p25).

nostalgically “praising the past to blame the present”\textsuperscript{66}. It is not the intention here to validate this model\textsuperscript{67}, but rather to indicate the historical context of anti-urbanism in relation to discussions of community.

It was in attempting to resolve the polarities of such models that Ebenezer Howard, writing at the turn of the century (and thus only about fifteen years after Tonnies’s seminal work\textsuperscript{68}), proposed his now well-known ‘three magnets’ model, which in contradiction of Tonnies, saw positive aspects both of the urban and rural realms\textsuperscript{69}. Whilst Howard identified problems related to urban life which included the exclusion of nature, air pollution, high costs, crowding, and the juxtaposition of poverty and wealth, he also identified advantages which included the availability of well paid work, and the social and recreational opportunities of urban life. Likewise, Howard identified both positive and negative aspects of country, or rural life. Advantages included the beauty of nature, fresh air, water and sunlight, but he also identified problems which included rural unemployment, low wages, the lack of amusement, and interestingly the “lack of society” and “no public spirit”. This analysis appears considerably more sophisticated than Tonnies’s apocalyptic vision, such that Howard’s justification of the need for garden cities was as much anti-rural as anti-urban.

\textsuperscript{66}Bell and Newby (1971, p22).

\textsuperscript{67}However, essentially polar models of community persisted in sociology, from the time of Tonnies and his contemporary Durkheim, and into the post-war era, notably Redfield’s folk-urban continuum (see Bell and Newby, 1971, pp42-44). Moreover, as will be addressed in more detail later in this chapter, sociologists in the 1960s talked of the ‘end’ or ‘eclipse’ of community in the face of an overwhelming mass urban culture (see Cohen, 1985). In itself, this continued to think of urbanity, and urban values, now characterised as mass culture derived from the media, as being that which would destroy ‘community’, in the sense of local distinctiveness and culture.

\textsuperscript{68}Cooke (1990, pp34-35) makes clear the extent to which the founding fathers of planning, such as Geddes, Unwin and Howard were influenced by the sociological ideas of the late nineteenth century, and fears for the dislocation of social life and communities brought about by the effects of urbanisation and capitalist industrialisation.

\textsuperscript{69}Howard’s most influential work, the book \textit{Garden Cities of Tomorrow}, was published in 1902 as a revision of \textit{Tomorrow: a Peaceful Path to Real Reform}, published in 1898. It was reprinted with a preface by F.J. Osborn in 1945, just as the state new towns programme was being prepared. Reference here is made to the fourth impression of this reprint, published in 1960. In this edition, the illustration of Howard’s three magnets model can be found on page 46.
Raymond Williams⁷⁰, in his book, The Country and the City, which draws widely upon the history of literature, also identifies these contradictory associations which attach both to the city and the country. He argues, in introducing his theme, that positive and negative associations have attached both to understandings of the country and the city. In this, he echoes Howard’s view that both poles offer an imperfect form of life⁷¹. To the city, he argues, has been attached the idea of “an achieved centre of learning, communication, light”, along with “powerful hostile associations...as a place of noise, worldliness and ambition”. The country, meanwhile, has gathered about it the idea of “a natural way of life; of peace, innocence and simple virtue” alongside “backwardness, ignorance, limitation”⁷². In recognising these associated values, Williams’ develops his most crucial theme in this context; that in tracing the historical context of ideas about urbanity and rurality, he notes a persistence of ideas, and recurrence of themes, arguing that “the ideas and the images of country and city retain their great force”⁷³. This, he indicates, is despite our “real social experience...of many kinds of intermediate and new kinds of social and physical organisation”⁷⁴. As an example of the latter, he notes that “the concentrated city is in the process of being replaced...by what is in effect a transport network: the conurbation, the city-region, the London-Birmingham axis”⁷⁵.

In the final chapter of his book, Williams argues that this persistence of ideas depends not on their reduction to archetypes, but rather upon “the forms and images and ideas being changed, though often subtly, internally, and at times unconsciously”. He goes on to say that this persistence “indicates some permanent or effectively permanent need, to which the changing interpretations speak”⁷⁶. As has been noted, this persistence occurs in the context of, or even because of, change, and it is the co-existence of persistence with change

⁷¹ As an aside, William’s book is notable for the absence of reference to Howard’s work, though he does draw upon many writers who were Howard’s contemporaries, such as H.G. Wells and William Morris, who themselves influenced Howard.
⁷²Williams, 1973, p1.
⁷³Williams, 1973, p289.
⁷⁴Williams, 1973, p289.
⁷⁶Williams, 1973, p289.
which Williams identifies as both “striking and interesting”\textsuperscript{77}. Moreover, he indicates that “the persistence indicates some permanent or effectively permanent need, to which the changing interpretations speak”\textsuperscript{78}. In other words, despite the changes wrought in urban form by new technologies, new transportation networks, and changes in the economic organisation of space, there remains a need to interpret the town and the country using images which have recurred throughout history. Previous understandings and interpretations of the city and the country are drawn upon to explain, interpret and make sense of the present and the imagined future. As Williams puts it, “our powerful images of country and city have been ways of responding to a whole social development”\textsuperscript{79}.

In the context of new settlements, these are valuable insights. New settlements are precisely examples of the intermediate and new forms of physical organisation, and by inference, using Williams’ argument, of social organisation too, which have emerged as the concentrated city has dissolved. If, in the midst of this process, as in others, older ideas of the city and the country persist and re-emerge, then there may also be evidence in new settlements of precisely such persistent ways of thinking. In physical terms, new settlements would seem to exist in the intermediate space between the concentrated city and the country, separate from the city - though being neither one nor the other, they must still be understood in comparison to established understandings of both. It may be supposed, following the line of William’s argument, that the persistence of images of the country and the city, albeit re-interpreted in a new context, may be a way of resolving “the irresolvable choice between a necessary materialism and a necessary humanity”\textsuperscript{80}. That is, that the use of such imagery is a way of establishing meaning within a predominantly urban society, one of increasing complexity and fluidity, where “any assumption of a knowable community (becomes) harder and harder to sustain”\textsuperscript{81}.

A sense of antipathy towards the urban can also be found in other writing contemporary to that of Williams, and, in a sense, underlines his thesis that images of the city constantly

\textsuperscript{77}Williams, 1973, p289.
\textsuperscript{78}Williams, 1973, p289.
\textsuperscript{79}Williams, 1973, p297.
\textsuperscript{80}Williams, 1973, p293.
\textsuperscript{81}Williams, 1973, p165.
recur, and are re-interpreted. Jonathan Raban, in his book *Soft City*, written in 1974, describes the city as a disturbingly fluid, shifting entity, where it is difficult to unravel the meaning of what occurs around the individual, and where fears of the unknown and the uncomprehended are ever present. Raban too sees the opportunities of the city; “our great modern form, is soft, amenable to a dazzling variety of lives, dreams, interpretations”, but also the dangers of this fluidity; “the very plastic qualities which make the city the great liberator of human identity also cause it to be especially vulnerable to psychosis and totalitarian nightmare”\(^8^2\). Moreover, Raban points to the failure of urban utopias, suggesting that this is part of the anti-urban sentiment he portrays; “our current mood of revulsion against cities is not new; we have grown used to looking for Utopia only to discover that we have created Hell”\(^8^3\). Again, there clear parallels here with Williams’ description of the city as being a place where “everything...from the magnificent to the apocalyptic can be believed at once”\(^8^4\). Berman\(^8^5\) too identifies the inherent instability, the fluidity and softness of urban experience which Raban describes. He argues that this modern experience has, in fact been shared by people for the past two hundred years, and that the roots of this modernism can be traced in writers such as Marx and Nietzsche.

In his seminal book, *The Condition of Postmodernity*, David Harvey describes Raban’s book, written in 1974, as “a historical marker”\(^8^6\), indicating that “the postmodernist moment has arrived”\(^8^7\). It is not the intention of this discussion to attempt, as Harvey does, to deal with the entire breadth of cultural change which constituted the transition from modernism to post-modernism, but rather to examine the concept of this transition as it pertains to the fragmentation of urban forms, and its implications for planning in relation to new settlements. Harvey defines the transition from modernism to post-modernism in the urban context to be “a break with the modernist idea that planning and development should focus on large scale, metropolitan-wide, technologically rational and efficient urban

\(^8^2\)Raban, 1974, p8.
\(^8^3\)Raban, 1974, p9.
\(^8^4\)Williams, 1973, p278.
\(^8^5\)Berman, 1982.
\(^8^6\)Harvey, 1989, p3.
\(^8^7\)Harvey, 1989, p6.
plans\textsuperscript{88}, such that post-modernism cultivates an urban fabric comprising a collage of uses, sensitive to vernacular tradition and local history, and generating specialised urban forms.

Krier suggests that the result may be a city made up of “complete and finite urban communities”, or of “cities within a city”\textsuperscript{89}. Smith talks of the “new fluidity and flexibility for social life” offered by the post-modern urban environment, and the “new opportunities for the restructuring...of society”\textsuperscript{90} that this provides, whilst acknowledging that in this context of fluidity and change “ordinary people...seem more interested in stability than change”, and pointing out that “people want and need to make ordered sense of their lives against a background of fragmentation and ephemera”\textsuperscript{91}. There is here, again, some commonality with the theme implicit in Williams (though never so explicitly stated, as he drew very different conclusions, related to the ubiquity of the power of capital, and the manner of its potential defeat), that the recurrence of older understandings of the city and the country is partly a response to the increasing size, complexity, and lack of ‘knowability’ in urban form. If Harvey’s construction of events is followed, then the transition towards this post-modern world grew out of anti-modernism in the late-1960s, and emerged with writing such as that of Raban in the early 1970s\textsuperscript{92}.

All of this seems to provide a persuasive context for new urban forms such as new settlements to emerge, and to pose several questions about the nature of new settlements which have emerged since the 1960s. New settlements appear to be, at least functionally, part of the city. Without pre-judging later discussion, it seems clear that new settlements have been the product of urban pressures for growth, and that they have been expected to function as part of wider local and regional economies. They are, therefore, economically dependent upon the urban superstructure, and linked into it through the network of transport linkages, such that urban centres might be expected to provide a focus of retail,

\textsuperscript{88}Harvey, 1989, p66, emphasis in original.
\textsuperscript{89}Krier, 1987, in Harvey, 1989, p67.
\textsuperscript{90}Smith, 1993, p246.
\textsuperscript{91}Smith, 1993, p247.
\textsuperscript{92}Or, as Harvey (1989, p38) more eloquently puts it: “Somewhere between 1968 and 1972, therefore, we see postmodernism emerge as a full-blown though still incoherent movement out of the chrysalis of the anti-modern movement of the 1960s”.
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cultural and social activity for residents of new settlements, as well as being major centres of employment. Nevertheless, they are envisaged as physically separate from the city, and hence to some degree could be seen as attempting to remove themselves from urbanity. This may reveal an attempt to combine, as Howard’s concept of the garden city did, to combine the advantages of urban life (employment, culture etc.) and the advantages of non-urban locations, which might be expected to include lower levels of crowding, and a more agreeable and healthy environment.

Moreover, new settlements may represent one facet of the fragmentation of urban structure which Harvey and Smith, amongst others, suggest are occurring as a result of the post-modern turn. They may be local responses, indicating the fragmentation of large scale urban planning, which Harvey suggests may be one indication of the transition from modernism to post-modernism in urban form. And, following Smith’s argument, it may be that new settlements are one manifestation of the search for security and stability in the midst of the fluidity and fragmentation of the post-modern era. It may be, therefore, that new settlements provide the security of place and community, in the midst of insecurity and instability elsewhere.

**Place and community**

Recent work by economic geographers such as Cooke and Swyngedouw, amongst others, has highlighted the re-emergence of the importance of locality, as a response to the post-Fordist reconstruction of economies and institutions. As Swyngedouw identifies, there is a synergy between work examining the consequences of post-Fordist reconstruction, and the effects of post-modern fragmentation. He describes this process as the “reconstruction and reterritorialization of space after a long period of deconstruction and deterritorialization in the aftermath of the crisis of the mid-seventies”. This brings the discussion to the issue of place, which has long been of considerable interest to geographers, and is pertinent to the discussion of new settlements, in that new settlements are attempts to construct new places where none existed before.
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93 Cooke, 1990.
94 Swyngedouw, 1989.
The work of Relph offers an uncanny echo of that discussed earlier, in that he feared the "destruction and replacement" of distinctive places by an essentially placeless geography, and wondered whether the remaining persistence of distinctive places was "the remnant of an old place-making tradition" and was shortly "to disappear beneath a tide of uniformity, or whether there exist(s) ongoing and developing sources of diversity that can be encouraged". Relph, writing in 1976, just at the time that Harvey suggested the postmodern moment had arrived, exhibited both the fear for the erosion of distinctive place that earlier writers had felt for the erosion of community, and looked for the sort of diversity in place making which is said to be one of the products of the post-modern turn in the urban context. In the geographic tradition of writers such as Relph and Tuan, "undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value", or put another way "abstract space, lacking significance other than strangeness, becomes concrete place, filled with meaning". Again, this abstract strangeness of undifferentiated space which Tuan talks of has strong resonance with the "soft city" of Raban, which was full of the unknown and the unknowable. Only when space becomes known and invested with meaning by individuals are places defined, becoming stable and secure centres from which to view "the openness, freedom and threat of space".

For Relph, place was a dynamic concept, involving interaction between people and locality, such that places were invested with "authenticity and significance" when individuals and groups modified them and dwelt in them, and that for people, places were "important sources of individual and communal identity". He was thus aware of the indivisible link between people and place, and the meaning conferred by each on the other. More explicitly, he made the link between place and community, suggesting not only that each reinforced the identity of the other, but that the landscape created by the dwelling of a community in a place was itself "an expression of communally held beliefs and values and
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96Relph, 1976, p141.
98Tuan, 1977, p199.
100Tuan, 1977, p6. Or in the words of Relph, "place...is home...a centre of safety and security, a field of care and concern, a point of orientation" (1976, p142).
101Relph, 1976, p146.
102Relph, 1976, p141.
of interpersonal involvements. That place is essential to the understanding of community is also acknowledged by Poplin and by Bell and Newby, although they also point out that in community studies, at least, there has been a dichotomy "between those who focus...on the people, and those which focus on the territory".

Cohen suggests that community is a relational concept, in that it expresses simultaneously both what individuals members share with each other, and the way in which they differ from other groups. In doing so, the community acquires a boundary, marking that within from that without. As a result, "the boundary encapsulates the identity of the community." These boundaries are expressed symbolically, and as such are ambiguous, allowing "their common form to be retained and shared among the members of a group, whilst not imposing upon these people the constraints of uniform meaning." To Cohen, the 'idea of villageness' is itself symbolic, in that "it renders eloquent but different meanings for its various users." This is an important concept in the context of new settlements; their physical separation provides a very distinct boundary, which in turn gives symbolic expression to the extent of the village. Within this, residents can find an expression both of a totality greater than themselves, but also find sufficient ambiguity to express their individuality.

An earlier footnote raised the issue of the eclipse of community, a concept put forward by Stein. The timing of Stein's book is of interest, for it was published in 1964, just as the plans for the first new settlements were being laid. Essentially his thesis was that the culture of the centre, distributed by mass media, would over time swamp the cultures of the periphery. This cultural imperialism would eventually impose a monolithic urban culture, in consequence sweeping away local diversity. In its basic structure, his argument shows
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103 Relph, 1976, p34.
104 Poplin, 1979, p3.
105 Bell & Newby 1971, p32.
107 Cohen, 1985, p12.
110 Stein, 1964.
distinct similarity to that of Tonnies, in that he too expected urban society to destroy local community.

Stein's theory, and to some extent the critique of it put forward by Cohen, work upon a model which supposes an urban centre imposing culture upon a periphery, consisting mainly of communities which are "rural, remote from the mainstream of modern life, or small-scale, semi-industrial occupational communities inhabiting the geographical or functional margins". This is a general critique of 'community studies', which has tended to concentrate upon communities in the Celtic fringe, marginal industrial settlements, and studies of community life in urban settings which "seem residual, on the verge of extinction". New settlements offer a different situation - they are not relict communities dealing with the impact of urban mass culture, but rather new creations, in the midst of that culture. Nevertheless, the critique of the 'end of community' thesis seems as appropriate to them as it does to the places which are the traditional interest of community studies' writers.

As Cohen suggests, this implies a cultural passivity, which denies the way in which people constantly make and remake culture. However, like the bipolar models of Tonnies, Durkheim and others, the eclipse of community assumes a temporal progress from one pole to another, from a situation in which the central culture is not dominant, to a time when it has subsumed local diversity. Both Cohen and Bell and Newby suggest that such contrasting states may rather be seen as co-existent, so that different modalities of behaviour might exist within a community at any given point in time. Hence, to use the specific instance of new settlements, individuals may engage in the contractual world of work outside of the village, whilst playing a different role within it, which owes far more

111 Cohen, 1985, p36.
115 Cohen, 1985, p36, p76.
117 Bell & Newby, 1971, p51, which states that "far from there being an exclusive continuum from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft, relationships of both types are found in the same community" (italics in the original).
to the more intimate relationships of place and community. This presupposes a particular analogy of interaction within the community, which owes much to dramatic metaphor.

Cosgrove\textsuperscript{118} uses the metaphor of theatre in discussing the interpretation of landscape, and Duncan\textsuperscript{119}, in discussing Cosgrove's recent work, extends the analogy, talking of the landscape as the stage set, and the people within it as the actors. However, the dramatic metaphor is not new in this context; both Cohen, and Bell and Newby, refer to such an analogy. Cohen\textsuperscript{120} suggests that individuals may act out a number of roles in differing situations, whilst Bell and Newby suggest that "one may visualise the community field as a stage with the particular ethos of the local society determining the players and the plays"\textsuperscript{121}. This provides a framework on which to understand the processes which define place and community in new settlements. The 'stage set' is largely provided by non-residents - those who conceptualise, plan, design and build the new settlement, and therefore the actions, intentions and assumptions of these actors are also important to what results. However, the set thus created is modified by residents and others over the years, to reflect their understandings of the place and the community which exists therein. The process of defining both place and community is ongoing and dynamic, in response to the changing roles played by the actors, who in turn are responding to changing circumstances.

\textit{Structure and content of the thesis}

The thesis continues by examining, in Chapter 2, a further area of theoretical discussion which frames the discussion of new settlements. New settlements follow upon a considerable history of building new places in the UK, following upon the ideas and theories of Ebenezer Howard. Chapter 2 examines the history of ideas which extends from Howard, through the state New Towns programme to new settlements, and examines what theoretical continuities exist linking Howard to more recent new settlements. Chapter 3 provides a methodological framework for the study, discussing and justifying the modes of research used, and elucidating the manner by which the three case study sites were selected. Chapter 4 collates the historical record of Census data which exists for the three

\textsuperscript{118}Cosgrove, 1992; Daniels and Cosgrove, 1993.
\textsuperscript{119}Duncan, 1995, p415.
\textsuperscript{120}Cohen, 1985, p29.
\textsuperscript{121}Bell & Newby, 1971, p30.
new settlements, comparing and contrasting their relative rates of growth, population structures, and a range of other socio-economic indicators. This also provides a quantitative basis for the critical histories which follow in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

Chapter 5 comprises a critical history of East Goscote, Chapter 6 that for Bar Hill, and Chapter 7 that for Martlesham Heath. These three chapters address the origin of development on these sites, and the development histories which have ensued. They also chart the development of community organisation and institutions in each village. Each chapter addresses the roles of key groups and individuals in each village, and assesses their motivations and aspirations. Chapter 8 synthesises the critical histories, comparing and contrasting the three sites, and placing them in the context of the statistical data, and the theoretical material discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Chapter 9 provides a summary of the main conclusions of the thesis. It is followed by a pictorial annex of maps, architectural sketches and photographs of the three sites, and a complete list of references.
Chapter 2
A History of Ideas and Philosophies from Garden Cities to New Settlements

"Ebenezer Howard (1850-1928) is the most important single character in this tale" 1

Introduction
Chapter 1 has provided an overview of the immediate historical context of new settlements, and of some broader theoretical issues which pertain to this study. This second chapter places new settlements into a much longer historical and theoretical context, and aims to elicit which ideas and philosophies have remained consistent from Ebenezer Howard’s original concepts of garden cities, and which have been modified and discarded in their passage through the building of the first garden cities, the state new towns, and so to new settlements. In so doing, the chapter identifies those theoretical ideas and philosophies which underlie thought about new settlements, and the extent to which both the new settlements studied in this thesis, and more recent proposals, reflect earlier attempts at new settlement building, particularly those inspired by Howard 2.

The chapter does not attempt a complete review of all the literature pertaining to garden cities and new towns, or to document the entire history from garden cities to the present, though it does draw on a number of sources which do attempt this, either for the entire period of history from garden cities onwards, or for part of that period 3. It also draws upon a range of texts which place the development of garden cities and new towns within the wider context of town planning history 4, and biographical material relating to key

1Hall, 1988, p87.
2Several authors have already written short articles which have attempted to link new settlements to the work of Howard, though all have been relatively short. For example, Hebbert, 1989; Holliday, 1990; Lock, 1989b; Ward, 1989.
4Ashworth, 1954; Cherry, 1996.
protagonists\textsuperscript{5}. Two texts which provide a particularly clear exposition of the underlying ideas and philosophies of particular periods in this history are considered in some detail, firstly a Fabian pamphlet from 1955\textsuperscript{6}, and secondly a Ministry of Housing and Local Government report dating from 1967\textsuperscript{7}. These are of particular interest because they so plainly state the ideas and assumptions which underlay new settlement planning at the time they were written.

The chapter should be read in conjunction with Table 2.1\textsuperscript{8}, which is reproduced as part of the synthesising chapter, towards of the end of the thesis. The text makes frequent reference to this table. The structure of the paper is thus as follows. Firstly, it traces the motivations, personality and ideas of Ebenezer Howard, and of three individuals who played a considerable role in interpreting his work. Thus, the discussion introduces Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker, architects of the first garden city at Letchworth, who had considerable influence upon the design and layout of early garden cities and suburbs, and in the translation of Howard's theoretical concepts into a built environment. The chapter then turns to the role of Howard's intellectual and moral successor, F.J. Osborn. Osborn was important not only because he acted as a confidante to Howard during Howard's later years, but also because the length of his career meant that his work spanned a period which began with the first garden city at Letchworth, but which continued well into the post-war period, and the era of state-led New Towns.

The chapter then traces the development of key themes as they passed from the pre-war garden cities, and into the state new towns programme, looking at the way in which old themes were appropriated and represented, and new ones introduced. These themes are followed into the context of new settlements and the chapter attempts to link these themes through the passage of time and context, to trace how much of the current theory and practice surrounding new settlements has its roots in the work of Ebenezer Howard, and the garden cities movement.

\textsuperscript{5}Beecers, 1988; Miller, 1992, and shorter articles such as Osborn, 1950.
\textsuperscript{6}Mackenzie, 1955.
\textsuperscript{7}Ministry of Housing and Local Government, 1967.
\textsuperscript{8}Also reproduced as Table 8.1 in Chapter 8, to aid understanding of the discussion there.
Ebenezer Howard

It is with Ebenezer Howard that this history begins. However, Howard’s work was built upon strands of earlier thought about utopian urban design and also a prior history of constructing new villages and other settlements, often with the aim of improving social conditions. Such new villages include early attempts, such as Milton Abbas in Dorset (a model village built in the 18th century for estate workers), and the “dour utopian rectitude” of Robert Owen’s New Lanark of 1798. These were followed, in the mid-nineteenth century, by a number of industrial model villages in West Yorkshire, the best known of which is Saltaire (built between 1853 and 1863), along with Copley (1847-53) and Ackroydon (1859). Towards the end of the nineteenth century, William Lever began development of Port Sunlight in Cheshire (started in 1888), whilst George Cadbury initiated the construction of Bourneville in 1894, some four miles from the centre of Birmingham. By 1902, a further village was begun at New Earswick near York at the instigation of Joseph Rowntree, which was designed by the architects Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker. Their design, and the principles embodied within it, formed a prototype for the first garden village at Letchworth, to which they were appointed as consultant architects in 1904, and later for the garden suburb at Hampstead, to which they were appointed architects in 1907.

The Garden City Association was formed in June 1899 on Howard’s initiative (but, it seems, at the prompting of at least one member of the Land Nationalisation Society) to promote his garden city ideas. Cadbury, Rowntree and Lever were, by 1902, three of the organisation’s numerous vice-presidents. George Cadbury provided considerable support to the Association, both in kind, and financially, and hosted its first annual conference at Bourneville in 1901. Thus, the roles of Unwin and Parker, and the early membership of men such as Cadbury, Lever and Rowntree in the GCA, clearly link the work of Howard, and the wider garden cities movement which grew from his ideas, to then existing new villages, built by philanthropic industrialists to house their workers. Moreover, as
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1 Miller, 1992, p4.
3 See Miller, 1992, pp78-103.
4 Hall, 1988, p103.
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Beevers identifies, the GCA was formed around a nucleus of members of the Land Nationalisation Society, with whose aims Howard was broadly in favour, and for whose support he was grateful. He was later to note that “the Garden City took its rise in the minds and hearts of those who were strongly in favour of the public ownership of land”.

Despite its name, the LNS was of a radical Liberal rather than socialist persuasion, and what appeared to attract its members to the GCA was that it offered “a practicable scheme of reform which carried no threat to existing landowners”.

Howard was born in 1850, and left school at the age of fifteen. He drifted from one job to another, and in 1871, at the age of twenty-one, he left to try his hand at farming Nebraska, surviving one winter before realising that he would not be successful as a farmer. Retreating to Chicago, he became a court and press reporter, working for a firm of shorthand writers. Whilst in Chicago, he first came across Dr Benjamin Ward Richardson’s pamphlet *Hygeia, or the City of Health*. Richardson was a pioneer of social medicine, and his prescription for a healthy city included low population density, good housing, wide thoroughfares, and much open space, all of which were elements he later incorporated into the garden city. He returned to England in 1876, taking up work as a parliamentary reporter and stenographer, work he continued for the rest of his career. He was an earnest man, not particularly concerned with wealth, and dividing his time between mechanical invention and his work on garden cities. In his early years, Howard was a Fabian, and moved amongst non-conformist churchmen, and reformers concerned with questions of land ownership reform. Likewise his circle included both radical liberals and socialists, thinkers and writers, including Bernard Shaw and Sydney Webb, who were members of a discussion and debating society with Howard in the early 1880s, before any
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16 Macfadyen, 1933, p40 in Beevers, 1988, p37.
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18 Much of this history of Howard’s early life is drawn from Osborn, 1950.
19 Chicago was then universally known as the garden city, following its rebuilding after a major fire in 1871. This may be where Howard first came across the term.
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of them were widely known\textsuperscript{22}.

Whilst Howard had left England as a restless young man, he apparently returned with a far greater sense of purpose, and into the metropolis at a time of considerable political ferment, with the country entering a period of instability and economic depression, particularly in agriculture. The traditional balance of agriculture and industry, town and country, was upset, and rural depopulation to the towns and cities was considerable. The combination of migration and natural population growth caused London to expand by 900,000 people between 1871 and 1881\textsuperscript{23}. In turn, this exacerbated problems of poor quality, slum housing, but also the flight of population to the suburbs. Essentially, it was the combination of problems - urban poverty and poor housing, alongside rapid and largely uncontrolled urban growth - which exercised Howard's thoughts about the future of the city. He was not alone in attempting to address these and other related issues.

According to Osborn, Howard, whilst in London during the 1880s, "listened to all the preachers and the prophets, the reformers and the revolutionaries"\textsuperscript{24}. Amongst these would have been Peter Kropotkin, the revolutionary anarchist, who first came to London in 1881, and whose ideas about local economic initiative and self-government influenced Howard. As Hall indicates, Howard dreamed of voluntary self-governing communities, to which end garden cities were the vehicle for the "progressive reconstruction of capitalist society into an infinity of co-operative commonwealths"\textsuperscript{25}. However, an even greater influence on Howard was Henry George, whose theories about the unearned increment of the landlord's rent accruing from economic growth, which provided Howard with a way of financing the sort of city described by Richardson\textsuperscript{26}. In the first edition of his book, entitled \textit{Tomorrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform}\textsuperscript{27}, Hall notes that in this first edition was a diagram, subsequently omitted from the second edition of the book, entitled "The Vanishing Point of

\textsuperscript{22}Beevers, 1988, pp13-14.
\textsuperscript{24}Osborn, 1950, in Beevers, 1988, p17.
\textsuperscript{25}Hall, 1988, p87.
\textsuperscript{26}Beevers, 1988, pp17-18.
\textsuperscript{27}This first edition of Howard's book was published in 1898, after which the Garden Cities Association was formed to promote its ideas. It was re-issued in 1902 with the title \textit{Garden Cities of To-morrow} (Howard, 1945), with some modifications to the text.
the Landlord’s Rent”28. Drawing on George, this explains how, as the urban land values built up in the garden city, so these would flow back into the community through a modest rate-rent. This would initially repay the interest on the money borrowed to develop the city, but as this was paid off would provide funds for a local welfare state, particularly pensions, under the direct control of the citizenry. This, of course, was precisely the sort of scheme which would also promote the co-operative commonwealths about which Howard was so enthused, and related to the ideas of Kropotkin and others.

Howard was adamant that he had thought out the central themes of his book himself, and had then found other writers who supplied the details. Whether this is true, or merely a post-hoc justification for the originality of the garden city idea, the precursors of the ideas he expounded stretch beyond Kropotkin, George and Richardson, and the circle of thinkers and writers in London amongst whom Howard moved. Hall identifies, amongst others, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, who fifty years previously to Howard had developed the idea of the planned colonisation of the poor, whilst both the economist Alfred Marshall, who advocated removing the urban poor into the countryside, and Charles Booth, who advocated the removal of the poor from the labour market to labour colonies outside London, seemed to be thinking along similar lines. His concept of the Social City was acknowledged by Howard to have been inspired by Colonel Light’s scheme to redevelop Adelaide. The crucial idea here was that once one city had reached its optimum size, a second city, separated from the first by a green belt, should be started. Indeed, as Howard’s book made clear, the garden city was expected to function in a network of similar cities, each linked and interdependent, rather than as a single, stand alone unit. His diagrammatic representation of this social city29 shows six cities of 32,000 population surrounding a central city of 58,000. These were to be separated by open land containing farms, forests, reservoirs and various institutions for ‘inebriates, epileptics, waifs and the insane’. As late as 1920, at the Ideal Home exhibition, the concept of garden cities in a related network was still being actively promoted30.

Howard’s diagram of the individual garden city, with its central place, radial avenues and

29Reproduced in Hardy, 1991, p23.
30Again, Hardy, 1991, p149 reproduces the contemporary diagram.
peripheral industry, was strongly reminiscent of James Silk Buckingham's diagram of a model city, Victoria, from 1849. Indeed, Miller suggests that the similarities were such that Buckingham's model was transposed from square to circular geometry to form Howard's Garden City. To this can, of course, be added the inspiration provided by the various model industrial villages discussed above. General William Booth of the Salvation Army was also an influence on Howard, who endorsed his idea of needing to remove the urban poor away from the influence of the public house, which resulted in Letchworth being 'dry' for many years.

Howard was also considerably influenced by Edward Bellamy's science fiction work of 1888, entitled Looking Backward, a vision of Boston in 2000 AD, transformed by consumerism allied to co-operation. The book seems to have been catalytic for Howard, and he cited it as the inspiration which motivated him to produce his own vision of the ideal society. He persuaded a publisher to issue the book in Britain, compiling an index for it in the process. Upon re-reading, he was more sceptical of its central ideas, realising that Bellamy’s society would require the sort of centralised, bureaucratic state, with the subordination of the individual to the group, which he would have abhorred.

Howard's Fabian views apparently moderated as he grew older, tending towards centrist rather than socialist attitudes. Aalen talks of his convictions being those of "moderate, common-sense socialism". He was committed to peaceful reform and saw the solution to class antagonisms being not simply a product of compromise between powerful and conflicting forces, but ultimately through their "reconciliation and combination". Marx was not mentioned in his writing, though Howard did draw upon the work of the revolutionary socialist H.M. Hyndman, as Hyndman had put forward the idea of depopulating the cities for the sake of the health and welfare of the masses. Whilst Howard supported the notion of collective action as a method of provision, he also favoured a mixed market economy.

Thus Howard appears as a complex thinker, very much a product of the intellectual, moral and political ferment of his time, but often seeming to try and find a third way between
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industrial capitalism and militant socialism. Indeed, the theme of a third way appears to permeate Howard's thinking, as expressed in his books. His three magnets model proposes the garden city to be a third way between town and country, literally town-country. Likewise, his arguments about rate-rent income and its use to provide a local welfare state effectively propose a third socio-economic system, superior to both Victorian capitalism, and to bureaucratic, centralised socialism. His alternative was rooted in voluntary, semi-co-operative, self-governing communities, rather than in any macro-scale solution. Indeed, Howard had little faith in state led solutions, and, arguably, little ideological relish for such solutions either. He seems to have been of the opinion that the state would never get round to initiating garden cities, according to comments he made to Osborn later in his life. His ability to stand between these two dominant ideologies also had other advantages. Howard never claimed an explicit party political platform and this appears to have helped his cause. It allowed him to gather support from a wide spectrum of people and organisations, from utopian socialists and radicals, to the wealthy middle and upper classes, who bankrolled both his campaigning, and the building of the garden cities later on. The major opposition to his ideas came from those who favoured high density urban development, as opposed to Howard's vision of low density garden cities.

Unwin and Parker

Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker were appointed as architects for the first garden city at Letchworth in 1904. They have a particular importance in this history of ideas, for they translated the schematic drawings of the garden city, provided by Howard, into the built environment of the first garden city. In doing so, they overlaid many ideas of their own, particularly those related to architectural design and urban form. As such, it is important to address their role if the evolution of particular elements of the built environment in garden cities is to be understood. Unwin, in particular, went on to play important roles in the development of inter-war housing policy, and the strategic planning of London, and as such, is an important figure in the wider development of town planning. In this context, however, it is their role in the development of garden cities and suburbs which is at the centre of the discussion.
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35Hall, 1988, p108 reports a comment made by Howard to Osborn in 1919, "My dear boy, if you wait for the Government to do it you will be as old as Methuselah before you start".
Unwin and Parker were cousins, and later brothers-in-law, when Unwin married Parker’s sister. Unwin was educated at Magdalen College School in Oxford, and then at Balliol College, gaining his BA in 1877 and his MA in 1881. He might have entered the church, but was advised against doing so, and returned north in 1881 to Chesterfield, where he began an apprenticeship in engineering, and at the same time, embarked upon his friendship with Parker. In 1885, he moved to Manchester to work as an engineering draughtsman, in 1887 becoming the chief draughtsman for the Staveley Coal and Iron Company of Barrow Hill. Initially, his work involved the design of engineering machinery, though later work included the design and laying out of colliery villages, and the architectural design of public buildings such as schools and churches within them.

Unwin, like Howard, took his inspiration from a wide range of sources, but was certainly influenced by some of the great thinkers and writers of the time. He had heard Ruskin lecture whilst he was at school in Oxford, and soon afterwards met William Morris, who, according to Beevers, became the “predominant influence on his early thought and work.” Whilst Unwin was certainly a socialist by the later years of his university career, in the early 1880’s, he did not follow Morris into Marxism. He had little knowledge of economics (unlike Howard, who as already suggested, was fascinated by economic models), and despite his training as an engineer, he did not share Howard’s fascination with technology. This was clear even in his early work, though his disquiet seems to have been as much about the social impact of the machines he designed in replacing labour, as to do with a lack of interest in the subject per se. He distrusted theoretical systems, and Beevers suggests that though he appreciated the essential rationality of Howard’s ideas “he regarded them as altogether too theoretical and experimental to appeal very widely to the English people.”

---

36 The marriage took place in 1893, following a number of years when the Parker family raised considerable objections to the proposed union.
37 The history of Unwin’s early life and influences is drawn largely from Miller’s excellent and exhaustive biography, published in 1992.
38 Beevers, 1988, p99.
40 Beevers, 1988, p99.
In comparison to Unwin, Barry Parker’s education and early working life were of a more aesthetic nature, including ‘a few terms’ at the Kensington School of Art studying decorative design. He then served his articles from 1889 to 1892 under G. Faulkner Armitage, an architect specialising in the ‘Cheshire Revival’ form of the Arts and Crafts style. Entering into practice, Parker began by designing a number of houses on his father’s estate, including the Parker family home. After co-operating with Unwin for the first time in 1894 on the commission for St Andrews Church in Barrow Hill, the cousins entered into partnership in Buxton in 1896. From this period until the time the partners began work on their commission at New Earswick, they developed their theory and style of housing design, jointly publishing a book, The Art of Building a Home, as well as a number of other illustrated articles. Influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement, they aimed for simple functional design, with one of Parker’s favourite quotations being one from Emerson indicating that the role of the architect was to ‘build a plain cottage with such symmetry as to make all the fine palaces look cheap and vulgar’. The use of this quotation by Parker indicates the aim they both shared, that there should by “no reason why an artisan... should not possess a home as artistic in a modest degree, as that of his more wealthy neighbour”.

Their early design work showed a determination to move away from the ubiquitous pattern of housing characterised by bye-law terraces, and began to develop layouts of cottages built around quadrangles, with a maximum density of between 8 and 12 houses per acre. By the time Parker and Unwin began work on Joseph Rowntree’s model village at New Earswick, their designs were extensively developed, and were progressively realised first at New Earswick, but then later at Letchworth and Hampstead Garden Suburb. Like Rowntree, Howard had forged his links with Parker and Unwin at the Garden City Association’s Bournville Conference in 1901, where Unwin had impressed Parker with a paper he presented. Parker and Unwin were one of several architects being considered for the Letchworth commission, but following interviews in October 1903, and the presentation of their plans early in 1904, Parker and Unwin’s plan for Letchworth was adopted in February of that year.

---

41 Miller, 1992, p23.
42 Miller, 1992, p25.
43 Unwin, writing in 1901, reported in Miller, 1992, p32.
As Miller suggests, Howard's writing had left many details “open to interpretation in the context of the selected site”\(^{44}\). As has already been suggested, Unwin had already worked out in general terms the principles he believed should govern residential layout and housing design well before he arrived at Letchworth\(^{45}\), both in his earlier writing, and in his initial work at New Earswick. It was in the early stages of design of Letchworth that Parker and Unwin developed the standard for housing density of 12 per acre which had such later resonance. Far from being a thoroughly considered design principle, the two architects worked from initial estimates of population and plot numbers proposed by Howard for the Letchworth site. However, Howard had not made any estimate for access roads and other service areas, and Parker and Unwin had to reduce the density implied by Howard, arriving at 12 houses per acre almost as a 'rule of thumb', according to Beevers\(^{46}\). Nevertheless, Howard was happy with this, and as the garden city tended to attract middle class residents with smaller families, and this combined with Parker and Unwin's housing density decision meant that Parker's initial expectations of 90 persons per acre were reduced by almost fifty per cent.

**F.J. Osborn**

If Howard had the idealism and the oratory, then it was F.J. Osborn who provided the necessary political acumen\(^{47}\). His working life in the garden cities movement began alongside Howard, and he was still editing *Town and Country Planning* until 1965 at the age of eighty. He began his work in 1912 as a housing manager at Letchworth, the first of the garden cities, and thereafter held various posts in and connected to the garden cities, and latterly the new towns, movement until his retirement over fifty years later. Like Howard, he was an industrious self-educator, but it was his writing that was most crucial to his impact, producing books and articles throughout most of his career, documenting and expounding his ideals. As well as being a champion of Howard's ideas, he was also his biographer, and often wrote at length about the man (for example, a substantial

\(^{44}\) Miller, 1992, p49.


\(^{47}\) Aldridge, 1979, p1.
biographical article from Town Planning Review\textsuperscript{48}). Whilst he was aware of the ideas of many of the utopian authors prevalent and popular at the time (Morris, Ruskin, Wells, Chesterton), he consciously rejected utopianism as having a part to play within the garden cities movement, unlike Howard, who appeared unconsciously to embrace it. Immediately we come across one of the key tensions within the whole new towns project, which began in earliest days with Howard and Osborn. Howard began with idealism, utopianism and a disarmingly simple vision, which he accepted would be modified by others, whilst Osborn rejected utopianism as having any part to play, and even denied the utopian strand within Howard’s work. Given Osborn’s astuteness, one must wonder whether this is simply self-delusion, or re-presentation of his friend’s ideas for consumption by a wide spectrum of more conservative public, and especially for government. Moreover, having outlived Howard, it was Osborn who carried the torch of earlier generations into the post-war era, often deeply critical of what was, by then, going on in the building and planning of new and old cities alike.

\textbf{Key Themes of the Garden Cities Movement}

So why did the idea of the garden city have such an impact? As suggested above, it had much to do with the personalities of Howard and Osborn, and especially in the way that they complemented each other—Howard the idealistic orator, Osborn the tenacious pragmatist. But it was also that they tapped into a rich seam of public disquiet about the state of the nineteenth and early twentieth century city, and about the effect that this was having upon the health and general well-being of the people who lived in them\textsuperscript{49}. For many this was not idle humanitarianism; some feared that urban poverty would foment revolution, others that the strength of the country (this at a time of imperialism and empire) would be undermined. Such fears engendered a profound anti-urbanism amongst a wide range of both popular and intellectual opinion, and Howard shared these misgivings about the city. But according to Aldridge\textsuperscript{50}, the anti-urbanism of both Howard and Osborn was not borne so much of a fear of revolution, or a dislike for the industrial aesthetic, but rather by the conviction that the city itself, innately, damaged physical health, eroded the quality

\textsuperscript{48}Osborn, 1950.

\textsuperscript{49}Aalen, 1992, for example, notes that many of those moving to Letchworth in its early years were particularly concerned with issues such as Food Reform.

\textsuperscript{50}Aldridge, 1979, p6.
of the race, and impaired fertility. These were general preoccupations for many of those in the garden city movement, with Lewis Mumford, in a letter to Osborn, positing that "the big city not merely devours population, but because of its essential nature prevents new babies coming into the world" 51.

These may seem strange ideas now, but in the context of, for instance, the eugenics movement, they reflected a common strand of thought at the time (indeed, according to Voigt 52, the garden cities movement had strong links with eugenic thinking, and in Germany, especially, came to form part of extreme right wing thinking). Moreover, thinking of the city as generically malignant is not an idea which died with eugenics or public health legislation. Jonathan Raban's book Soft City 53 at times reflects exactly the same sort of pathological, malevolent view of the city as predatory organism, as do the ideas in the previous paragraph 54.

In contrast the countryside is a mythical idyll, an essential and almost mystical source of all that is good and wholesome. Howard was a great proponent of this view of the countryside 55. A quotation from his book Garden Cities of To-morrow, reprinted in Aldridge 56, talks of:

"our kindly mother earth, at once the source of life, of happiness, of wealth and power... The country is the symbol of God's love and care for man. All that we are and all that we have comes from it. Our bodies are formed of it; to it they return... It is the source of all health, all wealth, all knowledge. But its fullness of joy and wisdom has not revealed itself to man. Nor can it as long as this unholy, unnatural separation of society and nature endures. Town and country must be married" (emphasis in original)

51 Aldridge, 1979, p6.
52 Voigt, 1989.
53 Raban, 1974.
54 The history of anti-urban sentiment, and its links with new settlements, is also discussed in Chapter 1.
55 Though, as the discussion in Chapter 1 of the Three Magnets model in Howard's book Garden Cities of To-morrow, his views of the city and the country appeared to be sufficiently sophisticated to understand that both localities had positive and negative aspects to them.
56 Aldridge, 1979, p7.
It is worth noting here the strong religious language, both Christian and pagan, and the importance to Howard of bringing together society (the city or town) and nature (the countryside) into a wholeness which neither one, and especially society, has on its own. The garden has long been seen in classical terms as the middle landscape between the city and the wilderness\(^{57}\), and Howard's work parallels this tripartite city-garden-wilderness model in his famous three magnets; town, country, and what he terms town-country. In effect this third option is the garden, the idyll between the degradation of the city and the isolation of the countryside. There is here, too, an echo of the third way discussed earlier, an idyll between the twin prongs of capitalism and communism.

Such a tripartite division has not, and did not, enter public consciousness to supersede an essentially bipartisan view of the city and country in opposition, and as polar opposites. Much of Howard's argument, and that of those who followed him, has been conducted within this bipartisan framework. The view of the wholesome idyllic countryside thus propounded has persisted in the mainstream of public consciousness long beyond the religious ideals in which Howard wrapped it. To live in the country is to put oneself apart from the city, and from the decay and decadence which it so often symbolises. In the countryside one encounters real communities, rather than the anonymity of the city\(^{58}\). Thus not just new settlements, but all new developments play upon the icons and images of life in the countryside- the village green\(^{59}\), the half-timbered cottage and the village pub. Many of these are aesthetic cues, and it is in the aesthetic realm where the strongest links between the ideals of garden cities and new settlements are, and it is where new towns are most different from these two opposing ends of the evolutionary spectrum. Indeed, it may be true that new settlements are closer to Howard's marriage of town and country than anything in the intervening period, offering, at their best, the convenience of proximity to the facilities of the city, and the visual cues and perceptual isolation of the village.

Osborn, like Howard, was wedded to the idea of the mystical countryside, and to the image of the pathological city- in his practical manner he resolved the solution to be low density,

\(^{57}\)See Cosgrove, 1992.

\(^{58}\)See the wider discussion of these ideas in Chapter 1.

\(^{59}\)As both the examples which are studied in this thesis, and more recent proposals suggest, the village green and the village pub seem to be almost essential components of any new settlement design.
cottage style developments at twelve houses to the acre. The language may have been
different from Howard's pulpit oratory, but the message was the same. Not only has this
density standard become a lodestone within the psychology of professional planning
(twelve taking on the nature of a magic number, a benchmark standard against which
everything else is compared), but it also became one of the key rifts between the traditional
wing of the garden cities movement (which in turn, as the Garden Cities and Town
Planning Association, later the Town and Country Planning Association, campaigned not
only for garden cities, but also for town and country planning legislation), and those who
took on the shaping of the post-war, state-sector new towns. Those involved in the later
work were influenced by modernist thinking, by ideas of high density, high rise living, and
were less wedded in principle to the twelve to the acre cottage plan, even if they often
adopted it, or its variants, out of pragmatism. Indeed, it was a subject over which Osborn
and his long time friend Lewis Mumford often disagreed. Nevertheless, the GCTPA took
up a strongly anti-modernist stance - Aldridge\textsuperscript{60} talks of "the GCTPA's three horsemen
of the apocalypse: high-density, high-rise and modernist architecture". Yet Howard originally
conceived of the garden city as a machine- as a way making society run better, more
efficiently and more productively. How far is his machine aesthetic from that of Le
Corbusier, and how easily does it fit with his mysticism and pseudo-religious language?
Like his attempted synthesis of communitarian and individualist politics, Howard often
appears to have tried to bring together the irreconcilable. These contradictions of
philosophy have remained both in town planning, and especially in the new town and new
settlement movements; and it is in their attempts to reconcile or resolve these that the real
differences between them and the original garden cities have arisen.

It is typical of the philosophical relationship between Howard and Osborn that the former's
social utopianism, and expectation of radical social reform and restructuring within the
garden city, was moderated by the latter into a relatively conservative, populist approach to
social goals. Far from being an ancient historical debate, this dichotomy has been of crucial
importance right through the history of planned new settlements- whether new settlements
(and garden cities, new towns etc.) are a way of building, or allowing to develop, new
forms of social structure, or whether they are simply a way of encouraging parts of the
present dominant societal structure (ie. of allowing the present order more easily and more

\textsuperscript{60}Aldridge, 1979, p18.
successfully to prosper). Again it also reflects a wider debate in planning between social radicals and conservatives, as to whether planning is meant to change society, or to perpetuate it. Inasmuch as both had their roots in Fabianism, and supported land reform, Howard and Osborn were radicals. In addition, Osborn rejected the notion of inherited wealth, and had little time for the monarchy. This was not so much a function of revolutionary socialist sympathies, as of his general dislike of any group having or wanting to have control over the lives of ordinary people. In that way he was equally fearful of those on the left who wanted to take power in order to rebuild society in another image, and impose other constraints on people. In his letters to Lewis Mumford, he was scathing about "mechanical leftism", and excoriated the "urbanised, cafe-lounging, quasi-communist, quasi-technocrat types" (probably his real thoughts upon those who took the reins of urban and new town planning in the post-war era).

Osborn undoubtedly had socialist sympathies, and was happy enough to see the erosion of class barriers which the passage of the twentieth century, and the two world wars therein, brought about. He saw the new world of the garden cities and new towns as healthier and closer to nature, but with essentially the same family, social and institutional structures as before. He was sternly opposed to those who saw planning as having a role in changing fundamentally the nature of the family, and was typically blunt about them in another letter to Mumford:

"There exists in their mind an idea that the family home is a dying institution, and that we are on the threshold of a new world in which, somehow, man will be born again as a social animal in a way different from past and present ways. When I was a young member of the Fabian Society I was surrounded by people who felt like that; I scoffed at it then as I do now."

As in this case, Osborn often stood opposed to fashionable intellectual opinion, and, as a corollary, often lined up alongside popular opinion. This was part of his attraction, and much of the success of the garden cities project, and the durability of its ideas, can be attributed to his populist talent. It was his feeling that ordinary people were little interested in intellectual culture (perhaps a surprisingly snobbish view from such an ardent self-

61 Aldridge, 1979, p9.
62 reproduced in Aldridge, 1979, p10.
educator, but realistic enough) or of its then favoured high rise, modernist architecture. He understood the aspirations of English popular culture well, and recognised the preference for houses with gardens, rather than flats, an attitude which has remained relatively unaffected throughout the century to the present day, despite the best efforts of many with power and influence to convince people otherwise. It has to be understood that such opinions at the time put Osborn in the anti-aesthetic camp, because the dominant aestheticism was that of modernism, and even now, the sort of conventional, semi-detached housing which he espoused is decried in design terms. But it was perhaps because he thought that "the speculative builder...stands far closer to the ordinary man"63, and championed the suburban vernacular, that the first garden cities were not modernist, but privately built to please popular mores. This made them relatively successful, a key to the continuation of the ideal, for failure of either Letchworth or Welwyn would have killed any chance of the later state new towns programme, and would have meant the end of the GCTPA (with not only their plans for new cities, but also for town and country planning legislation).

Osborn's attitudes to social planning appear not to have continued into the new towns programme, or new settlements planning. Indeed, he was very wary, as earlier paragraphs have suggested, of the whole notion of social goals in planning. For whilst later work made much out of the need to provide for social interaction, and social mixing, Osborn was of the opinion that very little would encourage mixing which was not based upon shared class or interests ie. that people could not be encouraged to develop community spirit except amongst fairly narrow, self-selected groups. His approach was somewhat anti-intellectual, as before, asserting that given the choice between a cosmopolitan social life within the public domain, and one which was home-centred, most would choose the latter64. This presumably has implications for what he thought would be adequate social provision, and echoes the rather puritan attitudes of those who laid out places like Bourneville (which had no pubs)- that social provision was essentially frivolous, and that those who used theatres and coffee houses were people with dubious, urban values (for example his views on cafe

63 Aldridge, 1979, p10
64 In a letter to Mumford in 1956, Osborn wrote: "The fact is that a home-centred culture, which is healthy, does to some extent conflict with...theatres, lectures, eating... - and that most people value more highly the former if they can't have both" (Aldridge, 1979, p10).
lounging urban intellectuals, which have already been stated).

His comments on the usefulness of small halls in 1956 are a useful reminder that the functional link between provision of social facilities, and their becoming centres of community life, and a catalyst for community spirit and interaction, was not taken for granted. Indeed, Osborn did not ascribe any great cultural efficacy to such halls, but said to Mumford: "None of them function to bring together the neighbours as a geographical social group. The only thing that did that in Welwyn was the air-raid warden service during the war". He felt that once the immediate bonhomie of the pioneers had passed, the major bases for social life were the family, and groups of like social class or interest. This challenges one of the key premises of post-war planning, that of social mixing ie. that a mix of social groups within a geographical area is desirable, and adds to the vitality of a community. What Osborn suggested, and what the experience of people in the new towns and private sector new settlements seems to show, is that people do not mix in this homogeneous way, but rather live alongside people of similar class and income (and if not, have little to do with their neighbours), and mix with those with which they feel a cultural or interest-based affinity. The function of voluntary social organisations within new settlements and new towns then becomes crucial, for it is they which form the nuclei of social life and interaction, rather than neighbourhoods of mixed groups of people, as was the orthodoxy in the state new towns. Indeed, despite his continued interest in post-war developments, Osborn, like Howard, only ever envisaged a limited role for the state in new towns; no more than a legal and economic framework within which people could choose to develop, or live in, a new town.

Post-war idealism: socialism and the state
It is no coincidence that the initiative on state new towns was taken by the most left-wing government that this country has had- the post-war Labour government. By this time, new towns had become a socialist project, a way of improving the living conditions of urban workers, and of attempting to build the new, socialist, utopian environment. This strand of thinking not only built upon the ideas of Howard and Osborn laid out earlier, but in some

---

65 Aldridge, 1979, p10.
66 Bishop & Hoggett, 1986.
ways challenged, overturned or subverted them. The legacy which the earlier generation had left was confused enough, but the new and avowedly socialist agenda made the track of ideas even more labyrinthine. In many ways it took the idea of garden cities away from its roots and remade it in another image, and it has only been over the last twenty years that the new settlements movement has rediscovered some of the themes of the earliest pioneers—privatism, cultural accommodation (rather than social engineering), and local diversity.

One of the clearest polemic expositions of the socialist agenda for new towns can be found in a Fabian pamphlet of 1955, entitled The New Towns— the success of social planning, and written by Norman Mackenzie, then assistant editor of New Statesman and Society, and prospective parliamentary candidate for Hemel Hempstead (itself a state new town). He makes it clear at the end of this paper what he considers to be the relationship between socialism and New Towns:

"It was a Labour Government that launched this unique experiment, which has drawn visitors from all over the world to study and admire it. It should be the concern of the Labour Movement to see that it is carried through to success. The New Towns should be showplaces of democratic Socialism, the proof that it can develop people as well as change things.

Unlike the reports of the immediate post-war period, Mackenzie's paper is in the best traditions of pamphlet rhetoric, and far more illuminating for that. It certainly echoes both Howard in Osborn in its reason for the need of new towns, talking about the "squalor of the industrial barracks of the nineteenth century", but Mackenzie adds two more built environments to his pantheon of evils; "soulless council estates and middle-class suburbs". Such a comment is fascinating for two reasons. Firstly it acknowledges the failure of an earlier socialist solution, even if it does not analyse why it failed, and secondly, it is critical of exactly the sort of vernacular suburban architecture of which Osborn was so fond. If Mackenzie had realised that the failure of council estates was not so much to do with the way that they were designed, but with the multiple social deprivations

67This part of the chapter draws primarily upon this fascinating and polemic document.
of many of the people who had to live there, then he would have seen through the myth of physical determinism which infused so much of planning thought at the time. But he and his contemporaries did not, and planning, as well as the new towns movement, remained saddled with such assumptions for many more years. Moreover, his contempt for suburban housing was hardly a populist attitude, as many people aspired to such housing. Rather it was an example of the sort of intellectual and cultural elitism which was a dominant strand of socialist thinking at the time. Such an attitude towards the aspirations of the masses is in many ways simply a newer and more intellectually respectable form of paternalism.

These two strands of thought, environmental or physical determinism, and socialist paternalism, are elaborated throughout Mackenzie's pamphlet. I will first deal with the deterministic aspect, then the paternalist, and finally go on to discuss other issues which Mackenzie raises. He elaborates the basic philosophy of socialism that "man" is intrinsically good, and capable of changing self and society for the better. But in Mackenzie's scenario, that ability to change self and environment is itself proscribed by that environment; "a bad environment corrupts and degrades, while a good one elevates and improves". The good environment which such a philosophy envisaged was one of "self-contained and balanced communities", thus maintaining one of the basic tenets of Howardian planning- that garden cities were arranged to be largely self-sufficient, and hence self-contained. By the time Mackenzie was writing, in 1955, there had already been some experience gained from the first stages of the earliest new towns, and it was clear that the concepts of self-containment and balance were beginning to creak at the seams, however strongly he reiterates them.

Mackenzie's "healthy civic complexity" was being eroded by the self-selection of groups moving into the new towns. Rents were too high for unskilled workers, and the middle classes did not "take kindly to living in new towns", partly because they wished to buy rather than rent their homes, and partly, he suggests "for reasons of snobbery". Those left were primarily skilled workers, hardly forming a balanced community. The corollary of this is that almost certainly some of the residents found work outside the new town (given

70Mackenzie, 1955, p1.
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that there was an overabundance of particular skills), and that both the unskilled workers and the middle classes lived outside the new towns. Thus even by Mackenzie's admission, there were functional linkages with other settlements, by definition ruling out self-containment. There seems to be a divergence between the rhetoric and the true facts of new town development, but this is hardly surprising. Garden cities, new towns, and latterly the new settlements, have all been first and foremost creations of the imagination, and only latterly physical entities. Thus they are conceived of not only as physical entities, but also as places of the imagination, a sphere in which rhetoric, image and expectation play as much a role as perception.

The air of vague unreality is maintained when one examines the social paternalism which plays a part in Mackenzie's message. He is refining a strand of thought which had always been part of social reformism, and was evident in Howard - the notion of improving the lot of the poor. Such improvements would, of course, be top down, with those of education and social position creating better conditions for their less fortunate brethren, with the assumption that they knew what they wanted, or, at least, what was best for them. Mackenzie maintains this tradition, this despite any socialist pretensions of delivering control of their destiny to the workers themselves.

Thus for Mackenzie, in poor environments, recreation means escape, this escape being "sought in the public house, the cinema and the dance hall". Such puritanical views of popular entertainment or culture were hardly in line with the aspirations of ordinary people then, and they are not those of the vast majority now. Whether people live in poor urban environments, or good ones, this does not appear to change their liking for popular entertainment, be that the pub, the football match or the bowling alley. For Mackenzie, such things would be replaced in a socialist system by "richer human relations", with self expression leading to fulfilment, which he presumably sees at some form of higher state. More specifically, he talks about the development of "healthy and vigorous voluntary organisations", which would presumably replace less healthy and less vigorous forms of passing the time. For Mackenzie, "the absence or comparative scarcity of 'passive'

73Howard, 1945 [1902].
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amenities, such as cinemas, public houses, dance halls, football stadiums, dog tracks, means that 'creative' and amateur interests are stimulated. It is precisely such elitist views of popular leisure activities which led many New Towns to be such social deserts, to their cost. Here again, Mackenzie's attitudes clash with his aspirations, for his paternalism here gives way to a desire for neighbourhood associations with local control, apparently power to the people. But the real agenda creeps through again as he talks of New Towns being "a test of our capacity for community building". As his audience is almost entirely the socialist intelligentsia of the Labour Party, and some activists, this is not so much a call for 'us', the people of the community, as much as 'us', fellow leaders of the new socialist society, to build new communities for 'them', the people.

We recall how Osborn pointed out that it would be the home which would be the centre of life in new communities for many people, and Mackenzie picks this issue up. Typically, he sees it not as a social inevitability to be worked with, but as a problem to be dealt with. This places him very much in the philosophical realm of those who wished to use new towns and town planning to fundamentally change society, rather than those, like Osborn, who worked with what existed, and aimed for improvement, but not wholesale change. Mackenzie talks about the disadvantages of community building in New Towns; "most of the residents are newcomers without roots, the distractions of home and garden making, the problem of baby-sitting", though he does see the newcomers having the advantage of youth, energy, talents and enthusiasm.

**Learning from experience—social planning in New Towns**

It is evident in Mackenzie's paper, even amongst the polemic, that a learning process was going on in the New Towns, and that in some cases plans and philosophical assumptions were being modified in the light of experience. By 1967, when the Ministry of Housing

77 Mackenzie, 1955, p7.
79 The dates of this report, and Mackenzie's pamphlet, should be noted in relation to the dates at which the three new settlements discussed in this thesis were first conceived. In all three cases, the initial idea emerged in the first four years of the 1960s, with building starting at two out of the three prior to the MoHLG report. Hence the three sites were not greatly predated by ideas such as Mackenzie's, and were contemporaneous
and Local Government (MoHLG) produced the report *The needs of new communities*\(^8^0\), which dealt with social provision in new and expanding communities, there was a substantial body of practical, experiential evidence to add to the theoretical and philosophical assumptions about the New Towns. Such a report may seem a particularly arid environment through which to follow the thread of Howard’s ideas, but it does show the way in which experience was modifying practice and philosophy, and also how evidence was still being seen through the assumptions of earlier generations.

Whilst the ideal of self-containment had just about survived, the long cherished concept of the balanced community had become redundant by the mid-sixties. This was not simply in terms of demographics, but also in terms of the attempt to balance and mix class groups. We will examine these strands of policy in turn, and then begin to examine how much of the experiential learning, both good and bad, was carried over into new settlement planning to add to the legacy of earlier generations.

It was the chameleon like nature of the concept of self-containment which had allowed it to survive so long. The concept as outlined by Howard, of a city or network of cities able to provide all the different levels of services, employment and commerce, producing all its agricultural requirements within its own boundaries, and functionally integrated at all levels, was long forgotten. It had become obvious that in such a tightly populated country as Britain, the isolation necessary to encourage such self-reliance would never be feasible, and the social control necessary to coerce people into working, living, shopping and engaging in leisure activities all within proscribed boundaries would have become repressive. Moreover no city or city-region, however large, could provide every conceivable cultural or economic resource required by every resident, and that even if it could, people would still travel outside it for all sorts of reasons. Once separated from platform rhetoric, the cold analysis of the MoHLG report suggested that people would travel outside of the New Town for many reasons- to visit relatives, for work (the report acknowledges the mismatch between employment and housing that existed in many cases), or for services not provided in the New Town. This last case is a crucial breakthrough, for

---

\(^8^0\) Ministry of Housing and Local Government, 1967.
at last it recognised that new towns had service levels limited by their population\textsuperscript{81}, and thus such towns would inevitably operate within a regional context other than that simply of population dispersal.

So what definition of self-containment remained which allowed the authors of this report to restate the principle? For a start they add provisos to these basic statements, "aspects of these policies are now being reviewed... in the light of the great social and economic changes which have taken place over the last two decades", and then begin to redefine their argument; "the importance of amenities, services and facilities is receiving increasing attention"\textsuperscript{82}. The report then goes on to state that places of different sizes can expect to have different levels of provision\textsuperscript{83}, and to define the threshold levels for provision of various services\textsuperscript{84}. Thus we end up with a far more contingent view of self-containment; it becomes little more than providing services adequate to the size of the serviced population, which is not at all what Howard intended, but is far more appropriate to the smaller new settlements, where the Howardian approach to self-containment would be near impossible, and is also far more reasonable an approach for the New Towns.

Self-containment thus remains as a reality in physical terms, but its social, economic and transportational significance, so much a centre of Howard's original theory, has all but evaporated. Nevertheless, the significance of this physical strand of self-containment should not be underestimated. There is a tremendous psychological and symbolic significance to a settlement boundary, often of far greater importance to its residents than any other form of self-containment. If a settlement has a distinct edge, visually signified by a change from built form to countryside (fields, woodland, or even water features), or by some other boundary feature, then it is definable as a distinct place, different and separate. This is qualitatively different for most observers and residents than the change simply from one type or style of built environment to another, or from the use of inter-urban boundary features. Such a perceptual framework builds upon the notion of each town and village being set distinctly in a sea of open countryside, so that each is wholly surrounded by 'the

\textsuperscript{81}MoHLG, 1967, p22, para 79.
\textsuperscript{82}MoHLG, 1967, p5, para 15.
\textsuperscript{83}MoHLG, 1967, para 79.
\textsuperscript{84}MoHLG, 1967, para 99.
country'; and in travelling from one place to another, one travels from the centre of a place, to its edge, then into a realm without place identification (to the traveller), to the edge of another place and then into its centre. Such a view of the British landscape is, of course, mythical, but it is a strong and pervasive myth. But then how does one explain the existence of distinctive places within the conurbations of Greater London, or the Black Country? How do such 'edgeless' places maintain their distinctiveness? The solution is an understanding of place which is not simply geographical, but also historical. The towns and villages which are now absorbed within the conurbations were once separate, even if they are no longer so. They thus had a chance to establish distinctiveness, with centres and edges, before they melted into each other. Local people are initiated with the boundary information of past geographies, and incomers learn it from them if they wish, and thus place specificity is maintained. The uninitiated observer does not see these boundaries, and has no mental picture of them. When a place is new, and without history, as in the case of garden cities, new towns and new settlements, there is no chance of such past geographies maintaining the place specificity, so it must be marked out with geographical separation. Thus all new places, if they are to be seen as such, need to manufacture distinctiveness by way of a physical boundary, and also tend to try and manufacture a history to justify such boundaries, and to give meaning to the space within those boundaries. This is what self-containment has become in new settlements—places that are functionally little more than peri-urban suburbs, but whose physical separation gives them a distinctiveness which makes them substantially different in perceptual terms. Perception is a crucial part of the process of social formation and community creation, and it is this perception of self-containment given by physical separation which gives the chance for new settlements to develop social lives and communal personae which few suburbs could ever manage. Whilst this concept of self-containment has very little indeed to do with Howard's original ideals, it is he who introduced the term, and even so far removed, it is still at the heart of what is meant by 'new settlements'.

And what of balance, that other key tenet of Howard's? It was apparent from Mackenzie's paper that various factors were beginning to select those most likely to live in new towns, both in terms of class, and of lifestyle stage. He went as far as suggesting that New Towns were predominantly skilled working class domiciles, and young in age structure. The analysis of the MoHLG does not seem to contradict this developing analysis, and indeed it
adds much detail to it, especially in terms of the lifestyle stage side of the of this developing approach. The report talks of the "abnormal age structures" in new towns, resulting directly from the fact that most of the incomers were young families. Children under ten years of age formed about a quarter of the total population, with a relatively small population of teenagers. This is precisely the pattern that has been found to develop in the early years of a new settlement, as Chapter 3 elaborates. Such a pattern does not remain static. Building occurs over a specific period of time, during which there is a large net in-migration of population, mostly of young families. This early stage of demographic youth soon becomes more complex, and as new building slows down, older people move in to join younger relatives, and the general level of population movement slows down. Population movement is then a combination of internal migration (from one size of house to another reflecting changes in family size and material wealth), and lower levels of in and out migration, which balance each other. Population size growth is generated by children born within the town or settlement, and not by migration. Over a period of time, the population ages, and the result of in and out migration is to create a more balanced population age structure. It would seem to be the case that over time, the population age structure of new towns and new settlements tends towards that of the general population, but for the initial years, such structures are very abnormal, and may be expected to take several decades to normalise. Thus in this sense at least, the idea of the balanced community is a myth for many years.

It is even more the case that balance is an unattainable dream when it comes to social class structures within the population. The MoHLG paper does not address itself directly to this issue. Certainly the information gleaned from new settlements seems to back up that which Mackenzie suggested; that is that neither new towns or new settlements attract a balanced cross-section of socio-economic groups. Both new towns and new settlements have economic hurdles to entry—rent levels in the case of new towns, house prices and the dominance of owner-occupation in new settlements. Moreover there are cultural barriers—there needs to be a willingness to move, and the understanding that the new place is 'our sort' of place, full of 'our sort' of people (such decisions are not necessarily consciously expressed, nevertheless, they are made). And finally movers must be sure that they can

---

make a living in the new place, either because there are new and suitable jobs there, or that they can continue in their old job from their new home. Such provisos all mitigate against a complete socio-economic mix in the population. Moreover, local factors such as the mix, size and intended market of the housing built can have a huge effect. The net result is that the smaller the new settlement or town, and the more limited the options of housing and/or employment thus offered, the more likely it is to be limited in socio-economic and life stage profile. It has already been established that the size of a settlement determines the community facilities available- and it also likely that there is a similar relationship between size and diversity in other spheres. There is little evidence that the garden cities or new towns literature ever saw limited social diversity as having inherent advantages, but saw it rather something to be tolerated and accepted as the inevitable outcome of larger social forces. But if limited social diversity is a fact of life, and is likely to be exacerbated in smaller settlements, then there is a need to ask whether a lack of diversity has some advantages. There is, for instance, every chance of increased social cohesion if residents are more uniform in terms of their socio-economic, lifestyle and class affiliations. If as Osborn suggests, the only things that are likely to bring residents together are common interests and class affiliations, then a narrowing of social diversity is surely a positive advantage to any community. This approach, which Osborn undoubtedly flagged, if only unconsciously and in exasperation, is in direct contradiction to the Howardian idealism, and to some received planning orthodoxies. It is, though, an approach which fits more comfortably with the different scale and context of new settlements. Moreover, if new settlements are to be the subjects of 'niche marketing' and 'social design', then the advantages of social similarity will become part of the propaganda of social image construction.

The thread of ideas
This chapter has begun to follow some strands of thought through from their Howardian beginnings towards current thinking about new settlements. Table 7.1 attempts to trace their development from the earliest thoughts on garden cities to the present day. Self-containment and social mix have already been covered in some detail, and these are the first two subjects in the Table. Howardian thought, as has been suggested earlier, was essentially anti-city, with a romantic view of the countryside, tinged with fragments of the
then prevalent eugenics. Such a view persisted into later revisions of garden city thought, and the essentially negative view of the city was still present in post-war new town thinking. Instead of the unifying of elements of country and the city, as in Howardian thinking, the solution had become the building of new urban utopias in order to eliminate the problems of the old cities. This idealised new towns policy was soon discarded and a more pragmatic line took hold—namely that the role of the new towns was to alleviate the problems related to population growth in the cities by accommodating overspill population (such an approach was based upon population forecasts which assumed a continuation of post-war baby boom fertility rates—but fertility rates fell and the new towns consequently seemed to lose much of their raison d'être)\(^87\). The Howardian views of the city and country have to some extent been restored by new settlements. Whilst the rationale for a new settlement may well be couched in terms of housing and land supply within the development plan context, much of their attraction to potential residents (and hence to the marketing departments of developers) is precisely that they are not part of the main urban mass, and are perceived to some degree as villages, and hence as rural. Those moving there see their move as one away from the city, as perceived, and to a rural setting, or, at least, a non-city setting.

In terms of design, the progress from garden cities to new settlements has been strongly driven by wider fashions, although there is some evidence that the new settlements have led fashion in residential urban design\(^88\). Inasmuch as Howard dealt with the issues of urban design below the level of general street layout, he was driven by his attempts to rationalise his vision of urban form. He appeared to favour a fairly regular pattern of medium density terraces, but it was Osborn and others who made more of the issue of detailed design. Osborn, especially, made much of the need for vernacular design. This was already counter to the developing academic orthodoxy of modernism, which took hold as the design philosophy for the early post-war new towns. Modernism in new towns never really achieved the vertical excesses seen in the redeveloped inner cities, or the outer urban

\(^{87}\)See Cullingworth and Nadin, 1994, p13.

\(^{88}\)Both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath have been the subject of interest from architects, and have featured in architectural journals. The documentation for both contains notes for visiting students, and it seems from interviews with those involved in the planning and development of both sites, and especially at Martlesham Heath (interview with Lindsey Clubb), that such visits are regular a regular occurrence.
Corbusian 'prairies and towers', but the vernacular of Letchworth was slowly superseded by what might be termed 'municipal modernism'. This was a diluted form, where concrete and uniformity dominated, and the supposed rationalism of the design sat well with the increasing minimalism of building budgets. The earliest of the new settlements owed something to this diluted modernism, and it can be seen, for instance, in the design of the shopping precinct at East Goscote, built in the late 1960s. Where budgets were more generous, for instance the early residential phases of Bar Hill, the result is less bleak, and in the fullness of time has achieved a maturity which has softened this effect. More recently, with Martlesham Heath in the vanguard, there has been a resurgence of vernacular style. There is much of the post-modern in this - the conscious borrowing and reappropriation of design elements has an element of niche marketing about it.

With the issue of initiative, there is likewise a similarity between garden city practice, and that of the new settlements. Both have depended on key individuals whose enthusiasm and vision drove the projects. In the case of the garden cities, it was Howard, for Martlesham Heath it was a land manager called Chris Parker. This was never a universal model for the new settlements - Bar Hill was an initiative arising from the contingencies of planning policy (though the then chief planning officer of Cambridgeshire was a key player), and East Goscote was the idea of a firm, where individuals do not appear to have been acknowledged as key actors in their own rights. Of more recent developments, Tircoed was the idea of visionary individual, and some of the prospective 'green' villages are likewise driven by fierce amateur enthusiasm. More frequently, the initiative has been corporate, involving companies or consortia, and in the last few years, as a plan led development system has been reasserted, the initiative has been the joint effort of planning departments, developers and consultants. It would seem unlikely that the initiative in new settlement development will ever pass as far into state hands as did the new towns programme in the 1950's and 1960's, where a collectivist and centrist approach grew out of the campaigning.

---

89 For a wider discussion of the urban design implications of modernism, see Harvey, 1989.
90 See picture 6 in the illustrative annex.
91 His thinking is elaborated in a number of papers noted in the references to this thesis, and an interview and correspondence elaborated upon this.
93 For example the Stroud Village Project, mentioned in Owen, 1993b.
94 Notably, in recent years, Consortium Developments Ltd.
efforts of some in the garden cities movement for an organised state planning structure for all development, new towns included. The collectivist approach, so graphically illustrated by Mackenzie’s paper discussed above, became more and more pragmatic, compromised until by the time of the last new towns, the state was little more than a provider of serviced plots to private developers, given carte blanche to do very much what they wished within the site, euphemistically termed ‘partnership’. This presaged the leading role which the private sector then took in new settlement development.95

A slightly different pattern emerges in examining the philosophy and approach of various phases from garden cities to new settlements. Howard’s philosophy, as seen earlier, was utopian and idealist, and his approach radical, though this was tempered once he began to adapt the message of his writing to a broader audience, and in the process of gaining financial support for Letchworth. Howard’s idealism was succeeded by Osborn’s anti-orthodox populism, exemplified by his attitudes to design and to social change. Utopianism re-emerged in the post-war socialist agenda, but it was of a different hue to that of Howard - although it thought of itself as radical in approach, it had nothing of Howard’s community based power structures. Instead, the post-war socialist agenda had much veiled paternalism about it, and its approach was as a consequence top-down (and hence inherently conservative in terms of the ordering of relations of power), rather than emerging from grass roots organisation.

This utopianism too was compromised as policy developed, and as political control passed between governments to the left and right of consensus centrality throughout the latter half of the fifties, and into the sixties and early seventies. The socialist aims of the post-war Labour government regarding new towns, as with much of their policy agenda, drifted into contingent pragmatism, as budgets tightened, disillusion set in, and the will for radical change was lost. The new settlements were marked in their approach by opportunism, taking their chance to produce a solution from radically different sets of circumstances. Rather like the garden cities, they led formal policy by some distance in time, and it was only later that their often maverick approach became absorbed into some from of

95And indeed, the method of development used at both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, where one organising body, in these cases private rather than public sector, managed the release of large plots (hamlets or phases) to housebuilders or architects.
orthodoxy; firstly the systematic, developer-led pressure on a whole series of sites in areas of intense development pressure (certain parts of the outer south-east and the East Midlands became targets), and latterly through the unitary development plan system. It remains to be seen what end products these later orthodoxies throw up.

The issue of intended social structures has been raised earlier in the paper in relation to the views of Howard and Osborn, where the ongoing philosophical debates of environmental determinism, and the division between radicalism and reformism were played out. Howard was, at least initially and in theory, a radical, who felt that new forms of society would and should emerge in garden cities. Osborn was far more a reformer, and seems to have feared wholesale social change for the effect it might have had on family life—moreover he felt that the nature of the British people, their natural reticence and conservatism, would limit the chances of change. He hoped simply to mitigate some of the problems of urban life, but did not expect or support wholesale change. Perhaps the strongest advocacy of social engineering via new settlements came with the post-war socialist agenda for new towns. They were seen as a way of building the new socialist society, but such plans foundered on their own internal contradictions—their top-down paternalism bred centralism, which in turn allowed considerations of cost, and governmental caution to intervene. The result was that the later new towns again reverted to little more than the aim of environmental improvement, mildly reformist in nature, but guided more by contingency than any vision for social change. Thus far, most of the new settlements built have either been socially conservative, trying to replicate or reinforce existing modes of social organisation (mostly unconsciously, recognising only that they have to meet the demand of the housing market, but also, in the spirit of Prince Charles, aiming to recreate historic environments, and hence, it would seem, a backward looking zeitgeist), or at most mildly reformist (experimenting with new physical layouts and designs, or trying to relocate population). Likewise most planned new settlements are of this ilk, but there are one or two which have more radical aims. Notable amongst these are the 'green' or 'sustainable' settlements, such as Lightmoor (a TCPA initiative in Telford) and the mooted Stroud Village Project. Whilst the conventional new settlements are perhaps most clearly closest to Osborn, these green villages do very much take on the self-sufficient ethic of Howard's original ideas.

There is, finally, the issue of land ownership. To Howard this was a crucial issue as he was
a strong advocate of land reform. For him, garden cities were a means of achieving this, and his intention was that the city's land would largely be held in common by the residents. Since then, it is only some of the private sector new settlements which have come close to this ideal. Closest of all, perhaps, is Martlesham Heath, where the communal lands of the village have piece by piece been handed over from the developers to a management company owned and controlled by all the property owning residents of the village. This is not entirely what Howard intended- it disenfranchises those renting property, and the houses are freehold, but it is closer in spirit than much that has occurred in the intervening period. The garden cities themselves never approached such an ideal, and in the new towns, the people's interests were equated as contiguous with the state- hence the state as landlord was seen as an ideal solution. It was, of course, nothing of the sort, as the interests of the state were far to often diametrically opposed to the interests of the people they were supposed to be serving. There is of course, a thin division between community control and ownership, and exclusive privatism, and the intensely private sector nature of many new settlements (especially in the United States more so than Britain) has been used to create a cloistered environment, from which undesirables can be excluded.

**Conclusions**

So what similarities remain between the work of Howard, and the ideals and realities of new settlements? Certainly the scale has changed, and new settlements are on average ten times smaller than Howard envisaged for new settlements. The idealism of Howard's work was very much of its time, but the poles of the city and the countryside, as moral negative and positive, remain. Moreover, there are different kinds of idealism now engaging with the new settlement idea- ranging from the desire to re-invigorate the planning process\(^96\), to radical green agendas. These are as much the zeitgeist as were the ideas which Howard harnessed in his time. Both idealise community involvement and control, though both have been compromised by expediency or serendipity, so that community control mutates into protectionism, collapses into apathy, or is diluted into petty bureaucracy. Howard's work introduced a whole series of concepts which the new settlements debate has to wrestle with, and either negate or redefine - certainly the issues of self-containment and social balance have to be addressed. Indeed, through the history of garden cities, new towns and

\(^{96}\)Hart, 1993; Lock, 1993.
new settlements, it has constantly been necessary to relearn the practical limits of Howard's theories as they are reinterpreted in new contexts, and potentially appropriated to justify current policy.
Chapter 3
Methodology

"I am not sure but that methodology is a little like religion"¹

Introduction
This chapter provides a brief discussion of the methodology used in this research, and the theoretical ideas which underpin it. It opens with a discussion of some key theoretical issues relating to the methodological approaches chosen, and the manner in which the practice of research addressed these issues. This leads into a discussion of the sources of information used, the choice of case study sites, and the manner in which the methodology was applied in each of the three case studies. Finally, the chapter outlines the main research questions which this thesis attempts to answer, or at least to address.

The Role of Methodology
The quotation of Charles Cooley, included at the beginning of this chapter, acts a criticism of the role of methodology in some studies. In a similar manner, John Eyles² refers to the phenomenon of “methodolatry”, where research is driven not by enthusiasm, interest in the subject, and a desire for real insight, but rather is consumed by the method itself. In effect, such a compulsive preoccupation with methodology produces research where the means are the main arbiters of the results, rather than their facilitators.

In a critical but illuminating paper by Peter Gould, the author warns of the potential for the rituals and forms of professionally accepted research to “shape severely the questions, procedures, methods and presentations”³ of a study, and of the fact that those who write about and study methodology are often themselves “more intrigued with the forms of the ritual

dances than actual enquiry"\(^4\). He goes on to suggest that the problem of this methodological rigidity is that researchers are not allowed to explain openly and honestly that what they really want to do is "poke around in this area and see what I can find"\(^3\), or in more academic terms "observe carefully, closely, openly and with as little prejudice as you can muster, and then describe, with insight, skill and thoughtful imagination, the topic you have chosen"\(^6\). In this manner, methodology then forms the means of inquiry, whilst the ends are always those issues at the centre of the study, and the conclusions drawn about them. This is not to neglect methodology, nor to fail in comprehending the ways in which methodology is not entirely transparent in the process of study, but rather to place it in its true role, subsidiary to the research issues themselves.

Thus, this research is not driven by the wish to prove the efficacy of a particular methodology, nor the need to justify a particular epistemology or paradigm. It is driven, at its heart, by the conviction that geography provides a unique way of looking, and can provide an analysis of the issues at the heart of this research which will illuminate one corner of geographical understanding, as well as providing valuable research evidence in an area, new settlements, which remains largely under-researched, as Chapter 1 indicates. It is also recognises (and perhaps, implicitly, celebrates) the unique insight of geography that places are unique, not least because no place is located where any other place is located\(^7\).

**The Case Study**

At the core of this study are three substantial case studies of three new settlements, which as extensive critical histories, form chapters 5, 6 and 7 of this thesis. The method by which these sites were selected for case study is discussed later, but it is first important to understand the nature of case study as a research method, and its advantages and disadvantages.

\(^6\)Gould, 1988, p15.
\(^7\)Gould, 1988, p18 and p26, citing the work of Herman Krick, 1962.
In the introduction to their book *A Case for the Case Study*, Orum, Feagin and Sjoberg\(^8\) provide a useful and concise definition of the case study, and an appropriate starting point for this discussion. They define a case study as "an in-depth, multifaceted investigation, using qualitative research methods, of a single social phenomenon. The study is conducted in great detail and often relies on the use of several data sources". The authors go on to provide caveats to their definition, which they acknowledge is broad, and not unambiguous, of which the two most important in this discussion are that case studies can make use of both qualitative and quantitative methods, and that research studies can involve a small number of case studies conducted in a comparative framework.

This definition gives a number of clear indications as to the nature of the case study as a methodology. Firstly, it points out that case study research involves either a single, or a small number of cases, which can be individuals, groups of individuals, organisations, or defined areas such as neighbourhoods or cities. This places case study in contrast to quantitative methods such as sample surveys and censuses, where data for a large number of cases is collected, and generally analysed statistically or numerically. In contrast to surveys and censuses, where the set of data collected on each case is generally limited, and has to conform to a fairly rigid structure in order to allow later analysis, case studies are far more extensive and ‘in-depth’. They allow the researcher to examine the case in great detail, and to follow up the issues which arise in the course of analysis\(^9\).

Case studies can utilise a number of different data sources to provide information about the subject. In this research, this is very much the case, with each case study using a range of sources, including documentary sources, such as local government records, correspondence and minutes, personal archives and newspapers, interviews with participants and representatives, and statistical sources. Indeed, as the definition goes on to suggest, it is perfectly possible to use quantitative sources, such as census and survey data, within a case study. However, the large scale use of primary quantitative data would require far greater

\(^8\)Orum, Feagin & Sjoberg, 1991, p2.
resources than are available to a MPhil thesis, and this study relies primarily on secondary sources where qualitative data are used.

**The use of interviews in qualitative research**

This study makes considerable use of interviews with key individuals and organisations in the three settlements, in order to piece together events at each site. These interviews raise a number of methodological issues which can be addressed here. These issues include the selection of a limited number of individuals for in depth interview, rather than more extensive work involving larger numbers of respondents; the process of selecting respondents; the corrigibility of interviewees and the interpretation of their responses; the mode of interviewing; the issues addressed in interviews; and the triangulation of the data gathered.

The decision to concentrate on intensive rather than extensive research, and hence to implement longer interviews with a number of key individuals and organisations, rather than, for example, a household opinion survey, was one taken primarily for reasons of practicality. As Burgess indicates "large-scale quantitative surveys usually require large resources"\(^{10}\), something that was not available in the context of the funding available to the study. Moreover, even at the early stage of the research, the decision was taken to take a qualitative methodological approach, because this was felt to be most appropriate to the subject of the study, and to the issues being addressed. Apart from issues of cost and time, it was felt that a qualitative approach offered a number of other advantages, as identified by Orum, Feagin and Sjoberg\(^{11}\).

Firstly, they identify the advantage that case study grounds "observations and concepts about social action and social structures in natural settings studied at close hand". To the geographer, this offers a particular advantage, in that it encourages a particular sensitivity to place, and the uniqueness of particular events and interactions occurring at or within a particular place.

---

\(^{10}\) Burgess, 1997, p291.

\(^{11}\) Or, in the words of Gould, 1988, p15, to investigate the "interesting things (which) turn up" in the process of research.
Nevertheless, this should not be overstated. Many of the interviews took place with actors in locations far removed from the new settlements themselves, and many of the actions of these individuals which concerned the case study sites were taken remotely, and to some extent, in the abstract.

The work of Orum, Feagin and Sjoberg also identifies that qualitative study provides information from a number of sources and over a period of time, allowing holistic study of complex events and interactions. Qualitative study also allows the dimensions of time and history to be included, enabling issues of continuity and change over time to be addressed. Hence, as well as allowing a particular grounding in place, and a sensitivity to that place, case studies also tend to encourage an understanding of the complexity of events and interactions, rather than abstraction, which might lose this density of insight in the process of simplification. Moreover, since the case study sites developed over time, it was also of great importance to the study that the methodology used allowed a full appreciation of change over time. Hence, a qualitative approach encouraged three key elements of the study - context, complexity and history.

**The Selection of Interview Respondents**

The second issue of methodology raised by the use of qualitative interviewing is the process of selection of respondents. In this discussion, it is important to understand that the case studies were conducted sequentially, one after another. The first was East Goscote, the second Martlesham Heath, and the third Bar Hill, and in each case study, the approach to the selection of interviewees was informed by the experience in the prior study or studies. In this sense, East Goscote, with no experience of other case studies preceding it, acted as a test bed for what happened subsequently, and was also the subject for approaches which were not pursued latterly. The situation at East Goscote was also complicated because it was a site that had not been the subject of academic study at any point in its history. This made it a particularly interesting and unique site, and as a result, the New Settlements Research Group provided a

---

small amount of additional funding which allowed interviews to be conducted with a number of randomly selected households, as well as with other individuals and organisations. In particular, the twenty-fifth anniversary of East Goscote provided a window of opportunity for wider study, as it provided a clear reason to residents for our intrusion upon their time and space.

Although the findings of this study were published separately as a working paper by the New Settlements Research Group, its findings are incorporated into the case history of East Goscote (Chapter 5), and it is therefore important to record here the methodological approach taken. A total of 66 households were interviewed, which comprised about 7% of all households in the settlement, with households selected at random from a large scale map (essentially determining an even spatial distribution of respondent households across the village). Households were informed of our intention to visit them by letter some days before, to ensure that their consent to participate was based on clear information about the nature of the study, and the intended use of the data. Local press coverage was also obtained to increase awareness of the study.

Interviews were conducted on a series of weekends between November 1991 and March 1992, using as their basis a formal interview questionnaire, though in practice, many interviews developed a less structured format, and lasted up to an hour, in the process imparting considerable qualitative information. The interviews themselves were conducted by the author, and also by Dr George Revill, a formal doctoral research student at the Department of Geography at Loughborough, and an experienced social researcher. The process of undertaking these household interviews underlined the difficulty of conducting such surveys with limited resources, as, in terms of the information elicited, they were a relatively time inefficient method of assembling data. They did establish some quantitative measures which would not have been possible without such a survey, though the size of the sample placed limits on the level of statistical reliability which could be accorded to the resulting figures, and

---

14Later in this chapter, ethical issues such as confidentiality and consent are discussed in more detail.
rarely established finding which could not have been reached through other quantitative methodologies (for example, the local catchment area of residents' origin, the length of residence, and the dependence upon Leicester as the major centre of employment and service provision). This underlined that for subsequent case studies, a more qualitative methodology would be both more time efficient, and likely to elicit the majority of the information that was likely to have been drawn from a household survey, as well as considerable information that no household survey could have guaranteed.

Concurrently with the household survey, a series of interviews were conducted with a range of key individuals, both those involved in the initial planning and construction of the village, and those involved in its subsequent social organisation. I had initially become aware of East Goscote when working for Charnwood Borough Council during the summer of 1990, and therefore the current planning policy surrounding the village, and the attitudes of planning officers towards it, were already well known. At this early stage of the research, some documentary material had been amassed, and the identity of both the developer and the architect of the site, and these were contacted with a view to interviews, along with the then current vicar of the church in East Goscote, and the clerk to the parish council. It was felt, rightly as it proved, that these two contacts would provide direction and access to a number of other individuals and organisations. They also had the advantage of being public figures in the village, and it was felt that their status might 'open doors' for the study, for, at the time, there was some concern about the degree of co-operation that might be forthcoming.

The interview with the parish clerk of East Goscote provided not only a substantial amount of information in itself, including documentary material, but also provided an indication of the other individuals and organisations that might usefully be contacted. As a result, meetings and interviews with the district councillor, the parish council, the local school and the old people's home in the village were arranged. Both the interview with the current vicar of East Goscote, and the interview with the parish clerk suggested contact with the previous vicar, by then working at another parish in the county. In addition, the household interviews themselves established a number of other contacts, including the person who arranged bookings at the village hall, and a journalist on the local newspaper.
Through this rather circuitous and somewhat serendipitous approach, it was possible to establish the likely best sources of information for subsequent surveys. Planners, architects and developers were useful sources, often because they had access to considerable amounts of documentary data, as well as secondary survey data such as census returns. In addition, they were often able to recall the events surrounding the initial planning and development of the site, and could indicate the whereabouts of other individuals involved at the time, but who had subsequently moved to other employers, or retired. Sadly, it was also the case that they were able to close off some potential leads, where key protagonists had either died in the intervening years, or simply disappeared from any traceable contact.

Despite some scepticism about contacting churches, they proved also to be useful sources of information, sometimes because they had been amongst the first formal organisations in the developing new settlements (East Goscote and Bar Hill), but also because they provided links to other organisations, as well as documentary material. Parish councils and comparable organisations were also identified as key contacts, as were local politicians and community activists. The inter-relationships between such organisations also quickly became apparent. Schools and facilities such as old people’s homes proved to be less useful, and were not pursued subsequently as direct contacts.

In all cases, the process of making contact with potential interviewees was preceded by a certain amount of initial documentary research, usually trawling the public archives held in libraries, local history centres, and county and district councils (planning departments, and research sections both proved to be useful sources of data). In itself, this yielded potential contacts for interview, as well as ensuring that by the time interviews were underway, some knowledge of the history of the site, and the issues likely to be covered in interview, was already in place. For Martlesham Heath, initial research in the county library and local authority (county and district) planning archives, yielded a number of points of entry for interviews, including the then current site manager, and a representative of the development company. These interviews, and separate parallel research led to meetings with the parish council, the parish council chairman, and representatives of the village management company,
whilst the current vicar was contacted independently, following successful experience in East Goscote. However, the most important contact, Chris Parker, the instigator of the development, former site manager, and the keeper of a substantial personal archive, was identified as a direct result of an interview with the then current site manager.

At Bar Hill, initial research at the county library in Cambridge, at South Cambridgeshire District Council, and Cambridgeshire County Council provided not only an initial data archive, but also a list of names of planning officers who had formerly been involved in the development of the village. In this, staff in the County Council’s research section were particularly helpful. The first interview, with the original architect of the village, Brian Falk, resulted from initial research, and tracing his present location through the RIBA directory. Direct contact was also made with the Residents’ Association, the Parish Council, the vicar of the church in the village, and the former planners whose names and potential locations had been provided by contacts at the County Council. Again, however, the most fruitful contact was made as a result of other interviews, with several interviewees suggesting contact with the former headmaster of Bar Hill school, who proved to have another substantial personal archive.

**The Mode of Interviewing; The Role of the Interviewer**

A number of authors address the issue of the style of interviews, and the best way in which to record them. In essence, as Eyles identifies, the choice is broadly between interviews which are structured and replicable, and those which are informal and interactive. In practice, the style of interview tended towards the latter, as the issues under discussion tended to depend partly on the nature of the individual being interviewed (and, in particular, the knowledge they could be expected to have of particular issues), to what extent they were representing a larger organisation, and the extent of prior knowledge held from documentary sources and previous interviews. A list of potential issues and questions was always prepared prior to the interview, in order to guide the discussion, but this format allowed for, and indeed expected, digression.

---

15Eyles, 1988, p3.
into other areas of interest as they arose in the course of interview. In this sense, interviews were not replicable, though they did have a loose predetermined structure.

Thus, as Burgess identifies, unstructured interviews of this type “draw on the art of conversation”, and, implicitly, involve the interviewer in establishing some rapport with the interviewee. This means that the interviewer needs to be sensitive to the style and personal agenda of the person being interviewed, drawing them out to tell the story in their own words and terms, whilst being sufficiently detached to interpret and question the account being given. This raises issues related to the role of the interviewer in the data gathering process, which can usefully be addressed at this point.

It seems unlikely that if a personal connection and trust had not been built up between interviewees and interviewer, some of the information gathered in interviews, and particular the personal recommendations which allowed access to other interviewees, would have been forthcoming. Moreover, several interviewees lent personal papers, and two lent substantial personal archives, none of which would have happened without trust between interviewer and interviewee. Blaikie suggests that the relationship of a social scientist towards social actors can range from that of a detached observer to that of a fully engaged participant. Certainly, given the establishment of personal relationships of trust and empathy, the role of the interviewer in this study cannot be conveyed as detached. Nevertheless, the study was not one of participant observation, and interviews were conducted in the process either of day trips to, or short stays at or near the case study sites. It was intended that all three case studies should be reported as critical histories, not merely piecing together reported accounts, but also examining them to elicit the meanings behind accounts, the conscious and unconscious assumptions of respondents, and their particular partial positions. Neither can this position be described as “conscious partiality”, though it shares the recognition that research is not ‘value-free’, and that a recognition of this can still allow a critical distance between the researcher and the researched.

\footnote{Blaikie, 1993, p210.}
\footnote{Blaikie, 1993, p211, reporting Mies, 1983, p122.}
Marshall and Rossman also identify the need to recognise that the “natural subjectivity of the researcher will shape the research”\(^{18}\). Indeed, they go further by suggesting that the researcher should “gain some understanding, even sympathy for the research participants in order to gain entry into their world”, and explain that the insights thus gained increase the likelihood of being able to describe the complex social system being researched. However, they do caution that the researcher should control for bias in their interpretation, which include using a another person to critically question the research analysis (in postgraduate research, a role taken by the supervisor), value-free note taking, and applying tests and asking questions of the data. Perhaps, however, the greatest control for bias of this nature, which is inferred, but not explicitly stated in Marshall and Rossman, is that the researcher should be aware of the possibility and the nature of the bias and particular interest they bring to the study\(^{19}\).

**Documentary Sources**

This research draws upon a very wide range of documentary sources, as has been suggested earlier in the chapter. The purpose of this section is to describe these sources in more detail, to explain why each of the case studies has a slightly different base of sources, and to place the collection and interpretation of data from these sources in its wider methodological context.

Burton and Cherry\(^{20}\) identify three important difficulties in attempting to piece together documentary records. Firstly they suggest one of the main characteristics of documentary sources, that “they have been produced by someone other than the researcher, for someone


\(^{19}\) In this sense, the extensive biographical notes which some authors include in their work to explain their particular interest in a subject is not self-indulgence - it does provide an indication of where the author is “coming from”. For an example of this, see the prologue of Saunders, 1990, pp1-10.

\(^{20}\) Burton and Cherry, 1970. The book was originally derived from a series of lectures prepared for the Diploma in Urban and Regional Studies Course at the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies at the University of Birmingham.
other than him, and, usually, for some purpose other than his.\(^{21}\) The fact that most documentary sources were intended for other ends than those of the researcher very often means that their value as historical documents are not recognised, leading to the two further problems which Burton and Cherry identify - selective deposit, and selective survival. In the former, documents which might prove valuable to later research are deemed of little worth at some point soon after they are produced, and are destroyed. The periodic clearing of files, especially in private sector organisations, of material relating to historic projects or correspondence, is often the cause of this. In the latter, selective survival, documents are recognised as worthy of retention, but are lost at some point subsequently. The reorganisation of local government, especially that which occurred in the early 1970s, has been responsible for much of this latter disruption of the documentary record.

All three of these issues have to be borne in mind when undertaking research based on documentary sources. The reasons for the creation, retention and survival of documents will have nothing to do with the aims of the researcher, indeed they may even run counter to them. Most documents, both personal and official, will have been written with a reason, and may themselves have been intended to guide thought in particular ways, to push a particular case, or even to mislead. Decisions to retain documents may have been taken for many of the same reasons. Sensitive or embarrassing documents rarely survive, and those that cast their author in a bad light may also subsequently be deemed ‘surplus to requirements’. Correspondingly, the documents which are kept are likely to be ones supporting official policy, or which support decisions subsequently taken. As in all things, it is usually the victors who write the history, and the account of history which survives from documentary sources has much to do with the orders given to an archivist.

Two examples from this research can be examined, both concerning the retention of documentary records by private sector developers. Both Jelson Ltd, the developers of East Goscote, and Trafalgar House, who for much of its history, were the developers of Bar Hill,

\(^{21}\)Burton and Cherry, 1970, p123. As one indication of the passage of time since this book was written, it is interesting to note that this quotation refers to the researcher persistently as ‘he’. It is in particular contrast to
proved to be very poor sources of documentary material. Jelson Ltd agreed to be interviewed, but could provide very little supporting documentary material. In their case, this was almost certainly a case of selective deposit of material, and no records survived of a project which, for them, was complete some 13-15 years prior to the initial contacts connected with this study, and which had begun between 25 and 30 years prior to our discussions. In this case, the planning history of the site was pieced together from records kept by the architects, who had retained at least some of their original drawings, as well as some of the original papers and minutes, and from the planning records retained by Charnwood District Council, which had survived the local government reorganisation which had seen such records transferred from the County Council, and from Barrow upon Soar Rural District Council.

In the case of Trafalgar House, several letters were written, and telephone calls made, to try and determine what records were held about the Bar Hill site. Several answers were received from various departments and addresses, initially suggesting that no records were retained, but latterly, saying that they had examined their records, but felt that there was nothing that could be of use to the study. In this instance, this could merely be a case of selective deposit and survival, with documents destroyed or lost over time, or of documents still surviving somewhere in the organisation, but their location being unknown to those who were being asked, or, more alarmingly, that records had survived, but were considered in some way 'unsuitable' for study. In the case of Bar Hill, this frustration was compounded because the planning officer who had been responsible for the plans to build the village in the first place had since retired and died, and the first developers had long since ceased to trade. The only way to deal with such gaps in the data record is by attempting to piece the story together from other sources, and to corroborate it with verbal accounts obtained in interview. This is the process of triangulation, discussed in more detail below.

**Corrigibility and Triangulation**

If, as has been suggested, the data collected by qualitative interviewing, or from documentary sources is to be tested, it is necessary to understand how it might be tested, and the manner in

---

Marshall and Rossman, 1989, p147, who refer to the researcher consistently as 'she'.
which it is interpreted and placed in a wider context. Thus, a number of questions must be asked of any account; who wrote it and why, does it provide an accurate record of events, and how does it compare with other records of the same or related events? In effect, there is a need to test the corrigibility of the author or the interviewee. As Cottle suggests "the meanings of texts are often found to be equivocal and highly contested"²², while Blaikie points out that "the social scientist should be able to give a different and competing account of social life from that offered by social actors"²³. Thus, any document or account can be interpreted, indeed, needs interpretation, by the researcher, and it is quite possible that the resulting interpretation will differ markedly from that intended by the original author.

There is thus a need to cross-check the interpretation both of interview accounts and of documentary evidence, as well as to compare records of the same events from different sources. This is generally referred to as the process of triangulation. Fielding and Fielding quote Levins suggesting that "truth is the intersection of competing lies"²⁴, and whilst this an exaggeration of the usual situation, it is true to say that the most reliable account of events is only usually obtained by utilising a number of (perhaps competing) sources. In effect, this applies the same logic to the evidence of research as would be applied to evidence in a court of law.

The term triangulation derives from surveying (the measurement of the height or location of a physical feature - for example, a hilltop - from three or more different points, to ensure accuracy), and in this context, can be defined as "the act of bringing more than one source of data to bear on a single point"²⁵, and as Marshall and Rossman go on to say, the use of multiple cases, multiple informants or more than one data gathering technique "can greatly strengthen the study's usefulness"²⁶. Using data from different sources can corroborate,

²³Blaikie, 1993, p209.
elaborate or illuminate the research in question. Fielding and Fielding express this slightly differently, in suggesting that triangulation can be achieved by combining methods, by using a number of data sources, or by using a number of different accounts of events.

Using these definitions, it is possible to assert that this research is triangulated on a number of levels. Firstly, it uses three different cases. This allows the comparison of events in three different new settlements, and indicates whether a particular event or sequence of events is unique (and therefore related to site), shared by two of the sites (in which case, there may be a common factor, but not one shared by all new settlements), or shared by all three sites (in which case, there is the suggestion that this is not only ubiquitous across all three of these studies, but is also a phenomenon which might recur in other new settlements).

Secondly, in each case study, a range of data sources are used. Typically these will include a number of qualitative interviews (ensuring that there are multiple points of entry, in order to avoid the possibility that the researcher is merely being guided around a self-referential sub-group of actors), and a range of documentary sources, including published and unpublished papers (both academic and non-academic), maps, plans, minutes, planning records, census records, personal letters, notes and memos, newspaper cuttings, advertising literature and community publications such as newsletters. Again, in order to guard against self-referential collection, this data was collected from a number of sources, including personal archives, developers, architects, planning offices and public library collections.

Thirdly, the research process has attempted to corroborate accounts of events against other accounts from different sources. This eliminates the possibility of incorrect data introduced from a single uncorroborated account, and provides greater certainty about the accuracy of the wider narrative. This corresponds with Hammersley and Atkinson, who state that "what is involved in triangulation is not the combination of different kinds of data per se, but rather an attempt to relate different sorts of data in such a way as to counteract various possible threats

to the validity of our analysis"\textsuperscript{28}. Thus, the importance of using multiple sources of data, and multiple accounts of the same events is not merely that it adds depth to the study, but also that it adds accuracy and validity. Moreover, the process of triangulation provides considerable defence against the assertion than the analysis relies on privileged insight\textsuperscript{29}, which is one critique of a qualitative method.

One criticism of triangulation is that it proves the data, but only because the researcher has drawn upon sources selectively, using only sources which are conducive to the argument (preconception)\textsuperscript{30}. This has not been the case in this study, and there are instances within the case study where discrepancies between the accounts are highlighted and discussed. These discrepancies are themselves of interest, because they highlight most clearly where accounts have attempted to pursue a particular bias in their rendition of events, and allow the remaining material in the relevant accounts to be subjected to scrutiny in the light of the initial discrepancy. Or, as Fielding and Fielding put it, "the differences between types of data can be as illuminating as their points of coherence"\textsuperscript{31}. Moreover, the case studies are themselves sufficiently different from each other to disprove the charge of selectivity. Rather, these three sites assert the importance of the individuality conferred by issues of place, location and history, rather than any selection for conformity.

**Research Ethics**

One final theoretical issue to be considered is the approach of the research project to issues of ethics. There is an evident need for the process of research to seek consent from participants, and, in some instances, to protect the identity of individuals or places. Homan\textsuperscript{32} provides a number of examples of research where ethical questions might be raised, usually where observation became, in many respects, surveillance, and did not seek the consent of the research subjects. He identifies the widely accepted principle that researchers "should seek


\textsuperscript{29}Fielding and Fielding, 1986, pp24-5.

\textsuperscript{30}Fielding and Fielding, 1986, pp24-5.

\textsuperscript{31}Fielding and Fielding, 1986, p31.

\textsuperscript{32}Homan, 1997, pp301-303.
and secure the informed consent of subjects". There are two issues here, firstly that consent should be sought, and secondly that consent is informed. In the context of this study, the latter is most important.

In the case of the qualitative interviews with key actors, all were pre-arranged, and hence consent can be assumed. Where these individuals handed over personal material, and other material not in the public domain, for use in this study, such an act can be taken to imply consent for use. Likewise, in the household interviews conducted in East Goscote, householders were able to refuse participation. However, the process of consent went far beyond this, and every effort was made to ensure that consent to participate, and to use the information gathered, was informed. In the case of the household interviews, potential participants were contacted by letter several days before, and this letter explained the nature of the study and their role within it. This was also explained verbally at the time of interview. For participants in the longer in-depth interviews, informed consent was obtained by explaining the nature of the study, and also pointing out that it was possible for some of the interview to be on the record, and some ‘off the record’ - that is, that it would only be reported anonymously, and not attributed to them.

This brings the study onto the second ethical issue, that of confidentiality and anonymity. All the household interviews were anonymous, with no record taken of the participants name. Addresses were recorded on the scripts, but only to prevent that household being recontacted again at a later date. This was done because there would have been no advantage to the study in recording names (no follow up or feedback was intended or promised), and the scripts contained personal data (for example, household structure, ages of individuals, employment status) which might not have been forthcoming in another context. However, anonymity was not generally offered to other interview participants, partly because in order to describe the source adequately (for example, the parish clerk, or the parish vicar) would have identified the individual anyway, and also because if subjects had remained anonymous, and sufficient details about their position had been withheld for them not to be easily identifiable, it would

Homan, 1997, p303.
have laid the study open to charges of relying on privileged knowledge. Moreover, the description of the individual making the comment was, in many cases intrinsic to the contextualising the comments that they made. However, as has already been noted, if respondents wished particular comments to remain anonymous, this was facilitated (though such a request was only rarely made, and then only to prevent potential charges of libel).

Researchers working in the community studies school have often renamed places to maintain their anonymity. This has sometimes been successful, and sometimes unsuccessful - the detail provided has often been such as to allow the identification of the site. Studies such as those of Mewett and Peace have been able to proceed with a false name for a place because the site was one of hundreds of similar sites (Mewett's was a study of a crofting community on the Isle of Lewis). However, given the small number of new settlements of the type studied, any description at all would have located them to an informed reader, even if false names had been used. Moreover, the study required an understanding of the locational context of the sites in order to fully consider their processes of development (for example, it was intrinsic to the development of Bar Hill that it was close to Cambridge, and developed in the context of the pressure for growth in that sub-region, and the planning policy devised to deal with that pressure). It was thus decided at an early stage that any attempt to anonymise the sites would be futile, and counter-productive to the study.

The selection of sites for case study

Three case study sites were chosen for this research, and it is necessary to explain the rationale for choosing such sites. Essentially, four criteria were used to select sites, namely their compatibility and similarity, the extent to which their development occurred over different time periods, their physical accessibility, and the extent to which they had been subject to other studies. Moreover, since there are only a small number of new settlement sites, the application of criteria quickly reduced the number of potential sites such that there was very little final selection to be done.

34 Mewett, 1986.
Chapter 1 provides a broad definition of new settlements, outlining some of their primary characteristics, including their size, their physical separation from other development, their residential nature, and their mode of development. On the basis of this definition, and using Potter\textsuperscript{36} as a starting point, a list of potential sites can be prepared. From Potter's list, it is possible to exclude a number of sites, because, by his description, they are 'suburban', or extensions to existing towns or villages. This leaves a list of potential sites as outlined in Table 3.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year started</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Planned population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dalgety Bay</td>
<td>Dunfermline</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Hill</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>142ha</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Ash Green</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>174ha</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westhill</td>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Woodham Ferrers</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>526ha</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martlesham Heath</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>243ha</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 - Potential new settlement study sites (based on Potter, 1986)

Potter's list does not identify East Goscote, though this was briefly discussed in a publication by ACRE\textsuperscript{37} in 1990. Thus, to the above list of potential sites can be added East Goscote, which fulfils the definitional criteria of a new settlement, is located just outside Leicester, was begun in 1965, covers about 150 acres (about 61 hectares), and has a population of just over 3000 people. It is this 'invisibility' of East Goscote in almost all planning literature (both academic and otherwise) which began to commend it strongly for study. Indeed, to underline this point, it is notable that Peter Hall\textsuperscript{38}, in a case study of planning and urban patterns in Leicestershire within the seminal Containment of Urban England\textsuperscript{39}, written at the time that East Goscote was

\textsuperscript{36}Potter, 1986.
\textsuperscript{37}ACRE, 1990.
\textsuperscript{38}Hall, 1973.
\textsuperscript{39}Hall, Gracey, Drewett and Thomas, 1973.
nearing completion, and covering the period of its conception, planning and construction, fails to mention the settlement at all.

Of these seven sites, Dalgety Bay and Westhill could be considered unlikely candidates because their location in Scotland made them difficult and expensive to get to from Loughborough. Both New Ash Green and South Woodham Ferrers were also difficult because their location placed them on the far side of London in terms of both train routes and main road links. In contrast, East Goscote was only a few miles from Loughborough, whilst Bar Hill was within an easy daily return car journey of Loughborough, whilst the city to which it was adjacent, Cambridge, was easily accessible by train. Martlesham Heath was further away from Loughborough, on the Suffolk coast beyond Ipswich. This made travelling a more lengthy business, but Martlesham Heath was advantaged as a potential site because the author had a good friend in Ipswich who could offer a convenient floor to sleep on, making stays of several days feasible. Moreover, the friend later made the process even simpler by moving into a house in Martlesham Heath itself. These may seem to be terribly prosaic reasons for site selection, but the practicalities of travel and lodging as a research student on a limited bursary loom large, and even car usage was a luxury, afforded only by borrowing the departmental car, and charging its use to a limited research support budget.

However, there were other reasons which also had considerable impact upon the choice of sites. Having eliminated the two Scottish sites for reasons of practicality, it was necessary to examine which of the five English sites would be most suitable for study. South Woodham Ferrers had two major disadvantages apart from its location. Firstly, it was much larger than all the other sites, and thus could more comfortably be described as a new country town rather than a new village. This reduced its apparent comparability with other sites. Moreover, David Lock, at the time engaged in research for the Department of the Environment\textsuperscript{40}, had been closely involved with the development of South Woodham Ferrers, and it was felt that he and other staff and students at Reading University might already be engaged in research at the site. Both New Ash Green and South Woodham Ferrers had also already been the subject of some

\textsuperscript{40}Eventually published as Breheny, Gent & Lock (1993).
academic study in 1981\textsuperscript{41}, and it was also felt that choosing these sites might limit the extent to which the research could be considered original. However, given the limited nature of these studies, had not the other sites offered stronger cases, New Ash Green could have made a perfectly adequate substitute.

East Goscote made a very strong case for study. It had been, for its entire history, apparently completely ignored by planners, architects, geographers and sociologists, having been neither the subject of academic study, nor of any article or paper in the planning or architectural press. With the exception of early coverage in the local press, and a single isolated description in Rural Viewpoint in 1990\textsuperscript{42}, the site remained unreported. Planners at Charnwood District Council appeared to view the site as an embarrassment, and as an eyesore. This meant that any study of East Goscote would be highly original, and that work at the site would be very unlikely to suffer from resistance because of prior exposure to research activity.

Both Martlesham Heath and Bar Hill had experienced a little more exposure than East Goscote, though neither had been the subject of anything more than relatively brief articles in the architectural or development press at various periods through their history\textsuperscript{43}. Again, this meant that the study of both sites was likely to yield extensive original material. However, it was evident in Martlesham Heath particularly, that the site was the subject of continued interest and disturbance by curious professionals and academics, reported by interviewees, and evident from the existence of prepared notes for students\textsuperscript{44}. Bar Hill was a little larger than the other two sites, but it was judged that the site was still likely to be comparable.

The selection of the three sites of East Goscote, Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath also offered particularly interesting opportunities in terms of their relative chronologies. All three were conceived in the early 1960s (East Goscote apparently entirely independently, and Martlesham

\textsuperscript{41}Bray, 1981a, 1981b. Both of these papers were later reprinted for a conference in 1985.

\textsuperscript{42}ACRE, 1990.

\textsuperscript{43}For Bar Hill, examples include Mellor, 1966b; Architectural Review, 1966; Oliver, 1967; Jack & Oakes, 1978; and for Martlesham Heath, Darley, 1979; Parker, 1979; Aldous, 1983; Williams, 1988.

\textsuperscript{44}Bidwells, c.1985.
Heath partly in reaction to the early plans for Bar Hill), and building at both East Goscote and Bar Hill began in 1965. However, whilst East Goscote was finished by 1978, the construction of Bar Hill was subject to a series of delays, which meant that houses were still being built on the site as late as 1992. The start of building at Martlesham Heath was delayed until 1975, at a time when East Goscote was nearing completion, and again, houses were still being built on the site in the early years of this decade. Hence, East Goscote had essentially been complete since the late 1970s, and had therefore passed through period of consolidation and maturation (both socially and physically) since that time, and offered perhaps the only case study of a new settlement some fifteen years after completion. The differing starting dates and construction periods of all three sites would also allow some consideration of any impact upon the speed of development, and the time at which the settlement was being built, and particularly the way in which changing understandings of urban form (not least that brought about by the modern/post-modern turn) affected these new settlements. The key features of the three sites selected are presented in Table 3.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Finish date</th>
<th>1991 population (households)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Former site use</th>
<th>Development pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Goscote</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>3,033 (989)</td>
<td>North of Leicester</td>
<td>Wartime munitions depot</td>
<td>Single regional developer / housebuilder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Hill</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4,407 (1,727)</td>
<td>West of Cambridge</td>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td>Initially single developer, later subcontracting sites to national and regional housebuilders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martlesham Heath</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3,577 (1,354)</td>
<td>North-East of Ipswich</td>
<td>Military airfield</td>
<td>Single managing landowner, commissions local architects and builders for each hamlet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 - Key facts about the three case study sites

Research Issues

This study was conceived at a time when interest in new settlements was particularly intense, and when new proposals were emerging at a considerable rate, as Chapter 1 identifies. In the midst of this interest, and the subsequent adoption of new settlements as a policy option in many structure and local plans, as well as in regional guidance, it became increasingly clear
that new settlements had not been the subject of much academic research, despite considerable professional, commercial and academic interest. When this research began, two major studies into new settlements were underway, the first PhD research by Chris Amos\textsuperscript{45}, a colleague in the New Settlements Research Group at Loughborough University, and the second a Department of the Environment research study, being conducted by David Lock, Tim Gent and Michael Breheny at Reading University\textsuperscript{46}.

Amos's study concentrated upon the planning policy implications and development processes of new settlement proposals after 1980, the majority of which were never built, either because they failed to achieve planning consent, or because the schemes were no longer considered viable following the collapse of the housing market in the early 1990s. The work for the Department of the Environment similarly concentrated on the reasons for, and merits of, the large number of new settlement proposals which emerged in the mid and late 1980s, and was aimed primarily at informing policy discussion within the Department. Its publication was considerably delayed, and the policy which emerged\textsuperscript{47} was decidedly guarded about the option of new settlements.

Thus, there remained considerable scope to add to the limited canon of research about new settlements, in particular, through the study of existing new settlements. Hence, the first aim of the research was to add to the sparse academic material which existed concerning new settlements. In particular, there had been little work done to examine existing new settlements, such as those identified in the discussion above concerning site selection. The study of such settlements addresses a number of research issues connected specifically to new settlements. Firstly, such research documents the planning and developmental histories of such sites, assembling a diverse range of material and examining how a previous generation of new settlements came to be. Doing this exercise in a comparative context also allows the study to draw out the similarities and differences between the three settlements, and to establish

\textsuperscript{45}The PhD itself emerged towards the end of my period of full time study, as Amos, 1992b, though Chris Amos's work emerged prior to this in a number of papers, and in articles in the planning press.

\textsuperscript{46}Published as Breheny, Gent & Lock, 1993.

\textsuperscript{47}Department of the Environment, 1992a.
whether they can be seen as the emergence of a similar response in a similar set of circumstances, or the emergence of a similar built form in response to sets of circumstances which were local, site-specific and contingent. The study also addresses whether these three sites can be seen as precursors of more recent attempts to build new settlements, and what lessons can be learnt from the experience of these three existing sites which might be applied to future new settlement building. Thus, in the context of the increasing prevalence of new settlement proposals, and the increasing acceptance of new settlements as a planning solution, this thesis attempts to inform the understanding of existing new settlements, and in doing so, usefully inform the manner in which further new settlements are planned and developed.

However, the study of these completed new settlements offers more than a study in planning issues and the comparison of built forms. These three new settlements ask more fundamental questions about the nature of community and place, how such concepts have been re-interpreted and re-moulded by the modern / post-modern turn. Chapter 1 identifies the transition into the post-modern world in the latter years of the 1960s and the early years of the 1970s, at the same time that these settlements were being built. Moreover, as Harvey suggests, the post-modern urban fabric is one which comprises a collage of uses, and generates specialised urban forms, one of which we may suppose may be the new settlement. The thesis attempts to understand the extent to which new settlements can be seen as a part of this modern / post-modern turn, and as a consequence, what they say about the changing understandings of urban life and urban form from that period onwards. Crucially, the thesis seeks to examine whether new settlements are symptoms of fragmentation brought about by the fluidity of the post-modern urban environment, or are rather, an attempt to make ordered sense and stability in response to the fluidity of the wider world. In a sense this asks whether new settlements are an attempt to resolve a contradiction of post-modern urbanism, that in the state of fluidity which appears essential, people nevertheless seek to make ordered sense of their lives, and to find stability, belonging and security.

48Harvey, 1989.
The first chapter of the thesis discusses the essentially reflexive nature of place and community. Locations become places when they are invested with meaning by people, and at the same time, places are important sources of individual and community identity for the people who imbue them with that meaning. Place allows this sense of collective belonging precisely because of a diversity of meaning and ambiguity, which allows a sense of shared identity, without imposing the constraints of uniform meaning. Thus, there is a sense of belonging to a totality greater than the individual, without losing the sense of individuality.

Thus, the thesis examines how new settlements, in the midst of the fluidity of post-modernity, might allow individuals to establish place identity, which holds in tension their need both to belong and feel secure, yet at the same time not to have their individuality constrained. Hence, the thesis uses these new settlements to explore how concepts of place and community are being re-formed and reconstructed in the context of the late 20th century, and thus to ask whether place and community remain relevant concepts in this context.

The two preceding chapters also introduce another contradiction of urbanism, that of seeking to reconcile city and country, as Howard's garden cities attempted to do by building new places which combined the advantages of both, at the same time eliminating their disadvantages. In the same way, new settlements can be seen as an attempt to resolve exactly the same conflict - to combine the economic opportunities and social choices of city life with the sense of belonging and security of a smaller world in the country. Thus, this thesis seeks place new settlements into a historical context which begins with Howard's garden cities (though there are considerably earlier antecedents), and moves through the state New Towns programme. New settlements emerged whilst the New Towns programme was still continuing, and this thesis asks to what extent they can be seen as a valid continuation of this history, what new settlements share with these antecedents, and in what ways they differ.
Chapter 4
Quantitative Indicators

Introduction
This chapter provides a quantitative background of statistics for the three sites of East Goscote, Martlesham Heath and Bar Hill, drawn primarily from Population Census\(^1\) and planning records\(^2\) sources. The issues covered include:

- the rate of growth (population and housing completion) in new settlements;
- the population age structure of new settlements during and after development;
- household structure (single pensioner and single parent households);
- socio-economic indicators (overcrowding, amenities, economic activity rates, unemployment, levels of owner-occupation & car ownership).

Discussion concentrates upon the first two issues of growth and population age structure, comparing and contrasting the three sites, and drawing out general conclusions as well as the extent to which sites exhibit individual characteristics.

Growth (housing completions)
Figure 4.1 illustrates the forecast and actual housing completion rates for Bar Hill, the actual housing completion rates for Martlesham Heath, the forecast completion rate for East Goscote, and the estimated actual completion rates for East Goscote, derived from Census household numbers. The figures are placed on a common time scale, that of the number of years from the start of building, as determined from the planning histories recorded in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. No estimated completion timetable has been inserted for Martlesham Heath, as one has not come to light during the period of research, and

\(^1\)Census of Population 1971, 1981 and 1991 (OPCS / ONS - supplied by Charnwood Borough Council, Cambridgeshire County Council, Suffolk County Council). Both East Goscote and Bar Hill have parish status, and are clearly and unambiguously defined in the 1971, 1981 and 1991 Censuses by their parish boundaries. Parish figures are therefore given for both settlements where Census data is used. Martlesham Heath forms part of a wider parish which contains the ‘old’ village of Martlesham. Martlesham Heath was therefore defined as an aggregation of Enumeration Districts (EDs).
interviews with those involved at the time suggests that no rigid completion timetable was ever proposed.

Figure 4.1 indicates that, in these case studies, estimates for the speed of completion of new settlements have been wildly optimistic, and average annual completion rates have been contained within a relatively small envelope in all three cases:

◊ at East Goscote, the average annual completion rate ran at 110 units p.a. for the first six years (from late 1965 to the 1971 Census), and at 85 units p.a. for the whole period of construction (taken as late 1965 to 1976);

◊ at Bar Hill the average completion rate for the whole period of construction (1965 to 1991) was 70 units per annum, slower in the earlier years (1965 to 1975 ran at about 55 units per annum), and slightly faster thereafter (1975 to 1991 ran at 75 units per annum);

²Housing completion data for Martlesham Heath (Suffolk Coastal District Council) and Bar Hill (Cambridgeshire County Council, South Cambridgeshire District Council).
the higher rate in later years is largely due to very high rates of completion through the mid-eighties, when the highest level of completion in a single year reached a peak of 240 units per annum;

at Martlesham Heath, the average rate of completion ran at 90 units per annum, building from 40 units per annum in the first three years, to 70 units in the fourth year, 130 units in the fifth, and reaching a peak at 230 units per annum in 1987-8 (year 11/12).

There are two main conclusions that can be drawn from this. Firstly, that on three very different sites, the average rate of completion ran at between 70 and 90 units per annum over the total construction period in all cases. At the same time, peak rates of completion did not exceed 240 units per annum, and this towards the end of the construction period (though not at the very end). This leads into the second point, which is that building begins slowly, often at below 50 units per annum in the early years, and builds through the period of construction. Building does not occur at the same rate throughout the time of construction, nor do house completion rates begin at or above the average rate.

The establishment of such parameters suggests a number of conclusions. Firstly and crucially, since the intended completion targets were higher in two cases (East Goscote and Bar Hill), and intended to be demand led in the third (Martlesham Heath), the actual completion rates in all three cases were primarily demand led. Given that the resulting rates of completion were remarkably similar, it would seem that there is a limit to housing demand on a new settlement site, which runs just below 100 units per annum over the construction period, but which builds to levels approaching 250 units per annum late in construction. This is inevitably complicated by the cycles of demand operating in the housing market, which, as will be identified later, also affected the level of demand at different times in each of the three settlements. Certainly, the capacity of the development industry to deliver completions does not appear, in any of the three cases, to have been the main arbiter of the pace of building. Thus, if it is assumed that there is such a demand limit, which operates as the main arbiter of building speed, then it must be asked both why this is the case, and what implications it has for development economics, and for social structures which are being established?
Certainly, if as it appears, there is a demand limit, then there is also a finite, if somewhat flexible, limit to the speed at which a new settlement can be developed. The pressure of development economics is always to complete the village in the shortest possible time, so that the considerable outlay on infrastructure such as roads and sewers, and on communal buildings such as shops and schools, is recouped as quickly as possible through house sales. This limits the proportion of the cost of development which is absorbed by interest on debts, and reducing this may have benefits for the residents of the village, and those who use its facilities. If less is spent on servicing debts, then more of the money expected to be recouped from house sales may be invested in the fixed assets of the village. However, it may also be that savings on debt charges are merely realised as increased profit passed on to shareholders, in which case the benefits of faster development are not passed on to the village itself, and the residents gain nothing from speedy completion.

The actual pattern of demand in a new settlement appears to run counter to the needs of development economics, not only in terms of average per annum completions (ideally at about 200 units per annum over five years for a 1000 unit village for development interests, but in reality running at below 100 units per annum in demand terms), but also the pattern of maximum demand over the constructional life of the settlement (development interests would prefer high demand early in the construction timescale, instead real demand appears to start slowly and peak in later years). Evidently, therefore, the real pattern of demand for housing on new settlement sites places constraints about what is possible in terms of ‘added value’ and the ubiquitous ‘planning gain’. There are several ways for the development industry to deal with this:

◊ compromises can be made in environmental quality, facility provision and density (as at East Goscote);
◊ the demands of the public sector in terms of planning gain (especially off-site works such as road improvements, or premises for publicly funded services such as schools) might be moderated (again, at East Goscote, the demands in this regard were considerably less);

3 The completion rates proposed for both Bar Hill and East Goscote were of about this scale, and more recently, such a rate of building was proposed for the settlement of Dickens Heath, brought forward as part of the Solihull UDP (see Owen, 1995).
company culture may encourage longer and later returns on investment (as at Martlesham Heath, or by using a non-profit making trust as developer, as at Tircoed); the purchase price of the land may be reduced, either through site-specific factors (such as occurred at Martlesham Heath, where the land was essentially treated as a nil cost item) or through the use of the planning system.

Another solution, led by the state rather than the private sector, might be changes both to the planning system, providing a more positive legislative environment for new settlements (PPG3 still deals with them primarily as a last resort option), and wider changes to the economic culture in which businesses operate. This would encourage longer timescales for returns on investment, in contrast to the relatively short-term environment which currently operates in this country (a convincing critique of the problems caused by short-termism is provided by Will Hutton, and this would seem to be as applicable to the development industry as to many other sectors of the UK economy).

### Population age structures - early years of construction

If demand is limited within a wider housing market, then those moving into new settlements may have particular requirements and characteristics, some of which would be individual, but some which may well be generic. The discussion which follows points to several generic characteristics of new settlement in-migrants, determined from the study of contemporary Census data. The first, and clearest, aspect of new settlement populations is revealed by an examination of their population age structures. The picture revealed by such an examination of Census data is uncannily consistent, such that very clear conclusions can be drawn.

---

5Department of the Environment, 1992a.
Figure 4.2 shows the population age structure for East Goscote as recorded in the 1971 Census of Population, whilst Figure 4.3 shows the same breakdown for Martlesham Heath in 1981. Thus both population age structures describe new settlements some 6 years into construction, albeit ten years apart, in different parts of the country, on very different sites, and with quite dissimilar forms of development organisation. Despite this, there are several clear similarities between the graphs produced. Both have a distinctive double-peaked structure, with the largest concentrations of population amongst children of school age, and amongst adults in their late twenties (East Goscote) and early thirties (Martlesham Heath). At this point in development, the population of East Goscote was much larger (2180 persons, 685 households) than that at Martlesham Heath (1188 persons, 408 households). As the development histories in subsequent chapters suggest, there are several reasons for these differential rates of completion, the two most crucial being that East

---

7At the time of the 1971 Census, Bar Hill, despite six years of construction history, was still very small, for reasons elucidated in Chapter 6. The Census then recorded 244 dwellings, and 201 households (indicating that there were more than 40 unoccupied houses on site), with a population of 680.
Goscote houses were aimed into a larger, cheaper sector of the market⁹, and that Martlesham Heath was affected, in the first few years of development, by a relative contraction in the housing market⁹.

Figure 4.3  Population age structure - Martlesham Heath, 1981 (six years from building start)

⁹Contemporary newspaper advertisements by the builders indicate that the houses on the East Goscote site were being sold towards the lower end of the price range (for similar house types) than those of the same builder in other parts of Leicester (including suburban estates) and Leicestershire.

⁹Interviews with Chris Parker, Lindsay Clubb.
Table 4.1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>East Goscote</th>
<th>Martlesham Heath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group population</td>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>Age group population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1  Population age group figures (number and %) for East Goscote (1971) and Martlesham Heath (1981)

As Table 4.1 indicates, 34.5% of the East Goscote population consisted of school age children, (aged 14 and under), compared with 28.5% in Martlesham Heath (aged 15 and under). In both cases, it is this age group which forms the first peak in the population, though it is even more pronounced in East Goscote than in Martlesham Heath. The second age group peak is among the young adults who are the parents of these children, and it is noticeable that the peak age group in Martlesham Heath is five years older than that in East Goscote. This would appear to be the product of the different markets into which the two
settlements sold - houses in Martlesham were relatively more expensive than those at East Goscote, and hence a little less likely to be purchased by young first time buyers. Martlesham Heath also had slightly more of its housing stock aimed directly at older people, though it also had more specifically for (younger) single people.

The slightly younger profile of the East Goscote population is most clearly seen in comparing the 20-24 age group, in which the Leicestershire village has 17.2% of its population, compared to only 4.5% in Martlesham Heath. The 25-29 age group is significant in both populations, forming 19.6% of the East Goscote population (the largest adult age group), and 12.9% of the Martlesham Heath population. The largest adult group in the Suffolk settlement were those aged 30-34 (14.6%), whilst in East Goscote this group accounted for 10.4%. Thereafter, the size of each subsequent five year group tails off rapidly, and older groups form a relatively small part of each village’s population. Those aged forty and over form only 10.7% of East Goscote’s population, whilst Martlesham Heath’s slightly older profile mans that this group forms 26.7% of its population. Nevertheless, the population structures in both cases contain relatively few older people.

It would appear, therefore, that these two new settlements attracted new residents who were primarily young couples, either with children, or about to start families. Other material\textsuperscript{10} suggests that the reasons that people at this particular stage of their lives chose to buy into new settlements were part of a series of trade-offs. They wanted to move out of urban areas and into the urban fringe (“the countryside”) to provide a better environment for their young families - cleaner air, less traffic, more space, and a lesser perceived threat of crime and other social problems. However, they did not have the financial strength to buy into established villages, and were prepared to put up with the disturbance of construction, the newness of the environment, and the lesser social status conferred on a new village in order to take advantage of lower house prices. The situation varied in each of the villages - East Goscote traded primarily on comparative price advantage, whilst some younger people seem to have been positively attracted by the modern house designs

\textsuperscript{10}Formal and informal interviews with residents, some of those involved in development and marketing, community activists and community leaders, and contemporary written material (community newsletters, newspaper cuttings, personal archives, sales documents) all lend to this view, and this composite explanation of personal motivations.
in both Martlesham Heath, and in the early parts of Bar Hill. One push factor may also have been of particular significance in East Goscote - many of the new residents came from areas of Leicester now predominantly occupied by Asian people, and hence 'white flight' cannot be discounted as one conscious or unconscious motivation. Certainly it is accepted in Telford new town, for instance, that there was a significant element of 'white flight' to the new town from Wolverhamton.

The dominance of young adults amongst those coming to live in new settlements is underlined by the one year migrant figures for Martlesham Heath in the 1981 Census (Figure 4.4). There, even six years into the construction of the village, the largest group amongst in-migrants were those aged 25-34, indicating that this is a persistent pattern for many years during the construction and settlement period of a new village.

![Figure 4.4](image)

**Figure 4.4** Age group structure of persons migrant in the previous year - Martlesham Heath, 1981

The youthful structure of the population of new settlements in their early years gives them particular problems as well as strengths. Considerable pressure is placed upon any facilities providing for children, meaning that in later years, the village may be over-supplied with facilities catering for children and young families, and that whilst the considerable efforts
which are expended in developing support networks for new parents, which can often have benefits in establishing the sort of informal networks on which community life builds, there is too little work put into building networks for other groups, or in preparation for different needs which will emerge as the population ages and becomes more complex in its structure. Schools, and especially the primary school which caters for the new settlement (more often than not on-site) have the most obvious problem. Initially, there is a large cohort of primary age children generated by the in-migrants, over-stretching the provision, and leading either to over-development, or to the immediate use of temporary classrooms at a new site. Later, the school finds itself too large for a village which is increasingly full of teenagers, for whom no recreational provision has been made, because the majority of resources were invested in facilities for younger children, rapidly becoming redundant.

Population age structures - fifteen to sixteen years from building start

Figure 4.5 Population age structure - Bar Hill, 1981 (sixteen years from building start)
Figure 4.6 Population age structure - East Goscote, 1981 (fifteen years after building start, three years after substantive completion)

Figure 4.7 Population age structure - Martlesham Heath, 1991 (sixteen years after building start)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age group</td>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>population</td>
<td></td>
<td>population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Population age group figures (number and %) for Bar Hill (1981), East Goscote (1981) and Martlesham Heath (1991)

Fifteen years from the start of building, East Goscote was already a complete settlement, with little substantive new building going on, and had been so for about three years (depending on accounts). Thus, households moving in would be replacing those moving out, and the only change in the structure of the population would be due to the differences between in and out migrants, the ageing of the resident population, and births and deaths.
Martlesham Heath was about to reach a similar stage in 1991, though in its case, a little more building was still to take place. Bar Hill, meanwhile, after fifteen years of rather fitful growth (the reasons for which are explored in Chapter 6), was just about to embark upon its fastest period of growth, and was thus still acquiring large numbers of new in-migrants, to add to those which had arrived since late 1965. At the 1981 Census, East Goscote had 3,184 residents, living in 948 households. Bar Hill, meanwhile, had 2,365 residents living in 817 households. Martlesham Heath’s later start means that the equivalent position (sixteen years into building) is reached at the 1991 Census, which recorded 3,577 people in the population of the village, in 1,354 households. As figures 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7 indicate, however, the age structures of the three populations show differences which point to their state of completion, as well as similarities which underline points raised earlier.

The clearest indication of comparison is that the population age structures of all three villages share the double peaked pattern identified earlier. All have populations which are characterised by a strong bias towards children of school age or below, and a second population peak of adults in their late twenties and early thirties, which in the case of Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, stretches into the late-thirties and early forties. The pattern has, however, moderated somewhat from the intensely peaked pattern seen in the structure of East Goscote in 1971, and Martlesham Heath in 1981. All three sites now have established, ageing families, as well as newer arrivals. Closer examination, however, indicates that the structures of the populations are different, especially with regard to those aged 15 and under. 694 Bar Hill residents, 29.3% of the total population, are aged 15 and under, whilst 1073 residents of East Goscote, 33.7% of its total population are in the same age group. In Martlesham Heath, this proportion is slightly lower, at 26.4%, and comprises 945 residents. However, of those aged 15 and under in Bar Hill, 39.5% are under 5, compared to 28.7% at East Goscote, whilst Martlesham Heath is about halfway between the two, at 34.8%. Conversely, 28.2% of Bar Hill’s children are aged between 10 and 15, compared to 38.4% of East Goscote’s, whilst Martlesham Heath again lies between these poles, at 34.7%. Thus, whilst East Goscote has proportionately more children, they are as a group, considerably older than those in Bar Hill. Martlesham Heath, though it has the smallest population of children, does not have the oldest such population.
The adult population in East Goscote, and especially that in the crucial range of 25-44 years old, is also skewed more towards the older end of this spectrum than that in Bar Hill, whilst the peak of adult population in Martlesham Heath is somewhat older than either:

- 25 to 29 year olds form 13.5% of Bar Hill’s population at this point, compared to only 9.6% in East Goscote, and 7.9% in Martlesham Heath;
- 30 to 34 year olds form 14.9% of the Bar Hill population, 13.0% of East Goscote’s, but only 9.1% of Martlesham Heath’s;
- 35 to 39 year olds form only 8.2% of Bar Hill’s population, but 11.3% of East Goscote’s, and 11.1% of Martlesham Heath’s;
- meanwhile, the 40-44 year old group is by far the largest in Martlesham Heath, at 10.3%, compared to 6.6% in East Goscote and 5.6% in Bar Hill.

Thus it would appear that whilst building continues at a new settlement, even after 15 years, the stock of younger families is constantly replaced, even as those who have become more established grow older. However, once building ceases, newly arriving, younger families arrive in much fewer numbers replacing out migrants, and the population becomes dominated by the cohort of households who moved in during construction. These families age, and, as they do so, the peak in the adult population moves up the age scale, whilst the number of young children diminishes, and the number of older children increases. However, if as at Martlesham Heath, the housing stock as a whole is aimed at a slightly higher segment of the market\(^\text{11}\), then the effect appears to be that the peak of adult population in terms of age is broader, and extends into the forties, even if the cohort of children is still comparatively young compared with the completed village (East Goscote).

Population age structures - twenty-six years from building start

By 1991, East Goscote and Bar Hill were twenty five and twenty-six years old respectively (Martlesham Heath will reach its twenty-sixth year at the 2001 Census). However, whilst East Goscote had been substantially complete for thirteen years, housebuilding at Bar Hill, though mostly complete, was still continuing. The population of East Goscote, as recorded

\(^\text{11}\)The higher market segmentation of Martlesham Heath is evident from contemporary sales literature and the quality of the built environment achieved, and is confirmed by interviews with those involved in the development of the site (for example, the interview with Lindsay Clubb).
in the 1991 Census of Population, was 3,033 people, resident in 989 households. Thus whilst the number of households in the village had increased by 41 since 1981 (mainly due to the construction of sheltered old people’s housing), its total population had fallen by 151 people (primarily a product of the static, ageing population, which is further discussed below). Meanwhile, the population of Bar Hill had grown considerably since 1981, reaching a recorded 4,407 people by 1991, living in 1,727 households. The continued growth of Bar Hill had, by 1991, made it by far the largest of the three settlements, with nearly twice as many households as East Goscote, though because these households were, on average, smaller\(^{12}\), the total population of Bar Hill was only about one and a half times the size of that in East Goscote. On the basis of the 1991 Census, Bar Hill was also considerably larger than Martlesham Heath, with an average household size of a similar order\(^{13}\).

\[\text{Figure 4.8} \quad \text{Population age structure - Bar Hill, 1991 (twenty-six years from building start)}\]

\(^{12}\)The average household size in East Goscote was 3.07 persons, compared with 2.55 at Bar Hill.

\(^{13}\)The average household size in Martlesham Heath at the 1991 Census was 2.64.
Figures 4.8 and 4.9 show, respectively, the population age structures of Bar Hill and East Goscote, as reported in the 1991 Census of Population. Table 4.3 shows the figures which make up these charts. Whilst similarities are evident between the two population age structures of the villages, the considerable differences caused by the earlier completion of East Goscote are also clear. Both populations are still relatively young, with only small percentages of their populations in age groups older than 55. However, whilst Bar Hill still shows some evidence of the double peaked structure noted in other, earlier, age structures, East Goscote’s has evolved into something far more complex - indeed, it is possibly the best example there is of the sort of population age structure which develops in a completed and maturing new settlement. The Bar Hill structure also shows evidence of developing from the double-peaked structure, which appears to characterise the growth phase, towards the flatter structure which is indicative of a broadly stable population.

Both villages have the largest of their school age population groups in the 10 to 15 range, 8.5% in the case of Bar Hill, and 9.6% in East Goscote. In East Goscote, the proportion in

---

14Of all the completed private sector new settlements, it is East Goscote which has been complete for the longest time, since 1978.
each of the three childhood age groups rises from youngest to oldest, suggesting a strong bias towards older children, and hence older families. It is notable that in the Leicestershire village, there is a distinct peak in the adult population in the 40 to 44 age group (11.6% of the total population), corresponding not only to the parents of these older children, but also to families who would have moved into the village in the mid-1970s as young adults. Bar Hill, in contrast, shows its largest single age group to be those aged between 25 and 29 (12.9% of the population); these are the recent arrivals, who are still adding to the village’s population, either by moving into newly built houses, or succeeding established residents as they move into larger houses, prompted by growing families. The hypothesis of continued new, younger arrivals in Bar Hill is also supported by the significance of preschool aged children within the population of the Cambridgeshire village - the 0 to 4 age group comprises 8.1% of its population.

The evidence of both of these population profiles suggests that for as long as a new settlement is under construction, and as long as new households are being added, younger adults and young children will form significant sectors of the population. However, the nearer to completion a site gets, the less significant these groups become, and the more significant become age groups attributable to older families - adults in their thirties and early forties, and older children. Once completed, there is no net addition of households to the settlement, and the existing population tends both to age, and to become more complex. It is particularly notable, for instance, that the 16 to 19 age group in East Goscote had grown by 1991 to the point where there was no visible division between the eldest second generation residents, the children of incomers, and the younger first generation residents. This had been a distinctive feature in the ‘double-peaked’ structure evident in all earlier structures, and in the 1991 Bar Hill population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Bar Hill</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>East Goscote</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Age group population</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>90+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Population age group figures (number and %) for Bar Hill (1991) and East Goscote (1991)
The changes occurring in a post-completion new settlement population are best observed by examining East Goscote, where the changes to the established population are not masked by the effect of population changes caused by settlement growth. The evidence from other sources is that in all three settlements, an early period of population volatility, a sorting process amongst the early residents, is followed by relative stability, if the effect of new arrivals is excluded. Most families who stay beyond the initial period of volatility then stay for a considerable period of time, and usually throughout the entire child-rearing phase of their lives. Once new building ceases, therefore, the population is, in majority, static, and ages as a cohort. Figure 4.8 illustrates the net change in population in each age group between 1981 and 1991 in East Goscote. Broadly, there is a net loss of residents aged under 15, a small gain of those aged 16 to 24, net decline amongst those aged 25 to 39, and gains in all older groups, particularly those aged between 40 and 54. This indicates that several interdependent processes are occurring over the ten year period:

---

15This hypothesis is strongly supported both by the results of the household survey carried out in East Goscote by the New Settlements Research Group (Owen, 1992 ed.), and by considerable evidence from interviews with residents and others, and contemporary sources such as community newsletters and newspaper cuttings.
the cohorts of younger children and young adults present in 1981 have aged, so that there are now fewer children and fewer young adults overall;

- the decline of younger adults is matched by increases in those groups which are ten years older, implying that the peak in the adult population consists broadly of the same individuals, who have aged ten years;

- the children of 1981 have not all become young adults and older children in 1991 - there is some indication of the cohort ageing and staying within the village, shown by rises in the 16 to 19 and 20 to 24 groups, but it seems clear that many of the children of 1981 have left the village to find education or work outside it;

- the relatively small decline in the 25 to 29 age group suggests that whilst there have been losses to this age group due to the ageing of first generation residents, there have been some compensating gains, perhaps by second generation villagers who have not left to live elsewhere, or by some new young arrivals to the smaller, ‘starter’ homes vacated by other, older families;

- the small growth in all groups older than 54 is not primarily a product of the ageing of first generation migrants, but partly the combination of the building of an old peoples home and sheltered housing, and due to the arrival of older members of extended families, once younger members of the family have settled in the village.

It is intriguing to speculate as to what may happen in the subsequent ten to fifteen years, as in new settlements of this age, there are now many families who were first generation settlers, but have reached the stage where the children they raised in the village have left home, or will soon do so, whilst the parents themselves begin to plan for retirement. At some point, many of these ‘empty-nesters’ will opt to move to smaller properties, leaving family houses to be reoccupied, either through succession by other, younger village residents moving from smaller houses, or by incomers to the village. In either case, this seems to point to a new wave of incomers, either directly to larger family houses, or into smaller houses. Whether this will be noticeable in Census returns, either through an increase in new migrants, or through further changes in the population structure of the village, remains to be seen. The likelihood is that these processes of further change will occur more gradually, and that there will be a continuation towards the more evenly balanced population age structures which have already begun to appear.
Comparison with regional and sub-regional population structures

The preceding discussion has indicated that the three new settlements have population structures which differ significantly from that of the wider population. In order to underline this, and to indicate the extent of these variations, it is necessary to compare the population age structures of the three settlements with the regions and sub-regions of which they form part. Figures 4.11, 4.12 and 4.13 make this comparison for each of the three villages using data from the 1981 Census of Population.

Figure 4.11 Population structure by age group, 1981 Census – East Goscote compared with Charnwood District, the County of Leicestershire, and the East Midlands Planning Region (% of total population)

Thus, comparing East Goscote with the district of which it forms part (Charnwood), its county, and its region, indicates clearly the strong bias in the population in 1981 towards the 25-44 age group, and to those 15 and under. Equally, the new settlement has a population which is comparatively under-represented in every age group of 45 years upwards. This is in a settlement which had been completed three years previously. Where building was still occurring, in Bar Hill and Marlsham Heath, the contrast with comparator districts, counties and regions is even more distinct. Bar Hill shows a clear relative concentration of population in the 25-34 age group, and in the 0-4 age group. Bar Hill also shares the under-representation in every population age group above 45 years.
Finally, Martlesham Heath also shows the distinct relative over-representation in the 25-34 age group, and also a slightly greater proportion of those aged 35-44. As in East Goscote and Bar Hill, there is also a significantly larger population of young children (under 5 years old) and some indication of a larger population of 5-15 year olds. Again, in every age group of 45 and over, the new settlement has a relatively small population. Notably, the contrast is greatest in comparison to its district, Suffolk Coastal.

![Population structure by age group, 1981 Census - Bar Hill compared with South Cambridgeshire District, the County of Cambridgeshire, and the East Anglian Planning Region (% of total population)](image-url)
Figure 4.13  Population structure by age group, 1981 Census – Martlesham Heath compared with Suffolk Coastal District, the County of Suffolk, and the East Anglian Planning Region (% of total population)

Figure 4.14  Population structure by age group, 1991 Census – East Goscote compared with Charnwood District, the County of Leicestershire, and the East Midlands Planning Region (% of total population)
This underlines the point made elsewhere in this chapter – new settlements have population age structures which are dominated by adults between 25 and 44 years of age, and by their children. In the construction phase, the contrast is greatest in the 25-34 age group, and amongst the smallest children, whilst once construction is complete, the age structure tends gradually to age. This latter point is underlined by Figure 4.14, which places the population age structure of East Goscote revealed by the 1991 Census in a similar sub-regional and regional context. The age groups in which the East Goscote population is relatively largest are now those between 40 and 49 years, with a similar proportion in the 50-54 age group as in the district, county and region. Meanwhile, at the lower end of the age scale, East Goscote shows a relatively large population of those aged 10-19.

**Other socio-economic indicators**

As might be expected from any district which consists primarily of relatively new, owner-occupied private housing in suburban or exurban locations, the three new settlements studied here exhibit:

- very high levels of owner occupation;
- very small ethnic minority populations;
- comparatively high levels of economic activity;
- low levels of unemployment;
- high levels of car ownership;
- low levels of household deprivation and crowding.
As an example, the 1991 Census of Population figures for Bar Hill and East Goscote are compared with the country as a whole on a range of measures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1991 Census of Population</th>
<th>Bar Hill</th>
<th>East Goscote</th>
<th>Martlesham Heath</th>
<th>GB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied households</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white residents</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic activity (of 16+ population)</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment (of economically active)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars per household</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>1.460</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with no car</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households lacking or sharing amenities</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households at more than 1 person per room</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone pensioner households</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent households</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 A range of socio-economic indicators for the three villages

The picture presented from these statistics underlines the picture gained from other more qualitative sources, as well as providing a base of simple statistical measures to underpin later discussion. Very high levels of owner occupation result from the manner in which new settlements were developed (though whether the high level of owner-occupation and consequent low level of rented housing was a result of conscious decision, or emerged through default is not entirely clear). Being new houses, they have very high levels of amenity (it is notable that only 4.8% of houses in Bar Hill in 1991 were without central heating). The population which lives in these households suffers far less from unemployment than much of the rest of the country (though qualitative material suggests

16Martlesham Heath has a lower level of owner-occupation than the other two settlements, though still considerably higher than the national average. The remaining households are accounted for mainly by private rented tenure, and these houses are mainly those rented out by Bradford Property Trust itself (interview with Gregory Zagni, BPT).
that they were not immune from either job insecurity or negative equity). Most notable is
the high level of car ownership. This is not merely a product of affluence - relatively
wealthy boroughs in outer London often have fewer than one car per household - but also
the extent to which a car is needed in order to be sufficiently mobile to participate in
society. Such high densities of car ownership, and the relatively small number of
households without a car, suggest not only relative affluence, and the relative youth of the
population, but also the extent to which cars are part of the sustaining culture of new
settlements. New settlements were created, and have remained, car-based satellites of
larger centres, and in that sense, and in the light of more environmentally aware land-use
planning, it can be argued that they are becoming anachronistic. Certainly no modern
new settlement proposal would now proceed without serious consideration being given to
their environmental sustainability. The strongest argument against new settlements is that
they do not fit in with the current broad policy objectives of redirecting development back
into cities, often by the re-use of derelict or underused land. The strongest cases for new
settlement development will be held by sites rather like East Goscote, where there is
already an undesirable, derelict or redundant land use, especially if it is adjacent to a
railway line (thus providing sustainable transport access).

Conclusions
This chapter provides a statistical portrait of the new settlements which are discussed at
length in the three subsequent chapters. These settlements have grown at remarkably
consistent rates, and their pattern of growth has shown features, such as slow expansion in
the early years, and the fastest growth in later years of development, which suggest some
commonality in the forces which shape their growth. Their population structures, and the
way in which they change over time, also show considerable consistency across sites. New
settlements start off being dominated by young adults and their children, and continue to
have considerable portions of their population in these groups until development ceases, at
which point the population enters a more static phase, with a more stable, ageing
population, which develops a more complex and balanced population age structure over

17 The research carried out on behalf of the Department of the Environment about new settlements (Breheny,
Gent and Lock, 1993) considers the environmental implications of new settlements at length. The latest
planning guidance for the West Midlands appears to show its influence in proposing new settlements which
are much larger than those discussed here for reasons of sustainability (see Stranz, 1994).
time. Such youthful population structures also have other consequences, which may include particular pressure upon services which deal with the needs of young families and children, but produces a concomitant lower demand for services directed at older groups (indicated by the relatively low proportion of single elderly households in new settlements). These three new settlements are all dominated by owner-occupation, and this has consequences in relatively low levels of unemployment, and in other indicators of affluence such as car ownership levels. High car ownership levels also say much about the nature of new settlements as automotive satellites of larger centres, and their dependence upon the car for their continued attractiveness as places to live. These key facts underpin the wider discussion which takes places in the next three chapters.
Chapter 5
East Goscote

Introduction
East Goscote, in Leicestershire, is the smallest of the three case study sites discussed in this thesis. Like the other two new villages of Martlesham Heath and Bar Hill, its development history begins in the early 1960s, but unlike them, East Goscote was not only started promptly (with site clearance beginning in 1962, prior to any permission on the site, and first house completions late in 1965), but was also completed far earlier, with the last substantive housing completions in 1978. Like Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, East Goscote was originally in the hands of one controlling interest, and remained there until its completion. However, the owners and developers of the site were a company of regional housebuilders, Jelson Ltd., and all the development on the site, including all of the housing, was completed by them. Jelson Ltd. were, and remain a family owned company, based in Leicester, and at the time of building East Goscote, were completing somewhere between 900 and 1200 units per annum\(^1\). Like Martlesham Heath, but unlike Bar Hill, East Goscote was a derelict military site, though the extent of building there was far more intensive than at Martlesham, and rather than finding alternative uses for existing buildings, the site at East Goscote was entirely cleared before development began.

The completion of East Goscote in 1978 means that for much of its history to date, it has been a complete entity, for which change has been a social phenomenon, rather than a physical one. One of the main reasons for selecting East Goscote as a case study, apart from its size, private sector initiative, and the complete lack of any prior research about the village (at least beyond relatively superficial local history\(^2\)), was that it provided one of the only examples of a private sector new settlement where development had been complete for many years, allowing the study of social processes after building ceased. For this reason, the discussion about East Goscote takes a broader approach to the essentially development based histories of Martlesham Heath and Bar Hill, and considers the social

\(^1\)Interview with Roy Longdon.
development of the village beyond its 1978 completion. In addition to interviews with key individuals involved both in the development process, and in the social organisation of the village, a questionnaire survey amongst households in East Goscote was carried out by the New Settlements Research Group, for several reasons: firstly, to establish a data set from which to consider social development after building completion; secondly, because so little other documentary data remains in existence, beyond some planning documents, maps and drawings; and thirdly, because East Goscote has never been the subject of any other serious academic research or reflection, either at the time of its construction or since. Whilst this part of the research provided some useful data about East Goscote, some of which is reported later in this chapter, the survey process indicated that interviewing key individual actors at the other case study sites, combined with the more extensive documentary material available, would yield sufficient data to construct the critical histories required.

Site history
Prior to the second world war, the site of East Goscote was agricultural land (presumably of Grade II or III, like much of that which remains around it now) between the villages of Queniborough, Rearsby and Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake in Leicestershire. This part of the county lies about 6 miles north-east of Leicester, in the valley of the River Wreake, and to the east of the Fosse Way, now the A46. In 1942, the land was acquired by the War

---

3 The survey undertaken was detailed, with about 7% of all households (66 in total) interviewed using semi-structured interview techniques, based on a standard interview proforma. Interviews often took an hour or more, and were conducted with as many members of the household as were present at the time. Households were selected randomly from a large scale map, and informed of the intention to talk to them several days in advance by letter. The interviews themselves were conducted on a series of weekends between November 1991 and March 1992 (thus coinciding with the 25th anniversary of the village) in majority by the author, and also by Dr. George Revill, a former doctoral research student at the Department of Geography at Loughborough, and an experienced social researcher. The results of this research were published in July 1992 by the NSRG (Owen, 1992), edited by and in majority written by the author of this thesis, with a contribution concerning the planning history of the site written by Dr Chris Amos (Amos, 1992a), at the time a colleague in the NSRG, and a former doctoral research student at in the Geography Department at Loughborough University.
Department from its then owners, and on the site was built an ordnance depot with shell filling capacity, and military quarters. Local folklore suggests that the intention was to build the depot at Rearsby in Yorkshire, and that it had "stood for twenty years as a monument to Anglo-Saxon military genius". The site was never used for its intended function, except in an experimental capacity, and was kept as a reserve site, occupied by a small detachment of the Pioneer Corps., who carried out maintenance duties. Following the war, the site remained in the hands of the Air Ministry, with one part of it taken over as a sewage works for Barrow on Soar RDC, whilst the railway sidings were used by British Rail. However, the majority of the site, including most of its buildings, were largely unused after the war (though the Air Ministry claimed that there had been some storage of equipment on the site), and rapidly became a semi-derelict eyesore.

Located between small, then relatively rural villages, in the midst of flat, open farmland, the site was a considerable visual intrusion, and the planning authority, Leicestershire County Council, became increasingly anxious to do something about the site. They made periodic enquiries to the Air Ministry as to their future intentions for the site, though no information was forthcoming until 1959, when a representative from the War Department Land Agent met with the County Planning Officer. At this time, the Planning Authority wished to see the site cleared, and the land returned to agriculture, and were unwilling to suggest to the Land Agent any alternative use they thought suitable. The aim of the Land Agent at this meeting seems to have been to test the water, and to find out whether there was scope in planning terms for the War Department to sell the land for some profitable use, in order to maximise the value of their land. Tustin also reports that several enquiries were received from prospective purchasers at this time, including one from Jelson Ltd., the eventual purchasers and developers, who were already looking to demolish the depot and use the site for housing (it is not known whether the concept of a free-standing new village had emerged at this point, though unless Jelson's planned other acquisitions between the site and either Queniborough and Rearsby, the site would remain free-standing, and the

---

5Mr. D.F. Offord, counsel for Jelson's at the local planning enquiry in 1962, reported in the Leicester Mercury, 14.11.62.
6Tustin, 1962.
7Tustin, 1962, paragraph 4.
distance between that and the realisation of the need for dedicated social and community facilities in a new centre, forming the core of a new village, cannot have been far). The site was also investigated as a potential permanent showground for the Royal Show, but the size and cost of conversion made the depot an uneconomic prospect, and the Show eventually found its home at Stoneleigh in Warwickshire.

Further activity seems then to have been minimal until October 1961, when the Planning Authority received several further enquiries about the site, and then found out, apparently after most other parties with an interest, that the site was to be auctioned on the 29th November by Hallam, Brackett & Co. of Nottingham on behalf of the War Department. Upon sale, the site would become subject to the Town and Country Planning Acts, and thus the Area Planning Committee met on the 23rd November 1961 to consider the various purchase enquiries, and to establish what might be the most acceptable option. The meeting was deliberately held only a few days before the auction to allow the consideration of as many options as possible. By the time of the meeting, ten enquiries had apparently been made, which were essentially variations upon five options:

(i) industrial;
(ii) storage;
(iii) residential;
(iv) a shopping centre, with housing, motel, sports centre and running track;
(v) a detention centre for the Prison Commission.

Before examining the way in which the Area Planning Committee considered these options, it is important to understand the scale of the site they were dealing with. The Depot was offered for sale in three lots (lot 1, the main site of 138.39 acres, lot 2, at the south-east corner, 2 acres, and lot 3, a large private house on the Melton Road, called Red Roofs, 0.43 acres) to which were later added the triangular plot of land in the north-east corner of the site (which remained, at the time of the sale, in the hands of the Air Ministry, amounting to about 6 acres, and which, judging from the one aerial photograph of the site, was also occupied by similar buildings to those on the rest of the site), and,

---

9Tustin, 1962, paragraph 6.
10See picture 10 in the annex.
seemingly, part of the land in the hands of British Rail and used as sidings off the main Leicester-Melton railway line. Thus the total area of the East Goscote site extended to about 150 acres, and as the aerial photograph of the site shows, this was essentially completely occupied by military buildings, and associated roads and hard standing. The floorspace these encompassed is considerable, and was detailed in the sales particulars11 as follows:

- storage, single storey - 575,305 ft²
- offices, single storey - 14,383 ft²
- garages, single storey - 16,256 ft²
- other uses, single storey - 31,496 ft²
- made up roadway - 56,005 ft. x 25 ft width
- railway track - 4,392 yards
- car parking - 2.1 acres
- hard standing - 19.42 acres
- 14 semi-detached timber bungalows (each 580 ft²)
- 4 detached timber bungalows (each 775 ft²)
- 2 detached 4-bedroom houses
- brick built barrack blocks (26,900 ft²)

In addition, it is worth noting that some of the buildings counted as storage were built to house munitions, or shell fillings operations, and were thus of very substantial construction, with liberal use of reinforced concrete. Thus the total floorspace on the site was close to 700,000 ft², mostly of brick or concrete construction, plus large areas of hardstanding. If the site was to be cleared, then the job would be a substantial piece of demolition, at not inconsiderable cost, meaning that clearance could only be economic if it was followed by redevelopment. However, on the positive side, the site already had foul and storm water drains (adequate for residential use of the site), and some electricity supply infrastructure, including a substantial ring main and several sub-stations.

It seems, from the account given by Tustin12, that the committee had decided they preferred the option of a new settlement on the site (ie. they preferred the Jelson option),

12 Tustin, 1962, paragraph 7.
and justified that, rather than the other way around. Residential development was thought most likely to produce a viable scheme, and that this should be a "comprehensive scheme for a completely new unit" to protect the gap between the new development and existing villages. Using the site for industry or storage was rejected for several reasons:

- complete redevelopment for these uses would produce a very large site, unlikely to get approval from the Ministry of Trade, or to be in keeping with its surroundings;
- use for these purposes without redevelopment would result in the retention of unsightly buildings;
- many of the buildings on the site were unsuitable for storage or industrial use.

The reaction of the committee to what would now be termed a mixed use development (option iv) was interesting, and illustrated both their lack of vision, but essentially the extent to which planning and development fashions have changed in the past 35 years. It appears that one potential purchaser of the land planned what was described as a decentralised shopping centre, plus housing, a motel, sports centre and running track. Whilst now such a development might only be seriously impaired by being avowedly 'out-of-town', the scheme was dismissed in 1962 because "the shopping centre would only occupy a very small part of the scheme and the suggested housing, motel, sports centre and running centre seemed to be only 'packing' to use up the rest of the site". At the same time, Cambridgeshire County Council were considering the new settlement option at Bar Hill partly because it offered the potential for a new retail centre in an essentially 'decentralised' location, and by the early '70s had approved the development of a substantial 18-hole golf course and a motel. Many of the more recent new settlement proposals have themselves been far closer to the mixed use development proposed at the Queniborough Depot, and it is common for such schemes to emerge where the wholesale development of larger sites is being considered (especially on large brownfield sites). Nevertheless, it appears that, even at this early stage, the idea of building a new village had grasped the imagination of several key members of the committee in a way that other options had not.

14See the account in Chapter 6.
15Details of the range of recent new settlement schemes can be found in Owen, 1993b, and Breheny, Gent & Lock, 1993. Other similar accounts include Potter, 1986 and Amos, 1991c.
It needs to be emphasised that this three hour meeting several days prior to the auction effectively decided the planning policy on a major strategic site in the county, even though the Area Planning Committee were keen to stress the provisional nature of their opinion. With the tacit approval of the planning authority for their plans, and because their decision left no time for others to review proposals, or for others to come in with proposals in the light of the strategic decision made (those who had expressed an interest in purchasing the site were informed of the committee's decision by letter on the 24th), Jelson's were in a very strong position, possibly an effective monopoly. Moreover, once the Planning Authority (even if only its Northern Area Sub-Committee) had made such opinions known, it would have been very difficult for them to defend any reversal at appeal, so they themselves were effectively tied to one option, and probably to one developer. The short timescale of the consideration of policy for this site is also evident, and worthy of note. Certainly it compares starkly with the protracted decision making process at the other two case study sites, and in more recent new settlement proposals.

Following a telephone conversation, the auctioneers were informed of the committee's opinion by letter on the 28th; essentially that they would prefer to see no development on the land at all, but in order to secure its clearance, which they saw as the priority, they would be prepared to "consider proposals for the subsequent redevelopment of the site as a self-contained residential community, including a small element of light industry of types suited to a residential area. The letter also made clear that the opinion was merely that of the sub-committee, and not that either of the full County Planning Committee (though it is difficult to envisage that key members of this had not been consulted informally, even though there had not been a formal meeting) or the Ministry of Housing and Local Government (from whom approval would be required, as development on the Depot site would constitute a major departure from the County Development Plan). At the auction, Jelson Ltd purchased the main site (lot 1), whilst a Mr Freer bought the 2 acre 'Riverside House' site, which contained the barrack blocks. According to the former vicar of East Goscote, the Rev. Dr. David Brewin, who had grown up in that part of Leicestershire, and

16From the letter sent to the auctioneers from the Planning sub-committee on 28th November 1961, confirming the decision of the committee at its meeting of 23rd November 1961, reported in Tustin, 1961, paragraph 8.
remembered the site in its former use, the site was sold for about £100,000\textsuperscript{17}. If this is true, then Jelson Ltd. got the land for just over £700 an acre. This compares with £400 per acre at Bar Hill, but this site had much greater infrastructure and social provision obligations attached to it, and no sewers or ring main, though it was a greenfield site, requiring no demolition or clearance. Jelson would also have gained from the extraction of the sand on part of the site, which apparently provided most of that required for building. Estimates in 1962 suggested that the total development cost of the planned new village would be in the region of £3,000,000\textsuperscript{18}.

It is not clear whether Jelson themselves had got as far as elaborating the concept of a new settlement, though even if this had occurred to them as the logical option on the site, it probably suited them commercially to keep this to themselves, rather than offer an expensive hostage to fortune in elucidating the concept to the planning authority, and effectively committing themselves to substantial facility provision. It thus falls to Ray Tustin, the then Northern Area Planning Officer, to take the formal credit for stressing the need for the site to be developed with ‘full communal facilities’, and for defining what these might be when Jelson first contacted him after the sale of the land; namely a church, village hall, school, public house, filling station and a village green\textsuperscript{19}. The village green appears almost totemic in new settlement proposals - without one, it seems, a village, even a brand new one, cannot really be a village. Moreover, this was in addition to ‘ample open space’, which Tustin listed separately. Tustin also wanted only a single access to the Melton Road (the main A607 Melton Mowbray to Leicester road), asked that any industry should be placed adjoining the sewage works in the south-west of the site, and stressed the need for extensive tree-planting on a site which was very flat, and without a great deal of existing vegetation.

\textsuperscript{17}From the interview with Rev. Dr. D.F. Brewin, former vicar of Bar Hill.

\textsuperscript{18}Leicester Mercury, 14.11.62.

\textsuperscript{19}Tustin, 1962, paragraph 10. It is also worth comparing this list with that drawn up by Chris Parker some years later in connection with Martlesham Heath, which included many of the same elements (see Chapter 7, and also Parker, 1982).
Planning

The first planning application (871/62) was submitted by Jelson Ltd. for the site on 2nd March 1962, just over three months after the auction, and a month after the firm formally acquired the main part of the land which comprised the site. This was a 'red-line' application, which, in addition to the land already in the ownership of the applicants, also applied to the Riverside House land, and to the triangular parcel of land in the north east of the site still owned by the Air Ministry. The logic of incorporating all three parcels of land within one comprehensive scheme is clear if a site plan is examined. Not only do they comprise the totality of the Depot site, but this is clearly bounded by roads on two sides, by a rail line on the third, and a brook on the fourth. Thus as a whole, the site is clearly bounded, and defensible in planning terms (which has proved important in more recent years, when there have been proposals to develop land between East Goscote and Queniborough, thus threatening the independent existence of both20), whereas if Jelson Ltd had simply submitted an application for, and later developed, the land in their ownership, there would still have been pressure to develop the remaining land at a later date. It suited the company to develop the whole site, so as to have as many house sales as possible with which to subsidise other development, whilst the planners were happier to see the site developed as a totality, rather than piecemeal, so as to clear the old military buildings entirely. Apart from outlining the area under consideration, the application did little more than indicate proposed land uses, only two of which, industry and the area intended for sand extraction, had acreages attached21. The full list of intended uses was:

◊ industry (10 acres);
◊ education;
◊ village centre for commercial and shopping precinct and public buildings;
◊ sand extraction - 15 acres adjoining the railway to be reclaimed for playing fields or open space;
◊ residential - the remainder (with incidental open space).

---


Land adjacent to the East Goscote site was of interest to developers when land allocations were being discussed for the district wide local plan.

21Amos, 1992a; Tustin, 1962.
Amos\textsuperscript{22} also points out that the application was submitted for 'change of use', when strictly it should have been for new development on a cleared site - no re-use for different ends was ever intended for any of the existing buildings on the site.

This application went to the Area Planning Committee on 5th April, which favoured it, but passed it on to the County Planning Committee (6th June). From there the application was sent to the MoHLG as a major departure from the Development Plan, with the recommendation for approval of the County Planning Officer subject to three conditions\textsuperscript{23}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item that all existing buildings on the site should be demolished before development commenced;
  \item that detailed plans (for buildings, roads, drains and landscaping) should be submitted and approved before the commencement of development;
  \item only two accesses, one from the A607 (Melton Road) and one from the B674 (Broome Lane) should be provided.
\end{itemize}

The Minister decided to determine the application himself, and thus it was called in on 20th August 1962, and examined at a Public Inquiry on the 14th and 15th of November of that year.

By the time of the public inquiry, both the Leicestershire County Planning Authority and Jelson Ltd. had been able to flesh out both their strategic justification (in the case of the former) and their proposals for the site. The Jelson proposals for the site were presented at the inquiry by John Nixon of Allen & Nixon, a Leicester based firm of architects. As with Brian Falk at Bar Hill, both of the principal partners at Allen & Nixon were relatively young, and thus, in comparative terms, relatively recently trained. The partner principally involved in the East Goscote development was John Nixon, who, according to his enquiry evidence\textsuperscript{24}, had trained in the design section of Leicester County Borough Town Planning Department for five years. He was thus familiar with planning, local government practice, and the locality. The firm already had an established business relationship with Jelson, though prior to East Goscote, generally only involving single houses and small plots\textsuperscript{25}.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{22}Amos, 1992a.
\textsuperscript{23}Tustin, 1962, paragraph 11.
\textsuperscript{24}Nixon, 1962.
\textsuperscript{25}Interview with John Nixon.
\end{flushright}
Allen & Nixon were engaged to prepare an overall concept to go forward to the public enquiry (which suggests that their involvement began after the land purchase, and probably after the initial application). According to Nixon, once the overall concept was complete, detailed design was taken over by Jelson’s staff, who were surveyors rather than architects. Nixon was influenced by the then current architectural fashion for Radburn design, and vehicular-pedestrian separation was incorporated into the design concept, though this was diluted by Jelson’s. The design was also influenced by HMSO housing guides released at about the same time, and by pictures of New Town architecture then appearing in the architectural press. Nixon, along with the MD of Jelson Ltd., Ron Jelley, and another member of the Jelson staff, Stan Skinner, visited several sites on the continent, seemingly to raise the expectations and aspirations of Jelson’s as to the design possibilities. The itinerary took in new housing developments in Sweden, Denmark and Germany (including a German new town called Sennestadt, south east of Bielefeld), and Nixon had also been influenced by New Ash Green, as well as older sites such as Bourneville. The influence of the continental trip can be seen in some of Nixon’s design sketches.

Intriguingly, Nixon’s inquiry evidence begins to deal with the potential advantages of a new settlement, as opposed to peripheral additions to existing settlements;

"The size of the area contained would seem to be a reasonable one to develop as a community, since it will be large enough to support its own community and social facilities ... thus giving character and form to the village. A complete concept of this nature where the limits are defined must have many advantages over the addition of numbers of dwellings to existing villages without the appropriate expansion of shopping and facilities. It will also allow planning of the road pattern with reference to the whole rather than small, unbalanced additions to an existing community."

Thus, as befits inquiry evidence, Nixon gives two essentially functional definitions of what might provide for a community on the site; firstly, its ability to support a range of social and community facilities, which bestow character and form. Secondly, he identifies a definable edge to the site as important to the success and appropriateness of the concept,
which ties in closely with the theoretical discussion of Chapter 1, where the concept of boundary is seen as crucial to the sustainability of community identity. Note that Nixon himself introduces the concept of community into his evidence, and then explains why the site and concept lend themselves to the use of the term.

The concept as described by Nixon allowed for an extension of 7.17 acres to the existing sewage works site, agreed with Barrow upon Soar ROC, and adjacent to this, industrial development amounting to 7.75 acres. The allocation of open space on the site was at this point quite generous, at 7 acres per 1000 persons, somewhat in excess of the standard promoted at the time by the National Playing Fields Association. Much of this was intended to form the playing fields which would separate the industrial and residential areas of the village, covering the area from which sand was intended to be extracted. All of these uses were planned for the west of the site, adjacent to the railway line. What was termed ‘amenity open space’ was intended to be spread throughout the remainder of the site, and was intended to include a village green adjacent to the Community Centre, and the centre of the village. Originally it was intended that a corridor of grassed open space would stretch westwards from the village green, through residential areas to the playing fields - this is shown clearly on sketch plans produced at the time of the inquiry, and reproduced in the local press in reporting it. This green corridor was intended to follow the line of existing spoil heaps on the site, retaining and planting on these to break up the flatness of the site.

In the village centre, it was planned to provide a church, pub, village hall, petrol filling station, shops (with maisonettes above) and old people’s dwellings. It was also planned to build some three storey houses in the vicinity of the centre, so as to provide further prominence for the centre. Central facilities were expected to be linked to a main paved area. The plans seem to acknowledge the inherent problems of new developments when the building of central buildings occurs some time after the first substantial residential buildings. This is a problem addressed by developers in all three new settlements studied, and whilst Bar Hill struggled for some time with inadequate social facilities and

30Leicester Mercury, 14.11.62; Leicester Advertiser, 16.11.62. The sketch plan is shown in the annex as picture 11.
unoccupied shop units\(^{31}\), in Martlesham Heath the solution adopted was for the developer to run the main supermarket themselves, at a loss, until sufficient trade was available to make it a viable proposition\(^{32}\). At East Goscote, the solution adopted was to provide shops (along with the pub and old people’s housing) at an early stage, but to let them on a rent, initially subsidised, which would be directly related to the number of houses built and occupied\(^{33}\).

A site of three acres was allocated for a primary school at the request of the Education Authority, in the central area of the village, and by the time of the inquiry, the broad layout of roads on the site was also decided. Nixon’s evidence\(^{34}\) states that the road pattern was not intended to be influenced by the pattern of development within the Depot, though in reality it was. The main loop road in the village followed a similar line to that in the Depot, probably because this was also the line of the electric ring main on the site, the main Melton Road entrance to the village was at the same point as the main depot entrance, whilst Broome Avenue in the village ended up following the line of another Depot site road, because it formed the boundary of the lot 1 land and the north-east corner triangle of land still in the hands of the Air Ministry.

The essentially urban nature of the East Goscote site was also established by decisions made upon density for the public inquiry - 6 dwellings per acre towards the periphery of the site, and 12 towards the centre. The relatively high housing densities on the site appear to have been a product of economic imperatives, and ran contrary to the desired approach of the architects, who would have preferred lower densities, which were felt to be more in keeping with the rural location of the site, and because of the impact that a high density development might have in a flat, open landscape\(^{35}\). Jelson Ltd. generally sold houses into the cheaper end of the market, aiming their products at younger couples and families. They stayed with this market for East Goscote, and pitched their sample house prices accordingly (in the range £1800 to £5000, with the majority between £2000 and £3000).

\(^{31}\)See Chapter 6.

\(^{32}\)Raised in interviews with both Chris Parker and Lindsey Chubb. See Chapter 7 for a fuller discussion.

\(^{33}\)Interview with Roy Longdon of Jelson Ltd.

\(^{34}\)Nixon, 1962.

\(^{35}\)Interview with John Nixon.
This had implications both for the design of East Goscote, and for its subsequent social development. Allen & Nixon had come up with new house designs for East Goscote, though they had already compromised to some extent by using standard Jelson elements such as window and door frames. Some of these designs were rejected by Jelso as too radical and unlikely, in their commercial opinion, to sell. Some of the new designs, particularly small terraced units, and a link detached house were used, and in other cases standard Jelso designs, used before on other sites, were substituted. Jelso's subsequently found that several of the new designs pioneered at East Goscote were extremely popular with customers, and used them on other sites. It may be that their conservatism in design, though understandable, was misplaced. Most of the houses built were two and three bedroom units, ranging from terraced starter homes to detached houses, though there were also some bungalows (both for private sale, and for Barrow on Soar RDC to rent to old people, as part of the 7.5% of dwellings originally intended for letting), and a small number of four bedroom houses. Again, this housing mix, both in terms of sizes and tenure, and the decision not to offer serviced plots for customised development, had implications for the social structure which developed at East Goscote. At the time of the inquiry, it was intended to build 880 houses, on 87.76 acres of residential land on the site. The final key decision made at this point in the proceeding was the intended phasing of the building, which saw completion in six years. A fuller discussion of intended and actual completion rates can be found in chapter 4.

As well as justifying their decision to proceed with residential development on the site, and detailing the site history to date, the evidence of the Planning Authority centred upon issues raised by the Minister in his decision to call in the application. Foremost among these were the need for an additional village in the area, the effect on surrounding villages, and the suitability of the site for this type of development. At Bar Hill, it was these sort of strategic issues which guided the selection of the new settlement option, and the choice of site (ie. the choice of site was led by strategic considerations), whereas at East Goscote, the

---

36 This critique of Jelso's approach to design emerged in interview with John Nixon, and the changes made are evident if comparison is made between initial design sketches, and houses later built on the site.

37 Nixon, 1962, paragraph 30, envisaged 75 dwellings completed in the first year, 150 in the second, 200 each in the third, fourth and fifth years, and the balance in the sixth. See Chapter 4, which compares intended and actual housing completion rates on all three sites.
consideration of such issues was used to justify decisions made about a particular site (ie. the site existed, and strategic justification was then thought through for the use chosen for that site, and for the detail of that use - site led strategy).

At the time of the inquiry, Leicestershire was subject to population growth of about 8000 persons per annum, which much of this growth occurring in the areas immediately adjacent to Leicester. The planning authority evidence makes clear that the depot site was outside the area considered to be part of the Leicester Fringe Area, or areas currently designated for overspill from the city. Hence the strategic justification for the new village on the Queniborough / Rearsby Deposit was not as a Leicester overspill. Rather, the Planning Authority pointed to the development occurring in other parts of the county, much of which was in the Soar and Wreake valleys, to the north of the city. Outside the fringe area, development was running at about 1300 houses per annum, and thus the Depot site would account for about two-thirds of one year's output, resulting in less building elsewhere in the county. The site was considered to be too large to be absorbed into either Rearsby or Queniborough, but that if development proceeded as a self-contained community, with physical gaps maintained between the villages, there should be no fundamental effect upon either of the two existing settlements. In this regard, the clearly defined boundaries of the Depot site were seen as an advantage, making it easier to prevent the new village spreading onto adjoining land, threatening the physical separation of settlements. Whilst no objections were received prior to the inquiry, during the proceedings there was one objection from the chairman of Rearsby Parish Council, who was himself a builder, and objected to the development on the grounds of density - essentially because he was unable to get permissions to build at anything more than 6 units per acre.

The inquiry inspector recommended approval of the application to the Minister, with the same provisos as suggested by the Planning Authority when the application was first sent to the MoHLG. The Minister, however, overturned the opinion of the inspector, and turned down the application. The Minister was concerned that too little information had been presented on which to make a determination, especially regarding the layout of the village, and which parts were to be developed for which uses. On the positive side, he felt that the

---

38 See Amos, 1992a.
39 Both village names are used in different sources.
advantages of the proposed development on the site exceeded the disadvantages. The Minister's decision letter (dated 20.6.63) suggested that Jelson Ltd. should co-operate with the Planning Authority in producing a 'small and informal town map', essentially an agreed layout and master plan for the proposed village. The Minister was happy for Leicestershire County Council to determine any subsequent applications, without further recourse to the MoHLG.

Following the receipt of this decision letter (which despite being a technical refusal, appeared in principle to support the concept of a new settlement development on the site) Jelson Ltd, Barrow upon Soar RDC and Leicestershire County Council met on the 4th July 1963, to discuss how they were to proceed. The County Council and Jelson Ltd also met with Mr Smith-Boyes of the MoHLG on the 17th of the month. At the former meeting, it was agreed to proceed with the Town Map incorporating the land in Jelson's ownership, the parcel of land purchased by Mr Freer, and the triangle of land still in Air Ministry ownership. It appears from the minutes of these meetings that it was again John Nixon of Allen & Nixon who was to proceed with the planning of the village, to the point at which a plan could be incorporated as part of the Town Map. The issue of parish boundaries was raised at the meeting, and though no one option was decided upon formally, it appears that the decision to create a new parish for East Goscote effectively began here, and discussions were planned with Barrow upon Soar RDC and the two parish councils affected, Queniborough and Rearsby. The issue of a new parish emerged again in 1965, in connection with a final decision upon a name for the new village. Decisions were also made at this meeting to contact a number of bodies to ascertain their needs in the village, including the Midland Red bus company (to establish desired road widths for buses), the Diocesan Extension Board, Free Church Council and Roman Catholic Board (to determine site requirements for churches), an anonymous petrol retailer (concerning the petrol station / garage) and various County Council departments (concerning education, library and other social provision).

Minutes of both parties recording this meeting still exist (Leicestershire County Council, 1963a; Jelson Ltd., 1963), and the account of events draws upon these.

Minutes of this meeting also exist (Leicestershire County Council, 1963b).

The record of events provided by Talbot, 1991 deals with this issue, and is discussed later in the chapter.
The second meeting, with the MoHLG representative\textsuperscript{43}, clarified what the Minister required for the format of the Town Map. Smith-Boyes, according to the minutes, suggested that Jelson Ltd. should make a fresh application which included their intention to retain one or two of the Depot buildings temporarily for storage and other site uses, and their wish to work part of the site for sand prior to completing demolition, so that the void created could then be used for building rubble where no alternative use could be found. It was originally intended that the industry on the site would provide employment for residents, adding to the degree of self-containment of the village, and this was reiterated at this meeting. Nevertheless, the Ministry line on the employment land provision was considerably more cautious than that of the developers. Jelson's felt that they could dispose of 7.5 acres, erecting units to customers' requirements. The Ministry wished to restrict provision in the first instance to half of this, and to proceed with more when the effect of factories in this position had been ascertained. It appeared that there was agreement between the parties as to the desirability of employment opportunities in the village, especially for women. This last point is interesting - there is little evidence in the documentation as to why local employment opportunities should be thought to be more significant for women residents than for men, though the assumption must be that male employment would be geographically more dispersed than that of women, whose lack of mobility and commitments to children would make local employment more attractive. It is unlikely that these assumptions would be made now, given the increased prevalence of car ownership, and the greater equality of women in the workforce, but it was made in 1963, and it did influence, albeit marginally, the physical planning of East Goscote. The MoHLG was also concerned that the amount of industry planned by the developers would exceed village demand, thus generating inward traffic flows (this in addition to flows generated by the activities of the businesses themselves) which would have to travel the length of the settlement from the Melton Road to the industrial units, through residential areas. The MoHLG representative was also taken to the site after the meeting, where demolition was already well advanced. That work was already in progress indicated the confidence with which Jelson's already viewed their prospects on the site.

\textsuperscript{43}Minutes referenced as Leicestershire County Council, 1963b.
The results of these discussions are evident in the report prepared by Allen & Nixon to accompany the plans and application submitted on 21st January 1964 (356/64). This was a new outline planning application, as advised by the MoHLG, and the report itself is dated 5th December 1963[^4]. By this time, the Diocese of Leicester had asked for the reservation of a half acre site for a church, whilst the County Planning Officer had advised the developers that a 1,300 ft\(^2\) site for a library would be required, preferably linked to the school, but certainly in the centre of the village. The County Medical Officer had asked for a site of 1.5 to 1.75 acres for an Old People’s Home close to the centre of the village, in addition to old people’s housing (small bungalows) to be developed in co-operation with Barrow upon Soar RDC. Sites were also reserved for a village hall (to be built by Jelson’s, and the subject of some considerable publicity later, when the company offered to provide this to the village, portraying it as a gift[^5], when it was, in fact, an undertaking made in this 1963 report), public house, shops, garage and filling station. A 3.5 acre site was set aside for a primary school, and following the discussion with the MoHLG representative, a smaller amount of industry was proposed initially, with an area allowed for expansion.

The part of the perimeter road along which traffic would travel to the industrial area was planned so that housing would only be built along the inner edge of it, and partly as a result of discussions with bus operators, the width of the main ring road was set at 24’0”.

Although the provision of open space at 7 acres per 1000 persons was carried forward, the arrangement of this open space had changed somewhat since initial plans were drawn up. On the north-west of the site, two large bunkers had proved impossible to demolish, and had been earthed over, to be incorporated into the playing fields. This meant that green space was lost elsewhere, mainly in the green corridor between the village centre and the playing fields, which had shrunk to a very narrow strip along a pathway by this time.

Indeed, examination of the plans in the files of Allen & Nixon as the village layout concept progressed shows how both the area of the village centre and the green corridor shrank as time progressed, at the expense of housing land. The extent of the central area was further reduced by the time the village was completed, and the green corridor reduced to a pathway for much of its length, though parts of it did remain. Indeed, it was pointed out in

[^5]: Interview with Lyn Palmer, East Goscote Parish Clerk.
an interview\textsuperscript{46} that the large verge and grassed areas which the East Goscote site has (some of which form the remnants of the green corridor) would not now be allowed by planning authorities, because of the high levels of maintenance they would require from borough or parish councils.

Unlike other sites, the provision of utilities to the East Goscote site never appears to have been contentious. It has already been noted that an electricity supply system was in place, and the actions necessary to ensure the provision of gas, water and telephones was relatively simple. Whilst storm water drainage was already in place on the site, some work was necessary to ensure adequate capacity for foul water sewage. However, unlike Bar Hill, where it proved difficult even to find a site for a new treatment plant, let alone to agree the apportioning of costs, at East Goscote, it was agreed that an extension to the existing sewage works adjacent to the site would occupy part of the Depot site, and this had been part of the earliest proposals. Barrow RDC forecast that the new works extension would be in operation by the end of 1965, given approval for the development, and the Trent River Board had asked that houses should not be completed and occupied until the new capacity was available. This part of the development hence became the rate determining step in the proposal, and early completion thus benefited all parties, including the developer (the sooner the works were complete, the sooner they could begin recouping their outlay through house sales, whilst for the Planning Authority, there was considerable advantage, because the limited capacity of existing works was threatening to hold up permissions for several other housing sites in the area\textsuperscript{47}).

\textbf{Building}

This outline application for the site was granted on the 1st June 1964\textsuperscript{48}. Thus, from the sale of the site to the approval of development, only 3 years and 6 months had elapsed, which in comparison to both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, is a remarkably short span of time. There appear to be several reasons for this. The County Planning Authority were keen to see action on the site as soon as possible, as were Barrow RDC and the parish councils. In

\textsuperscript{46}Interview with Roy Longdon of Jelson Ltd.
\textsuperscript{47}Interview with Roy Longdon.
\textsuperscript{48}Leicestershire County Council, 1964.
addition, there was almost no opposition to development of the site - it was agreed to be such an eyesore that almost anything would be an improvement. Development of the East Goscote site appeared to threaten neither vested interests or special interest groups. The planning authorities did not agonise over strategic policy options, or engage in studies to justify their decision. The significant policy decision appears to have been made in a relatively short period of time prior to the auction of the site, and officially in the space of a three hour meeting. The decision appears not to have been challenged. Moreover, only a limited number of issues were considered at the public inquiry, compared to the far more lengthy examinations common today. Together with the lack of concerted opposition this resulted in an inquiry which took only two days, and a relatively simple case for the inspector to consider. Finally, there was a developer involved from the first days who was convinced of the viability of the project, and keen to proceed.

The approval for application 356/64 was very short, with only seven conditions, and taking up only one typed foolscap page. There was no legal agreement (such as a Section 52 agreement) involved in the permission. This considerably simplified the process of negotiating and granting the permission, reducing the time between application and approval, and the costs incurred by the developer in the provision of infrastructure, landscaping and so on. The developer and planners appear to have operated on the basis of trust and gentleman’s agreement, an arrangement which presumably suited the developers far more than the planning authority. The conditions in the permission were (in paraphrase):

49See Tustin, 1962.
50With the exception of a single adjacent landowner at the public enquiry, according to Amos, 1992a. Neither interviews nor documentary sources turned up any evidence of public opposition to the scheme. Discord emerged later over the naming of the village, the creation of the new parish, and payment for street lighting during the inter-regnum prior to the new parish being created. See Talbot, 1991 and discussion later in the chapter.
51For example, the lengthy application and appeal process undertaken for the Consortium Development sites in the 1980s, the lengthy beauty contest for sites in Cambridgeshire, and the time taken to get new settlement proposals through local plan processes. This is discussed in Chapter 1.
52This is very different to the events which transpired at Bar Hill, where the developers which eventually agreed to build the village were the third company approached.
The uses of the various parts of the site should be as shown on the plans supplied with the application, excepting the central area, where the detailed arrangement shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority prior to development, and shall contain all the features shown in the submitted plan (on the plan a county home, church, school, public house, shops, village hall, garage and associated parking, though this was not spelt out in the permission).

The development should be phased in the manner shown in the application, or in a manner to be agreed between the developers and the Local Planning Authority.

No dwellings to be occupied until they are connected to a sewage disposal works constructed by the developer in accordance with detailed plans approved by Barrow RDC, or unless the RDC agrees that adequate facilities are available at existing works.

Industrial uses limited to light industry (as defined in the then current use classes order).

Detailed plans to be submitted and approved for all houses, roads and storm water drains before development commences.

Access made available at the points marked in the application.

A tree planting scheme to be prepared and approved by the Local Authority before the commencement of development, with trees to be maintained for ten years after planting.

This approval, and the plans which it refers to, only commit the developer to make provision for central area services (though as has been noted, they had made undertakings to provide the village hall from their own funds), rather than to provide them, and the only provision to which Jelson Ltd. were committed was that of a new sewage works. Unlike Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, the developers were not required to provide or contribute to any off site infrastructure, notably road improvements. This considerably reduced the costs of building the village, and the costs laid out in building work prior to house sales.

Whilst the planning of East Goscote had proceeded relatively smoothly and quickly, the opposition to it was beginning to build from the neighbouring villages of Queniborough and Rearsby. This opposition crystallised around the establishment of a separate, new parish for East Goscote, and also about the confirmation of the name for the village. Initially, it was the parish council at Queniborough which became concerned about the new
parish, because most of the land which comprised it would be taken in turn from their own parish. Publicly, their fears were that the loss of land would reduce the parish rateable value (amounting to 174 acres, or one-tenth of its penny rate income), that they would be ‘cut off’ and made an ‘insignificant village’. The Queniborough Parish Council appears to have expected to be given jurisdiction over the new village, thus increasing their income and significance. Instead, it seems reasonable to assume that they feared being dwarfed by their new, larger neighbour, which, in terms of population, would become the most significant village in the area, usurping Queniborough’s primacy. At an inquiry held by Leicestershire County Council’s General Purposes Committee on July 22nd 1965, the parish council cited that the Boundary Commission favoured the integration of smaller parishes, whereas this involved the creation of a new one. They suggested that “if East Goscote stood alone it would be a characterless community. Queniborough, on the other hand, was a village of tradition and charm, where the newcomers would feel a sense of belonging.” The Boundary Commission argument seems inappropriate - the new parish was not simply splitting an existing population (only a handful of people actually lived in the area to be transferred before the construction of the new village), but making provision for a substantial new one. The Queniborough Parish Council appears to have made the assumption that many have made over the years about new settlements; that the new village could not develop any form of realistic self-identity, and would be without character. Moreover, it seems difficult to understand how the residents of East Goscote would be made welcome in a community when they were seen as ‘newcomers’, and by inference, outsiders.

The other two nearby villages tried to exert their control over the new village in a more symbolic way, by suggesting alternatives to the name, East Goscote, which Jelson’s and the press had been using since at least 1962. The chairman of the Ratcliffe Parish Meeting apparently suggested Wreakeby or Broomvale, whilst Rearsby Parish Council put forward Doddingthorne. The name East Goscote was, nevertheless, chosen, presumably
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54 Talbot, 1991, apparently quoting directly from contemporary newspaper cuttings (though these were not referenced or alluded to).
56 Evinced by all the contemporary documents and newspaper cuttings.
because it had already established itself through use. It also had substantial historical 
precedence in the area, as East Goscote was the name of the hundred (the medieval level of 
organisation between parish and county) which covered the Wreake valley area. It was in 
itsel itself claiming some historical legitimacy for the new village.

About fifty houses were complete by the end of 1965, and the first family moved into a 
house on Long Furrow just before Christmas of that year. However, until the order was 
made confirming the new parish on the 1st April 1967 (Ministry of Housing and Local 
Government Order No.26189, The County of Leicester (Parish of East Goscote) 
Confirmation Order, 1966), the new houses were still officially the responsibility of 
Queniborough Parish Council (the new parish was formed from 79ha of Queniborough 
parish, 14ha of Ratcliffe-on-the-Wreake parish, and 98ha of Rearsby parish, and 
incorporated the village itself, plus the disused gravel workings in the Wreake valley west 
of the village - a total of 27 persons lived in these parts of the three parishes in 1961). 
Whilst some street lights had been installed by the builders, but Queniborough Parish 
Council, although the responsible authority for lighting, and initially they refused to pay 
for the current for the lights in the new village. This appears to have been a final act of 
pique by the parish councillors of the old village.

East Goscote’s parish council was elected in 1967, and initially consisted of five 
individuals (though in more recent years it has consisted of ten members, reflecting the 
increased size of the village). The four men on the council were the village’s councillor on 
Barrow RDC (John Wilford), a teacher, an accountant and an engineer. The sole woman on 
the council was another teacher. It is notable that in a village that was to become 
dominated by skilled manual workers, its first elections to its parish council were 
predominantly in professional occupations.

The physical development of East Goscote appears to have proceeded in a relatively 
uncomplicated manner, though the speed of construction did not keep pace with the 
schedule produced in 1963, which had foreseen completion in six years from starting, by 
1971. The Local Education Authority opened the Broomfield County Primary School at

East Goscote in 1968, and from 112 pupils, had grown to 325 by 1972, and rising to over 500 in the late 70s (before falling to around 250 currently) thanks to the preponderance of young families in the village, itself a product of Jelson’s marketing policy. Jelson Ltd. constructed the first shops in 1967, and the first two tenancies, a greengrocer and a general store, were occupied in September of that year, followed by a newsagent, a butcher, a hairdresser and a haberdasher. The rent subsidy provided by Jelson’s appears to have been important in encouraging early tenancy, as trade in the early months was slow, though increased as time progressed, and more houses were completed and occupied. The East Goscote precinct of shops was always intended simply to serve local needs, rather than serving a sub-regional role, as at Bar Hill, and since the completion of a second group of four shops, supplementing the original six, the village has sustained these ten shops without the need for an anchor attraction such as a supermarket. The village hall was built in 1969 at the expense of the developer, and a large public house, with function rooms above, was also built by the developers, though paid for and to the specification of a brewery. Indeed, it is important to note that Jelson’s only provided the shops, village hall, sewage works and playing fields from their own funds, and of these the shops were a commercial venture for which commercial rents were charged once the village had grown sufficient to provide the necessary trade, and the sewage works were an essential condition of the permission. The parish council purchased the village green from Jelson’s in 1976, to secure the future of the land. The land for the school, library and old people’s home was sold to Leicestershire County Council at commercial rates, and the council themselves built the school and the home. Similar arrangements also applied to the garage and the church - Jelson’s only ever undertook to reserve sites. This is very different from both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, when far more was required from the developers in terms of planning gain. No new settlement developer would achieve such a favourable settlement in the current climate, where significant planning gain would be secured through the use of a Section 106 agreement.

Interviews with the headteacher and staff of the primary school at East Goscote.

Interview with Roy Longdon.

This account of events was compiled from a number of interview sources, primarily those with John Nixon and Roy Longdon.
Although a purpose built church building was not completed until 1975, paid for by the Anglican church, a vicar and church organisation had been present in East Goscote since the earliest days, and had been one of the first organisations active in the village, almost certainly predating the parish council. Services were initially held in the house of the first vicar, and then in the village hall. The church also published the community magazine from 1969 to 1982, when cost, and parish mergers stopped it. Thereafter, the church published its own parish magazine for more limited circulation, whilst the parish council took over the publication of the village magazine, by then called ‘Long Furrow’, after the name of the main circular road around East Goscote.62

Ling Dale Lodge, the old people’s home in the centre of the village, was built after the majority of the village was complete; started in 1980, but not completed until 1985, because the company building it went bankrupt. Not only is this a well-respected old people’s home within the county, but it also functions as an informal centre for services to other older people in the village. The existence of such a home, as well as the sheltered housing that was built more recently on the site originally reserved for the library (the land was sold to Charnwood Borough Council, who themselves developed the sheltered housing), provides a necessary contribution towards the balance of a village that would otherwise be even younger in its age structure (though as both the census data in chapter 4, and the survey data later in this chapter suggest, the population of East Goscote is ageing for other reasons, mainly the static nature of the original population). Though a site was reserved, the library was never built because of budget limitations and other priorities at Leicestershire County Council, though in 1992, a library was provided in a pre-fabricated building on the edge of the school site.65

Building and house sales at East Goscote were affected by the national economic problems in 1973, and the village was not substantially completed until 1978, some 13 years after the

63 Interviews with staff at Ling Dale Lodge.
64 Though as both the Census data describing population age structures in chapter 4, and the survey data later in this chapter suggest, the population of East Goscote is ageing for other reasons, mainly the static nature of the original population.
65 Interviews with Lyn Palmer, Parish Clerk, and Ron Jenkins.
first housing completions\textsuperscript{66}. Nevertheless, by new settlement terms, its completion was relatively quick and short of problems. This was helped by the retention of the site in one continuous ownership, but also because of the relative simplicity of the site, the limited obligations placed upon the developer, and the limited expectations in terms of design and environment evident in the approach of Jelson’s, and accepted by the Planning Authority. Once the sites in other ownership were incorporated and developed, just over 1000 houses were built on the site, mostly two and three bedroomed units, but also some four bedroomed houses. It is accepted by those involved that the greatest design effort went into the earlier stages of the village\textsuperscript{67}, and especially the areas within the Long Furrow ring, and that the areas outside of this, completed later, were built to far more conventional estate patterns. However, the earlier houses were often built with grouped garages, separate from houses, and these have posed the greatest problems with maintenance, and have often fallen into disrepair. Though the housing in East Goscote is often relatively conservative in design, and its built environment is only of mediocre quality, the houses have generally lasted well, and provided effective, spacious homes. This should not be underestimated in its significance - houses have to work first and foremost as places in which to live. Conventional house designs do have the advantage of offering familiar maintenance problems, and clearly understood demarcations of responsibility between public and private property. Despite the failure to secure the provision of a library until very recently, and the ongoing lack of medical facilities in the village, both of which have exasperated residents, the development has secured the provision of a range of other social, community and commercial facilities. These have their shortcomings - the village hall and the church are showing the consequences of being built down to a price, as does the immediate environment around the shops. Perhaps the most obvious failing is in the landscaping of the site, for whilst private gardens are beginning to mature, and soften the edges of housing areas, the public spaces are marked by a lack of trees and other planting, both to soften the landscape, and to break up its flat topography. This was recognised as a key need in the original permission, and the 1981 Wreake Valley Local Plan also suggested, three years after building was completed that there was “considerable potential for environmental

\textsuperscript{66}Interview with Roy Longdon. 
\textsuperscript{67}Interview with John Nixon.
improvement in the village through tree planting and landscaping schemes. The comment would still be appropriate today.

If we are to judge by the feedback from the questionnaire survey amongst households, the level of satisfaction regarding the design of East Goscote is quite high, though hardly unanimous. But caution is required, because to be a resident is already to be part of a self-selected group—it neither includes those who looked but did not move in, nor those who moved in and moved out again. There remains a substantial minority of residents who describe the built environment using terms like ‘legoland’, and who are critical of bland and boring design (this term ‘legoland’ also emerged independently at Martlesham Heath, used mainly by non-residents as a disparaging remark about the village). The majority view is far more positive, citing the quality of the environment as a function of the care which individual residents take of their property, and appreciate the mature gardens and trees on the site, and the changes made to individual houses which have created variety and colour. Few who have them appreciate the blocks of garages which are separate from the houses, both for reasons of access and security, and other major complaints concern dog-fouling (a ubiquitous complaint that would be recognised by every parish and district councillor, and most council officers in the country), and those residents who do not maintain their property, as well as the poor quality of the environment around the shopping centre.

East Goscote suffers in the design of its built environment from being a flat site, with the consequence that it will always have a tendency to look boring and bleak. Likewise the fact that all the housing was built within a twelve year period by the same developer would not appear to bode well for high quality environmental design. In retrospect, the circular road around the site, whilst acceptable from a traffic engineering point of view, is hardly conducive to road safety, given that it makes a very tempting race track. Given these criticisms, twenty-five years of being lived in have softened East Goscote. As well as the variety created by individualisation of houses, and the softening effect of mature vegetation, the very fact that the buildings are no longer new has given them a greater
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68 Charnwood Borough Council, 1981.
69 The discussion which follows is derived primarily from the household questionnaire survey undertaken, the nature of which is described earlier in the chapter.
sense of belonging within the wider environment- their wider impact is less stark and glaring. Another fifty years of gentle erosion and weathering might even give them a certain picturesque attraction.

**Social organisation**

The household questionnaire survey asked the length of time respondents had lived in East Goscote (it is worth noting at this point that the research was carried out early in 1992, and as such, the time periods referred to are based on that date). This is, of course, a useful measure of residential stability or mobility. From the sample of 66 households, it emerged that the average length of time resident in East Goscote was 14 years, over half the age of the earliest parts of the settlement. Of the 66, 24 households had been in East Goscote for between 20 and 24 years (ie. they had arrived there between 1967 and 1972), and a further 14 had been there between 15 and 19 years (dating their arrivals between 1972 and 1977). Thus 58% of the sample had been resident in East Goscote for over 15 years. A typical family, from this evidence, would have moved in as a young couple, sometimes with a small child or children. If finances allowed at the time, the family may well have moved into the house they occupy now, though many reported having moved into a smaller house in the settlement, and then moved on to a larger property after a period of two or three years. The major attraction of East Goscote appears to have been the availability there of relatively cheap and plentiful housing, at a time of high demand. Certainly the prices in East Goscote were substantially below those in Queniborough, Rearsby or Ratcliffe (or indeed any other exurban village around Leicester). This is clear enough from contemporary house advertisements in the press\(^7\): East Goscote prices were comparable to those in suburban Leicester, and below those of the most desirable suburbs. The earliest incoming families now have children either just completing their education, or who have

\(^7\)For example, an advertisement in the Leicester Mercury of June 30th 1966 prices houses at East Goscote at £2825, and provides a list of other sites in and around Leicester and Leicestershire. The East Goscote price is in the low to middle range of cost. This remains the case for much of the time of the construction of the village, though there is evidence later that prices rose after construction was complete. An advertisement in the Leicester Mercury of 14.6.86 describes an East Goscote house as being in "a village location". This is undoubtedly estate agent's hyperbole, but must have been vaguely credible at the time. By the 1980s, it appears that East Goscote was placed in about the mid-range of the local housing market, an analysis supported by evidence from local interviews.
jobs of their own, and the family units are beginning to break up. This has implications which are discussed later. Despite this evidence of current stability, at least one source suggests that in its earliest days, East Goscote was a relatively transient place, with many people moving in and out\textsuperscript{71}. Thus, it appears, a sorting process went on in the first few years, with many of the original incomers moving on (for a range of reasons, we presume, some connected with East Goscote, and others not), whilst others, finding the house and the village convenient and sufficiently pleasant, stayed to form the nucleus of the established population.

Only five households in the sample had been in East Goscote between 10 and 14 years (1977-82), but there appeared to be larger numbers who had moved in more recently than that, with 12 households who had moved in between 5 and 9 years previously (1982-1987), five of which had moved in eight years previously, and 11 households who had arrived within the last four years. When the year by year figures are examined, four distinct peaks in the length of residence data can be seen (though with the small size of the sample these must be treated with some caution), the largest at 20-23 years (22 households), another at 16-17 years (9 households), two small peaks at 6 and 8 years (four and five households respectively), and one at 3 years (four households). These figures, of course, indicate those who moved in and stayed on, not the total volume of people moving in, many of whom may have subsequently left; nor can we find out why those who did not stay moved out, or when. Nevertheless these figures seem to suggest several waves of mobility, diminishing in size as the settlement aged, which will have complex roots in housing supply on the village, external push factors, and waves of economic prosperity and recession.

\textit{Catchment areas and circulation patterns}

Respondents were also asked where they moved from to come to East Goscote—essentially trying to establish the catchment area for the settlement. Each individual who was adult at the time of the move was counted separately, as many couples moved to East Goscote on marriage, and came from different places. What was immediately apparent was that the catchment area of East Goscote has been and continues to be relatively local, with the vast majority of respondents having moved within Leicestershire, the vast majority of those

\textsuperscript{71}Interview with the headteacher of the primary school.
from the city of Leicester or its immediate suburbs, and within that group, mostly from the north-eastern areas of the city.

The most frequently cited origins were Syston (16), Leicester (central and unspecified) (12), Thurmaston (11), Belgrave (8), Birstall (6) and Scraptoft (6). Of these, Syston, Thurmaston and Birstall are residential suburbs on the north-eastern side of Leicester, which have strong functional links with East Goscote, Belgrave is close to the centre of Leicester, and has undergone substantial Asian in-migration in the last 20-30 years, with consequent ‘white flight’, and Scraptoft is a village now in the edge of suburbia on the east of the city. Most of Leicester’s suburbs were mentioned by one or two respondents, along with occasional mentions for villages in the Soar and Wreake valleys. A handful had come from Nottingham and its satellites, with long-distance moves from Essex, London, Stockton, Huddersfield and Newcastle-under-Lyme also cited. It is interesting to note that not one respondent mentioned Loughborough in this context, despite its proximity and size (apart from Leicester, it is by far the nearest large town, the only comparable place being Melton Mowbray, which itself was only cited once). Whilst it was clear that for the residents who had been there longer, their move to East Goscote had been a move to the urban fringe from the city and its suburbs, for more recent arrivals, there was some evidence of moves from smaller villages by younger people, unable to afford property in their home village. For them, East Goscote served the purpose of providing cheaper property within distance of their parental homes, often rationalised as a move away from the confines of small village life. There was also some small evidence of second generation East Goscote residents\footnote{Also supported by interviews at the primary school.}, as well as extensive evidence from other parts of the questionnaire that parents had joined children or vice-versa in living in the settlement.

The simplest circulation pattern which emerged from this research was that concerning retail (shopping) destinations for households. Households were asked where they went for convenience shopping, for their weekly food shop, and to shop for less frequently purchased items, anything from clothes to furniture (in effect asking them which of the major towns or cities they used for non-food shopping trips). Households often mentioned

\footnote{Also supported by interviews at the primary school.}
several destinations for at least one of these, and each of these was counted in compiling the relative popularity of shopping destinations.

Within this, the circulation pattern revealed for convenience shopping destinations was the simplest of the three, with most respondents either giving only one answer, or claiming not to 'convenience shop'. The commonest destination, unsurprisingly, was East Goscote, with 41 respondents saying that they used the local shops of the settlement. The next most frequent answer was Syston, with five respondents citing it, followed by Leicester (3- all because they did convenience shopping whilst in the city for work), with Queniborough, Sileby and Coalville all mentioned once. This is essentially what would be expected-'corner shop' shopping, with proximity as a key factor. What also emerged from the questionnaire and interview work was that the shops were a crucial social theatre for the residents of East Goscote- a place to meet people, to share local news and gossip, and for communication of events and meetings via notices in shop windows. Not only that, but the small mall of shops has become a political issue in East Goscote, partially because it has become a centre for the youth delinquency which is seen as the settlement's foremost problem, but also because its condition is a subject of dispute between the original developers, Jelson Ltd., who are still owners and landlords, and the parish council, who want environmental improvements made (and indeed, have tried to do so of their own accord, only to be prevented by auditors, because the amount they wished to spend on improvements was too much to use on one item in one financial year).73

The pattern of responses concerning weekly food shopping proved equally distinct, but substantially different. What is important to note is that people's loyalties in this respect were as much tied to particular retailers as to places. Were the retailer to move, or the respondent convinced that another retailer might be better, they would go elsewhere, substantially disrupting any assumptions about the socio-spatial significance of people's consumer choice. We are, to the greatest extent in this category, working with the 'non-place realm'. Given this proviso, there is still some significance to the locations of the most popular choices. These are Syston (34 citations) and Thurmaston (20 citations)- the peri-urban suburbs on the north-east of Leicester. Next most frequently mentioned was the

73Interviews with Lyn Palmer, Parish Clerk, Ron Jenkins and other members of the parish council.
centre of Leicester (9), a function of work linkages (shopping done by one or other partner in the household after work in the city) and the city's pre-eminence as the regional centre for East Goscote. Other significant occurrences were Beaumont Leys (a suburb on the north of Leicester) which was cited six times, purely because of the location of one major out-of-town supermarket there, and Melton Mowbray, cited five times, preferred by some as a shopping destination for which parking and access were thought easier. Loughborough, about as far from East Goscote as Melton, was only mentioned twice, pointing up the weak functional linkages between Goscote and Loughborough, despite the latter's status as the main town of Charnwood Borough, in which East Goscote is situated.

When respondents were asked which centres they used for non-food shopping, they often gave more than one answer, but even then, the clarity of the retail pattern was not obscured. Indeed, the question appeared to emphasise the pre-eminence of Leicester as the city to which East Goscote looks both functionally and socially. It was cited a total of 58 times, its nearest competitor being Nottingham, cited 15 times. Given the proximity of Leicester in comparison to Nottingham, this is perhaps not surprising, but the difference would have perhaps been greater had Leicester not suffered from the perception of being crowded, a difficult place to drive into and find parking spaces, and with fewer shops and less choice than Nottingham. It was the problems associated with Leicester that caused small numbers of respondents not only to use Nottingham as a shopping centre, but also to use smaller centres such as Melton (mentioned nine times), and Loughborough (mentioned seven times). Interestingly, few respondents seemed attracted by the out of town shopping facilities at Fosse Park, at junction 22 of the M1- only one respondent cited it for non-food shopping, and only two for food shopping.

Hence, in retail terms, East Goscote functions very much as a satellite of Leicester. This is partly a result of proximity and convenience, but also because its residents, by and large, have strong connections with the city; both functional, in terms of employment, and socially, in terms of their personal and family histories. Whilst all new settlements, and certainly the three studied in this research, function as satellites to larger cities or towns, the compactness of East Goscote's circulation patterns appear distinctive; a product of the lower levels of mobility in Leicestershire than in the south-east, the relative speed with which East Goscote was settled, that its houses were only sold to a local market by a
regional housebuilder, and the market to which these houses were sold, which was itself composed of socio-economic groups who are typically less geographically mobile. Present and future new settlements are unlikely to be aimed at (in marketing terms), or to appeal to, the same socio-economic groups that colonised East Goscote some twenty years ago, setting the seal on its social structure.

It is important to emphasise the strong links that East Goscote appears to have with Syston74, in addition to the links with Leicester. As there are no medical facilities (doctors, dentists etc.) in East Goscote, residents have to go elsewhere for these services. Almost without exception, residents are attached to the health centre at Syston, although one or two use dentists closer to their place of work, or in their previous place of residence. Whilst this is a function of proximity and provision, it reinforces the links that East Goscote has with its neighbour in other respects, not only in terms of service, retail and leisure provision, but also in terms of personal ties. It has already been noted that many of East Goscote's residents moved there from Syston, often using Syston as a stepping stone from inner Leicester, but many residents also plan to move back there at some point. For some, there is still an aspiration to use East Goscote as a stepping stone on to a ‘real’ village, though for many, this has been an aspiration harboured for many years, and never achieved, either through inertia, or lack of resources. For many of the middle aged families, it has become something to do ‘when we retire’. But many others see a move back to their roots in Syston as inevitable- the supply of houses which would appeal as homes to retire to in East Goscote is limited, whereas this is not so in Syston. For these people, a move to a village has never been a realistic option, either financially or socially.

An ageing population
It appears obvious from the Census data, and has been realised by some residents, that East Goscote faces significant demographic change in future years, a consequence of the fact that large numbers of its present residents moved in at a similar time, and are at very much the same stage in their lives. This has implications in terms of community facility provision for particular groups within the population, as well as for the balance of house type provision in the settlement. East Goscote was originally conceived to cater for the

74A small town, about a mile from East Goscote, and part of the suburban edge of Leicester.
needs of first time buyers and young families, and this in the late sixties and early seventies. As the population has aged, there has emerged an apparent mismatch between demand and provision, with, if anything, an oversupply of facilities for young families, young mothers and their children, and an under-supply of facilities for older adults and adolescents. As a result, adults have had less involvement with the community as they have got older, and have in many cases looked to social involvement outside of East Goscote, whilst adolescents have had little to occupy themselves, and a small minority have become involved in petty vandalism. It would be wrong to suggest that this is entirely the result of facility provision - it is normal for adults to become more home centred in their activities once they have families (and once their children are past the mothers and toddlers / crèche / playgroup stage, they have less to call upon the community for, and their contact with community structures will be less). There have also been attempts to start youth groups to cater for the adolescents in the settlement, without success.

More crucially perhaps, many of the long term residents of East Goscote are entering later middle age, and the departure of their children from the family home is imminent, if it has not already happened. For many, though not for all, the family home will be too large, and they may wish to move to different type of house, possibly a bungalow, with a view to settling into active retirement. To do so, they may need, or wish, to move out of East Goscote, leaving a large number of houses to be occupied by new residents. This will affect the stability of the settlement, and a new cohort of arrivals may again change the nature of it. To what extent this scenario takes shape depends on how many families decide to leave the village, and over what period of time.

The uses made by residents of the village’s social facilities, and their wider social circulation patterns were also examined by the household survey. In addition to specifically religious uses, the church centre is used for mothers and toddlers groups, and for a crèche—virtually all the families in East Goscote have made use of these facilities at some time or another, though for most it was something well in the past, and the connection for many people with the church hall or the village hall was minimal. Both the
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75Partly a result of the sales policy of Jelson Ltd.
76Bishop & Hoggett, 1986.
77Interview with Rev. Dr. D.F. Brewin.
church and the village hall profess a wide range of user groups and events, but the questionnaire process did not pick up any great evidence of use by the population. A similar story could be told of the pub- the majority of those questioned profess never to use it (they either do not use pubs, or used others in neighbouring villages), and those that did were in the vast majority male. The most likely places to meet other residents, if one is to go by the questionnaire responses, are the shops, or out walking the dog.

The social lives of people in East Goscote seem, unsurprisingly, to have extended beyond the boundaries of the settlement to sports facilities in the centre of Leicester, or at Wreake Valley College, on the edge of Queniborough. Church attendance patterns, for those so involved, seem to have far more to do with denominational allegiance than to community allegiance; and people choose their clubs, pubs and social groups of various sorts far more on atmosphere and personal preference than proximity. Moreover, many households professed to having little formal social involvement beyond their immediate family, and informal connections with friends.

This is the product of a increasingly mobile society, in an essentially urban area. The social circulation of people does not remain within the area of the settlement, but rather uses a much larger area, and a whole range of facilities in other settlements. Secondly, the majority age group in the settlement is that which has a much more home centred and informal expression of its social interaction. Nevertheless, it seems somewhat contradictory that there is much evidence of full programmes of events in church rooms and at the village hall, but less evidence of usage from questionnaire returns. But we are here falling into the trap of envisaging East Goscote as in some way homogeneous or monolithic. One of the lessons of the community studies school is that under any veneer or presumption of unanimity within a village community lie a multiplicity of divisions. This is so in East Goscote.
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78See Cohen, 1985, for a wider discussion of the way in which communities present a united face to the external world, whilst concealing a more complex and fragmented picture within.
Defining village life

When I first met with the parish council, a member of that council remarked that he would 'be pleased to see the results, because you might find out what people won't say to me'. Thus he recognised, even if he would not have said so directly, that there were divisions within the settlement, contrary to the unitary positive picture he had initially painted. As one might expect, there are a broad range of views, and East Goscote is far from simply bipartisan, but the poles of the spectrum can perhaps be characterised as the community builders, and the community avoiders. Unsurprisingly, it is the community builders who appear to run the village, forming a core of people on the parish council, in the church, and linked in with the old people's home. This group promotes the village identity of East Goscote, and reject any suggestion that it is simply an estate, or not a 'proper' village. They are by nature joiners and doers, encouraging others to join in 'village life', and to support local events, and attempt to engender greater general responsibility within East Goscote, using the parish magazine to criticise those who do not paint their garage doors, or who allow their dogs to foul communal spaces. The atmosphere they engender is one of earnest, slightly paternalist self-help and responsibility. The issues they espouse at local level - those above, as well as concern about youth delinquency, providing play areas for children, and a Christmas bonus for pensioners out of the parish precept, do indicate a sense of their assumed responsibility for community welfare.

In contrast, the community avoiders paint the community builders as self-aggrandising, interfering and ineffectual, or else simply ignore them. There is no doubt some truth to their view, as at their worst the community builders can be intrusive, setting themselves up as the moral arbiters of their 'village'. But the community avoiders are not linked by a common ideal, as are the community builders - their only link is that they have, or want, nothing to do with a village based community life. They may be recent arrivals, with stronger connections elsewhere, and confused by the internal politics of East Goscote; they may have developed strong social lives outside of the settlement; they may have had disagreements or fallen out with members of the 'ruling group'; or they may simply see the whole 'village community' ideal as sham, and reject it - there are many reasons why the community avoiders have little to do with the formal organisation of what goes on in East Goscote. There are of course, vast numbers of the residents who cannot be classified easily
as either builders or avoiders - their attitudes waver between support and cynicism, depending on the issue, and recent experience.

Most of the people of East Goscote have climbed in socio-economic terms - they have, by acquiring skills and working hard, achieved financial security and in many cases, a degree of moderate wealth. They are, almost by definition, home owners, and politically would have been natural allies of the eighties Tory party\(^80\) - probably the crucial skilled working class vote which swung to the right in 1979. Education, therefore, is a way for their children to continue the progress that they have achieved. Some families appear to see the next step up for their offspring via formal academic qualifications (a substantial group of the 16-18 year olds encountered had aspirations of university, polytechnic or higher education of some sort - subjectively this seemed more common among the women), whilst others have obtained similar skills to their parents, examples including plumbers and car mechanics (more common amongst the men). Women in East Goscote, by and large, have stayed at home and raised children, only going out to work when the children were old enough, and then to low skill jobs such as checkout assistants. Men, conversely, seem to have taken to the traditional role of breadwinner, more usually in manual trades. However, the household survey encountered both men and women with non-manual skills, and higher levels of academic education than is the norm, including those in high status technical and professional roles.

It can be said with some certainty that East Goscote has developed a recognisable identity and community life, which is recognised by most of its residents, even if they choose not to take part in it. Indeed, as the former vicar suggested\(^81\), East Goscote certainly has a greater sense of community than many older villages, which may look the part, but where contact between residents, and a sense of belonging, is far less. The identity which the village has developed borrows little from history, apart from the village name, but owes much to decisions made in the early years about the target market for house sales, and the consequent origins of the people who moved into the new village, attracted from the centre

\(^79\)Interview with Ron Jenkins.
\(^80\)The district councillor himself was initially elected as a Liberal, but moved to the Conservative party whilst in office.
\(^81\)Interview with Rev. Dr. D.F. Brewin.
of Leicester by low house prices and an exurban, if not truly rural, location. It illustrates, as the other two case study sites do, the resilience of the community ideal, and the way in which it is shaped by those that build and plan, and those that populate, new settlements. The people who now live in East Goscote are of urban origin and culture, but in this new environment, have shaped an identity for themselves and their place of residence which is distinct from Leicester and nearby villages, but which remains, functionally, linked to both.
Chapter 6
Bar Hill

Introduction
Both East Goscote and Martlesham Heath existed as windfall sites before the concept of developing new settlements on them was mooted. The new settlement concept emerged as a practical and profitable way of utilising these specific sites. In contrast, the concept of a new village in Cambridgeshire, which became Bar Hill, existed before a specific site was chosen. Bar Hill emerged from a policy context for Cambridge which had been established in the immediate post-war era, and which, in the early 60s, had fallen upon the concept of new villages as another way of dealing with the continuing problem of the expansion of Cambridge. It was only when the policy existed that the site of Bar Hill was chosen.

Bar Hill differed from both East Goscote and Martlesham Heath for a second key reason. Whilst the latter two sites were both private sector initiatives, the initiative for Bar Hill was in the public sector, with Cambridgeshire County Council, though development was carried out by private companies. Thus Bar Hill emerged from public planning policy, in a long-term, strategic context. In stark comparison to East Goscote (which is only slightly smaller) which was being developed at the same time, Bar Hill was surrounded with a great deal of academic and planning thought, and was the subject of extensive attention in the specialist architectural and local government press of the time. Despite this, it was racked with financial difficulties, delays, changes of ownership, and legal problems - so much so that building was not complete until the early 1990s. In many ways, Bar Hill could serve as an example of precisely how not to develop a new settlement.

Like both of the other sites, and especially Martlesham Heath, Bar Hill was the product of a few key personalities, despite its public sector beginnings. The primary personality, and the equivalent of Martlesham’s Chris Parker, was W. Leathley Waide, the then Chief Planning Officer at Cambridgeshire County Council. Indeed, not only was Waide responsible for Bar Hill, but his efforts also gave Chris Parker the idea for using the
Martlesham Heath site as a new settlement. And, as both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath are still cited today as seminal new settlements, it may be suggested with good reason that it was with Waide that the current new settlements movement began, even if the same idea had occurred at the same time to an obscure provincial housebuilder in Leicester. The differences was that Jelson Ltd never wrote academic articles, or courted the specialist press.

**Policy background**

As Waide describes in his proof of evidence to the Bar Hill public enquiry held in December 1963, the policy context into which the site emerged was the one conceived by Sir William Holford between 1948 and 1950, enshrined in the Statutory Development Plan for the County published in 1952, and approved by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government in September 1954. It is ironic to note that what was established in 1954 by this plan was, in effect a unitary development plan for Cambridgeshire, and planning in Cambridge and its county then became a plan-led system. Its downfall was perhaps its inflexibility, and its attempt to 'buck the market', which led to many of Bar Hill's subsequent problems.

Cambridge’s immediate post-war planning problems were essentially those that afflict the city now - significant pressures for growth on a town whose medieval core was already deemed to be crowded beyond capacity. Holford’s plan was, in simple terms, to restrict the growth of the city, and to stabilise its population at about the 100,000 mark (in 1951, the population of the city of Cambridge was 89,410, and had grown to 94,740 by 1961; today it is estimated at about 100,200). Growth was to be redirected to surrounding villages, so that they expanded, rather than the city. This expansion was intended both for villages which were satellites of Cambridge, and also for those further out. Crucially, it was intended to decant industry and services along with the population. Implicit in the plan was a redirection of growth to market towns such as Huntingdon, Peterborough, Newmarket and Ely, which were then outside the county boundary (and the friction between Cambridge and Newmarket, still in Suffolk now, over the scale of development between
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1Interview with Chris Parker.
2Waide, 1963.
them, is still an issue today). By 1957, the Holford plan was supplemented by a green belt around Cambridge.

The Holford plan caused as many problems as it solved; indeed it was a victim of its own success. Growth was initially directed to a ring of villages around Cambridge (known at the time as Town Map No. 2, and comprising places such as Grantchester, Girton, Impington, Milton and Fulbourn, as well as several smaller villages, such as Madingley). The target population figure for the growth of these villages was reached in 1964, though it was not forecast to reach these targets until 1971.

As now, Cambridge sits on the periphery of the south-east region, and was subject to very great development pressure. There were restrictions upon new industrial development, except for firms already established in the area, and yet unemployment remained well below the national average of the time, which was itself a fraction of today’s levels. Against this buoyant economic situation, the plans for the growth of Cambridge and its environs had failed to forecast the high rates of natural population growth in the late fifties and early sixties (the so called ‘baby boom’). Nearly all the private sector housebuilding during that period took place outside the city, in the villages, whilst the building in Cambridge was mainly by the local authority, replacing older slum housing, and repairing war damage.

According to commentators at the time (notably Waide’s successor as Chief Planning Officer, Brian Mellor, writing in 1966), there were essentially three problems which resulted from this surge in growth in the villages. The first was the distribution of the growth which was occurring in the county. The Holford plan had recognised the tendency for growth to occur south of Cambridge, rather than to the north, and this had persisted in the new growth. Thus whilst the dispersal of growth from the city had been successful, much of the growth which resulted in the villages was felt to be satisfying the demands of out-migration from the south-east, and not just the redirection of development pressure from Cambridge. As the demands of out-migration from the south-east region were seen essentially as insatiable, and counter productive to the orderly development of
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3Cambridgeshire County Council, 1985; Mellor, 1966a.
4Mellor, 1966a, 1966b.
Cambridgeshire, it was seen as necessary to find ways of encouraging growth to the north of the city, where it would serve the needs of the expanding population of the Cambridge city-region, and not that of the south-east as a whole.

Secondly, growth over and above that predicted had placed increased pressure upon the provision of utilities to villages in Cambridgeshire. There were particular problems in providing main drainage to serve much of the new growth. At the time, only fifty percent of the county had main drainage, and there was only capacity for marginal growth in many areas. Whilst there was a programme for new works, there had been a certain time lag in bringing facilities on stream. The third, and perhaps most acute problem was that of the impact of the growth on the villages themselves. Whilst there had generally been reasonable plans for the provision of educational and social facilities to the expanding villages (the policy of village colleges for secondary education was as the time innovatory, and well thought of\(^5\)), there was a great deal of concern that the levels of new building were in danger of damaging the character of the villages. This was thought to be partially a result of the sheer volume of growth, but also one of the unsympathetic design of much of the new housing and industry.

**The rationale for new settlements**

New settlements were seen as part of the ongoing solution to the problems caused both by development pressures upon Cambridge, and the problems caused by the policy devised to deal with this growth\(^6\). There are several important reasons to look at the rationale for new settlements, and the justification for the selection of the site at Bar Hill Farm. Firstly, the understanding of this policy is crucial in understanding what subsequently happened at Bar Hill, and secondly, because Bar Hill served as both an inspiration and a cautionary example for Martlesham Heath, and because both of these are still cited today as examples of new settlement development, the rationale for new settlements in Cambridgeshire has had ramifications for many other sites, and over the intervening thirty years. Finally, because there are strong resonances between the justification for new settlements in Cambridgeshire, and the arguments put forward contemporaneously for state new towns;
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\(^5\)Interview with Bill Norton.

\(^6\)Waide, 1963; Mellor, 1966a, 1966b.
thus the assumptions of the Bar Hill case form a useful bridge between the prior history of thought running from garden cities through to new towns, and the history of thought about new settlements which has developed subsequently.\(^7\)

**The new settlement solution**

According to Waide's proof of evidence\(^8\), it was a Councillor Randall, a farmer who had been a member of the County Planning Committee since its inception in 1948, who first suggested that concentrating some of the county's development into 'new village communities' might solve some of the problems caused by the Holford plan, and outlined above. Waide does not say in what context this idea emerged, or what rationale Randall placed his idea, but we might surmise that Randall saw not only a planning solution, but a way of maximising the value of farmland. There is no indication that the landowner at Bar Hill farm was connected either with Waide or Randall, but rumours persist to this day that the selection of Bar Hill as the site of the first new settlement in Cambridgeshire had other reasons than purely planning, and it was pointed out in the course of interviews that Waide had retired by 1966.\(^9\)

Waide established four parameters for all future development in the county. Although these were not intended specifically to apply to new settlements, the assumption is clear that they would best fit such a model. The parameters were as follows:\(^10\):

\(a\). use the existing public services to the full;

\(b\). reduce to a minimum the costs falling on the community by new development;

\(c\). secure that the distribution pattern was best suited to the future long term needs of the County;

\(^7\)The continuity of ideas which runs from garden cities, through state new towns, and finally to new settlements, is discussed more fully in Chapter 2.

\(^8\)Waide, 1963.

\(^9\)For reasons of confidentiality, the source of this suggestion has to remain anonymous. However, the issue was followed up with other interviewees without finding corroborating evidence. However, the circumstantial evidence is still intriguing. Brian Mellor had, of course, succeeded Waide as Chief Planning Officer by 1966, as his authorship of two papers in the journal *Official Architecture and Planning* (Mellor, 1966a, 1966b) confirms.

\(^10\)Waide, 1963, page 6, paragraph 32.
d. secure a major improvement in the standard of layout and design of new development.

The latter three parameters are the most crucial. Waide wanted to redirect development away from the south of Cambridge towards the north-west, impose stricter standards of design and layout (and hence he wanted more direct control by the County over these issues), and he wanted the development itself to be organised so that the provision of community infrastructure, and its maintenance, would be internally funded, rather than being a drain on the public purse.

**Theoretical assumptions**

However, much of Waide's argument in his proof of evidence is concerned with justifying the choice of the particular site of Bar Hill for new settlement development, and it was left to Wyndham Thomas, then director of the TCPA, and an associate of Waide's, to present the broader theoretical justification for new settlements in his proof. Not only are Thomas's arguments fascinating, but his active participation in the inquiry is also an intriguing link with the work and ideas of the TCPA as discussed in Chapter 2. Thomas's discussion takes as its core the concept of the city-region, and the assumption that what was to occur at Bar Hill was simply another version of the new towns policy, but on a different scale to that practised for London, because of the differing scales of the two central cities of the city-regions in question. As Thomas clearly said, "a different scale of problem requires a different scale - not kind - of solution".

As demonstrated by the discussion in Chapter 2, there was an ideological assumption made by the advocates of new towns that such towns were intrinsically better in social terms than old established towns and cities, as well as more efficient, and better in aesthetic and functional terms. This assumption was carried over by Thomas to the idea of a smaller new settlement. He states on the first page of his proof that "the social advantages [of new settlements] are much superior conditions for family life and an increased degree of civic and community consciousness, and of participation in communal life". In 1963, the
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12Thomas 1963, p1, para 5.
denouement of such modernist\textsuperscript{14} optimism was not far away, but such idealism drove both the new towns movement, and the beginnings of new settlement development. The difference was, of course, that whilst new towns were an established and widely discussed concept, Bar Hill merely hung onto their conceptual coat tails in order to give itself greater legitimacy and a wider context. Nevertheless, there is much in Thomas's discussion which is rational and commendable even in the unforgiving light of hindsight.

By the early sixties, the concept of self-sufficiency, as developed by Howard, had been substantially rethought, so that Thomas did not expect towns of 100,000 people to be entirely self-sufficient, and certainly not a settlement of Bar Hill's size. Instead, the formula Thomas adopted was that all new settlements, regardless of the size "should, to the fullest extent possible having regard to their size and situation, provide for the daily requirements of their inhabitants; schools, shops, play-areas, commercial and public services, and employment\textsuperscript{15}. The key phrase here is the caveat regarding size and situation - whilst the TCPA were aware that absolute self-sufficiency was unobtainable, and that there would be a socio-economic dialogue between any new settlement and the existing urban fabric, there was still a strong desire not to advocate dormitory satellites, but rather functional sub-centres in a wider matrix.

Thomas saw several benefits resulting from the building of a new settlement, the first being that separation from the central city, despite its proximity thereto, should foster "a sense of place and belonging\textsuperscript{16}, which he felt should engender higher levels of local concern and participation in local affairs. More controversially, he suggested that "the maintenance of social order (or the rules of good behaviour) is easier in small communities\textsuperscript{17}. This 'small is good' philosophy is displayed elsewhere in the proof, and is evidently an underlying assumption made by Thomas. His argument is that in small communities, people know each other, and anonymity is reduced, and that this in some way encourages 'good neighbourliness'. Such an assumption is predicated on the restriction of the social world to the settlement under consideration, yet in the wider urban

\textsuperscript{14}See the broader discussion concerning the modern / post-modern turn in Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{15}Thomas, 1963, p1, paragraph 3.

\textsuperscript{16}Thomas, 1963, p2, paragraph 8i.

\textsuperscript{17}Thomas, 1963, p2, paragraph 8i.
matrix which he accepts is the basis for all interaction, social networks would extend in a complex manner throughout a wider area, and would be based on other factors than proximity. Indeed, Thomas seemed uncertain of this argument himself; and says in his proof that this “is an aspect of social planning I do not wish to stress in...this inquiry”\(^\text{18}\).

Alas, copies of any cross-examination which went on at the inquiry do not survive, so we do not know whether his musings on social organisation were questioned or accepted.

Thomas was on firmer ground when he discussed the advantages of small settlement size in another context. He stated that “the village... will provide a clear choice between environments”, and argued that new settlements provided an alternative to town life. He felt that a small new settlement would be qualitatively better than the alternatives, which he characterised dourly as “a world increasingly dominated by big towns, big buildings and big organisations”\(^\text{19}\). Whilst his assertion that small is necessarily better must be questionable, the concept that new settlements offer a new and distinct choice to people, which is qualitatively different to anything else, is a useful one. If people choose new settlements in a positive manner (and it appears from the case studies in this thesis that they did, certainly in the earlier years, as pioneers, and do now, because the new settlements are still perceived as different), then we can be sure that they are making a commitment to that lifestyle, and in that sense, may be more willing to contribute to and to protect both the physical and social environment.

Wyndham Thomas was still a voice of his age, however, when discussing the issue of social diversity. He notes the intention of the village to provide housing for a wide range of income groups, occupations and family sizes, partly by providing some housing for council tenancy. He suggests that this would provide “a much greater social diversity than is characteristic of city suburbs”. Moreover, he posits that this will provide for another feature of traditional village life, “the mixing of classes not through physical proximity but by virtue of shared interests and activities”\(^\text{20}\).

\(^{18}\)Thomas, 1963, p2, paragraph 8i.

\(^{19}\)Thomas, 1963, p2, paragraph 8ii.

\(^{20}\)Thomas, 1963, p2, paragraph 8ii.
There are several issues here. Firstly there is the implicit assumption that social diversity is a legitimate and desirable aim of town planning. Yet it has been noted that in both East Goscote and Martlesham Heath, particular socio-economic groups tend to predominate in each settlement (with a pattern which is different for each settlement) - that is, a particular type, or series of types of people, are choosing to live in new settlements. Indeed, Thomas implies just such a choice elsewhere in his submission, as has already been noted. Secondly, there is the assertion that there would be a greater degree of social diversity in a new settlement than in a city suburb. This is surely questionable, even if only in the light of subsequent experience from new settlement developments. Thirdly, it would seem obvious that what was being attempted at Bar Hill was precisely the mixing of classes through physical proximity, whether or not there were also shared interests and activities which cut across class boundaries. The egalitarianism is perhaps laudable, but the manner of its achievement seems woefully thought out, and with cloyingly patrician overtones. At best there are strong overtones of top-down social management evident throughout Thomas's submission.

Perhaps the greatest discontinuity between current thinking, and that which prevailed in 1963, is evident in the submissions of both Waide\textsuperscript{21} and Thomas\textsuperscript{22}. This is the manner in which the car, and the traffic congestion generated thereby, is handled. The county council plan, as outlined by Waide, envisaged the redirection of growth by creating a growth pole (Bar Hill) in an area of the Cambridge city-region where growth was relatively low, and roads relatively uncongested. Nevertheless, Bar Hill implied the dispersal of population, economic activity and development away from the city of Cambridge, and into more distant areas, as specified in planning policy. This was, in itself, expected to contribute to easing the city's traffic problems. What such a strategy did not countenance was the traffic generated by dispersal, not only in longer journeys to work, but also in the atomisation of such city centre functions as shopping to outer city locations, encouraging peri-urban growth and traffic movement. In short, new settlements such as Bar Hill may have

\textsuperscript{21}Waide, 1963.
\textsuperscript{22}Thomas, 1963.
addressed, albeit clumsily, social sustainability, but they did not address the issues of environmental sustainability.

The design and detailed planning of Bar Hill

Whilst it not intended to be a major theme of this chapter or of the thesis as a whole, there is a need for a brief discussion of the general design principles and layout of Bar Hill, both to put into context the later discussion (and especially to underline the extent to which original concepts were quickly compromised), and to indicate where design issues had social implications. The architects who were initially responsible for Bar Hill were Covell Matthews and Partners (subsequently to be referred to as CMP), whose partner in charge of the project was Brian Falk. Falk still practices now, and was hence a young man in comparison to Waide and other key personalities at the time of Bar Hill’s inception. He was a masters graduate of City Planning at Harvard, with some North American experience.

Falk’s proof of evidence to the public enquiry provides a fascinating timetable of events, and piecing this together with parts of Waide’s proof provides the following sequence of events. The site location had been decided upon by 1960, and possibly before this, as work on economic feasibility was underway by the latter part of that year. It appears that in May 1961, when the County Planning Committee were presented with the parameters for site selection, there already existed a fait accompli concerning the location of the site, even if the committee were not told so. Reading between the lines, it would appear that Waide and a few associates had decided upon the Bar Hill site prior to any consideration by the democratic process, and that councillors on the appropriate committees were given the impression of decision making, when in fact the papers presented to them were guiding them to rubber stamp a decision long since made by the County Planning Officer.

23 An issue which, in a contemporary context, has been addressed in relation to new settlements. See Lock, 1991 and Breheny, Gent & Lock, 1993.
24 In addition to his original proof of evidence to the enquiry, and the supporting plans and drawing supplied from his own archives, the discussion about Falk’s role in the development of Bar Hill is supplemented by information gained in an interview with him, in London, early in 1993.
An anonymous firm of London architects had assisted Waide with the work on economic viability, and had introduced an interested developer at this point (who were according to a Cambridgeshire County Council history of the site published in 1985, were a company called Walls, Hickman and Partners). These architects met the Planning Committee in June 1961, and obtained broad assent for their proposals, but the relationship broke down shortly afterwards because the developers were unwilling to provide all that the planning authority wished - it would appear they considered the county's aspirations to be unviable, or at least very risky. In Autumn 1961, the SPAN group and their architects examined the proposals, and apparently liked the concept, but not the site. Their plans for a new settlement at New Ash Green in Kent were unveiled a few days before the Bar Hill public enquiry.

Finally, in early 1962, Holland, Hannen and Cubitt (HHC), another developer, became involved, and it was they who appointed CMP on 14th February 1962. Thus HHC were the third development company approached by the county, and CMP the third set of architects who had considered the site, excluding the county architects themselves, who were also involved. If nothing else, this indicates a degree of caution by the private sector concerning the Bar Hill development.

Preliminary design proposals were submitted to the county in March 1962, though Waide does not mention that the target population at this time was only 2500 people, in comparison to the target of 3500-4000 people used by the time of the public enquiry at the end of the following year. By May 1963, the formal support of the County Planning Committee had been given, following the submission of an outline planning application in March. These plans were the subject of articles in the Architects Journal (24th April 1963), and the magazine of the National Parish Councils Association (1st July 1963), as well as featuring at the Town Planning Summer School Exhibition held in Cambridge that summer. A revised master plan was published in August 1963, and the final preliminary master plan, as presented to the enquiry, was issued on 30th September 1963.

28 Unlike the situation in East Goscote, where one developer, a regional housebuilder, Jelson Ltd., was involved from very early in the planning process, and saw the project through to completion.
The site of Bar Hill, some five miles from Cambridge on the A604 Huntingdon Road, totalled 345.1 acres, mostly on heavy clay, but with 60 acres closest to the road on Lower Greensand, and therefore of greater agricultural value. The site rose gently from the road, gaining 60' in altitude by the extremities of the site, with the village envisaged in two wings, occupying the rising land around a shallow valley at the village centre. Thus, design was at least partially determined by topography. It also determined the early social structure of the village, as house building began on both sides of the village centre, and football matches in the early days were based on teams drawn from each wing of the village. Despite the slopes within the village, however, the site was essentially rather open and windswept, with few existing trees. This was tacitly admitted in Falk’s description of the site. Thus whilst the natural slopes gave some scope for architectural creativity, the overall effect was hampered from the outset by the bleakness and openness of the site.

Falk’s proof of evidence raises two issues of great importance to Bar Hill, and to new settlement design in general - those of ‘rurality’, and of what approach to take in resolving the design dilemma of trying to create a ‘village’ in a very few years. Falk states that an aim of the development (and one central to his role as the senior architect) was to create a “rural village”. This “environmental character” would emerge from the layout of the built environment, and from the “visual unity” of the development. By this, it appears that Falk did not simply mean the village itself, but also its context in the landscape - but he acknowledged the difference between the process of design and development which was to go on at Bar Hill, and the processes of landscape formation which went on in existing villages. In the latter, the built environment of the village, and its relationship with the external landscape, were the result of decades, or even centuries, of incremental growth, accretion, and assimilation. At Bar Hill, Falk made a conscious and explicit decision to try and incorporate the new village into the landscape, rather than to try and shield it. Falk was far more positive, and saw the assimilation of the new village into the landscape not in terms of screening, but rather in the use of sympathetic materials, and in avoiding

31This in itself is worthy of note - the pattern in more recent proposals has been to hide the new settlement with trees, or to try and find a site where it would not be visible.
monotony of detail, form and roof line". Whilst neither the proof nor Falk’s earlier paper of March 1963 discuss such issues, by the time house designs were published, this philosophy had also been incorporated into the detailed design of the housing groups and units, such that architectural motifs from other Cambridgeshire village buildings had been borrowed and incorporated into the designs. Such motifs included half-timbering, and particular window details. It must be said, though, that from the perspective of the 1990s, Falk’s earliest working design sketches, the designs produced for the first houses, and the early houses themselves, do not give the impression of vernacular Cambridgeshire design, but rather a sympathetic modernism. Much of the detailed design which CMP and Falk produced in 1963 and subsequently was lost when HHC sold the site, an issue which is discussed later. Nevertheless, by that time, the broad layout of Bar Hill had been determined, and much of the CMP master plan remained, especially in its broader aspects. Most notable amongst these was the adoption of a Radburn layout, separating vehicular and pedestrian circulation, with a perimeter road circumscribing the developed part of the site (the remainder of the site outside the road was intended for use as green belt, open space, tree-planting, agriculture and allotments - some of this was maintained, but modifications were made, as described later). The line of the road has undoubtedly changed since the initial drawings were made, but it, and the pattern of pedestrian paths have remained, even if, in latter phases of development, the pedestrian network became restricted to paths from new housing areas to the village centre, and not within the housing areas themselves, as was the case in the earliest phases (where true Radburn separation was observed, and the front door of the house was often on the opposite side to the vehicular access. Residents have rectified this over the years - the door on the vehicular side of the house has become the ‘de facto’ main entrance). CMP also envisaged houses in groups of about 100 units, facing inwards on their own common areas. To this end, the village master plan was divided up into such groups, which were also intended to form the phasing of development. Later phases diluted the design ideal of groups of houses centred upon a common area, much as they diluted the Radburn principle.

See the sketches of Falk’s early house designs in the illustrative annex.

This is evident when visiting residents in such houses, not only at Bar Hill, but elsewhere where such layouts have been ‘in situ’ for many years.
but the groups remained, even if, in the end, they became little more than a convenient way of phasing development, and carving it up amongst various housebuilding companies.

The master plan for Bar Hill seems to have had considerable foresight as to the role of the car in subsequent years, though at least some of this arose as a product of the policy in Cambridgeshire to disperse population, development, employment and community facilities as widely as possible in the whole county - this was essential to the Holford plan, and to the then innovatory policy of village colleges. Not only was there explicit recognition of the two-car family, and provision made for this, but the allocation of Bar Hill's centre to serve a wider population than that of the village itself effectively established an out-of-town shopping centre. The earliest plans saw a precinct of 50 shops, though this paid too much attention to the model adopted from existing villages, and never came to fruition. It was eventually replaced by a smaller precinct of shops, about a dozen in all, and a supermarket, on the lines of modern out-of-town developments.

When interviewed in 1993, Falk\textsuperscript{35} provided an illuminating critique of his own creation. He had been impressed by Radburn designs in the US, but in retrospect saw the model as underestimating the need for rear garden privacy. Neither did the Radburn formula consider crime in the way that more recent architecture might; the lack of private space and the dominance of communal space, as well as the multiplicity of accesses, makes it difficult to establish defensible space. Bar Hill suffered because the theories used to determine its design were not based on British experience, but imported from the US. Falk felt that there was a need to develop a theory of settlement based on British experience, and that the theories used had been insufficiently examined to establish their basic principles.

However, Falk's most substantial criticism was the increase in the size of the settlement, from original proposals of about 2500 people, to later targets of 4000 people, and a current population of nearer 5000. The original design was based on the assumption of 2500 people, but this was uneconomic, and as we have noted, was increased in size as the design and planning process proceeded. The plan of the village was not reviewed as this

\textsuperscript{35}Interview with Brian Falk.
enlargement proceeded, though Falk felt that a complete re-assessment should have been undertaken.

Falk had aimed to avoid the failures of the state new towns in designing Bar Hill; he had seen these as dull, monosocial, massive, and under bureaucratic control. Rather, he wanted to develop a community which was "truly a village", with all levels of income, and all views, represented. His view is now that this was a false aim, and always likely to undermined by the choices offered by mobility and income. Self-containment was thus impossible.

The Early Years of Development - 1963 to 1968

Following the public enquiry, outline planning permission was granted for the site, though with fewer conditions attached to the permission than the County Council would have wished. As a result, the provision of facilities at Bar Hill was in many cases not a contractual liability, but merely an assurance from the developers that provision would proceed according to the authority’s wishes. In today’s climate of exhaustively negotiated Section 106 agreements, this seems rather naive. It proved to be so, because such a gentleman’s agreement could only possibly survive if both parties remained the same. The sale of the site by HHC meant that Bar Hill lost even this agreement. Nevertheless, following detailed planning consent for phase one of the development, building proceeded, and at that point it was envisaged that development would be completed by about 1971/2, though estimates of the date for completion varied between accounts, even those which were contemporaneous.

Outline planning permission was granted in December 1964, with detailed consent for the first phase of housing development obtained in August 1965. Work on site began in November 1965, nearly two years after the public enquiry. CMP’s initial plans envisaged

36 As the synthesis and conclusion make clear, new settlements have, in practice, been exclusionary. Residence there generally requires the financial ability to owner occupy, and car ownership in order to have sufficient mobility. In turn, of course, this requires the income, and hence the employment, to sustain such a lifestyle.

37 Mellor, 1966b.

38 Covell, Matthews & Partners, 1963.
three hundred houses during the first year and a half (thus perhaps the middle of 1967), and another five hundred during the subsequent two and a half years (taking the programme to the end of 1970). During these first four years, it was also intended to complete the village centre. A further 260 houses were planned for the next two years, followed by ten years of incremental building, resulting in a further 150 units (thus arriving, at about 1982, with a final total of 1210 houses). By 1966, this estimate had risen to 1250\(^{39}\), though a completion date for substantive building of around 1972 still appeared to be accepted. Estimates of total site cost also varied, with Architectural Review in January 1966\(^{40}\) placing it at £6-7,000,000, with a first phase cost of £500,000, and Official Architecture and Planning\(^{41}\) suggesting £8,000,000 in October of that year. The site was purchased in 1963 by HHC at a reported cost of £400 per acre, £140,000 in total. At the time, this was about the going rate for residential land; purchase was not made at a discount rate, for instance, at agricultural land value. Off-site costs, including sewers, water mains, the access road and flyover junction, were in the region of £220,000, whilst on site costs, which included extensive landscaping (including the green buffer zone around the site) and the perimeter road, were estimated at £300,000. Thus total up-front costs were around £660,000. House prices were pitched competitively with the market, though their quality, internal space, and surrounding landscape were considerably better than the norm.

The contemporary social history provides the first indication that even from the earliest days, the process of building Bar Hill did not run to plan. In May 1967 (when, according to the forecasts, some 200 houses should have been at, or near, completion), a local newspaper\(^{42}\) reported that the then current population of Bar Hill was seven, comprising three households; six adults and one school age child. Later sources indicate that there were a whole range of problems and delays which had plagued the site\(^{43}\). The original site intended for the new sewerage works for the village was not released by the County Council Smallholding Committee, and an attempt to negotiate a joint scheme between HHC and the two adjoining parish councils fell through because of the resistance of the


\(^{40}\)Architectural Review, 1966.

\(^{41}\)Mellor, 1966b.

\(^{42}\)Independent Press, 26th May 1967.

parish councils. One wonders how much of a part was played in this decision by the resentment of these bodies towards the new development. In the end, the developers had to buy additional land on which to build the sewage plant. Additional land was also required to supplement inadequate storm drainage provision.

Although the original forecast of 1963 placed completion of part of the village centre concurrently with the completion of the first 200 houses, this did not take place. Provision of village centre facilities immediately fell behind the perceived need of incoming residents. The slow rate of house sales seems to have been partially a result of the iterative effect of poor publicity about issues like those above, because the housing market was poor in that area of Cambridgeshire, and because sales were initially handled by just one, London-based, agent. Thus, whilst the location of the site, north-west of Cambridge, ran counter to local market trends which placed the highest levels of housing demand to the south of the city, the sales were handled by a company with little local knowledge and a monopoly position. Soon, not only was Bar Hill tarred with poor publicity about delays in infrastructure, and poor community facilities, but it also became evident that houses on the site were difficult to sell. This did not encourage sales, or provide the buoyant housing market necessary to sustain the up-front costs being incurred by HHC.

In 1968, HHC sold Bar Hill (many later sources, including those of the county council, report the sale as taking place in 1969 - however, contemporaneous newspaper articles report press releases about site progress by the new owners in 1968, and a letter to residents from the new owners dated 26th June 1969 talks of it being “nearly a year” since the site was purchased by them). Later sources suggest that this was due the losses being sustained by HHC because of the combination of low and delayed sales, and high on-costs. However, interviews with those involved at the time suggest that this was not the major reason that HHC sold out. HHC was also guarantor on a project in Hamilton, Ontario, which was not doing well. The Bar Hill project was sold primarily to provide
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liquidity to service these debts. Whether Bar Hill was chosen to be sold because it was not an attractive project to hold on to in profit generation terms will never be resolved.

1968-1975; the wilderness years?
The new owners of the site were the Trafalgar House group of companies. The Ideal Building Corporation (linked to Ideal Homes) was the direct purchaser, and they formed a separate company, Bar Hill Developments Ltd. (BHDL) to take over development of the village. Housing construction was taken on by the Nunn Corporation, a local subsidiary of Ideal's. With the change of site ownership, all the undertakings of HHC with regard to off site and on site works were lost, and thus because there was no legal agreement to provide such facilities and infrastructure with the planning permission for the site, as there would be today, the responsibility for these costs seemed to pass from the private sector to the public sector. However, the confusion and wrangling that this engendered simply delayed many essential major works for many years. At the time of the sale, fewer than 100 houses had been completed on the site, though it remains unclear how much of the more prosaic infrastructure such as sewers and roads was inherited with the sale, nor what contributions HHC had made to the local authority as part of their commitments.

The new owners had a different approach to the development of the site, and this rapidly became clear when CMP were sacked as architects on the project. The pure Radburn layout principles of the original design fell out of favour, as did the housing designs first used. In their place came more conventional estate road layouts, and very much more conventional and conservative housing designs. Indeed, the first houses built following the Trafalgar House take-over were designs taken directly from the standard Ideal Homesteads range, though it appears that subsequent building was to designs prepared specifically for the site by the new architects, Marshman, Warren and Taylor. The new houses apparently sold more readily, and house prices on the site had begun to appreciate by 1971, but the extent to which the original design principles had been sacrificed were summed up in the anonymous words of a planning officer recorded at the time: “I would be less than honest
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if I said I was proud of what is going up now”\textsuperscript{50}. The caution of the officer concerned was justified, as the official line of the Chair of Cambridgeshire County Planning Committee, Tony Cornell, was at the time that it was a “pleasure to look at”\textsuperscript{51}. Four years later, in 1975, the views of councillors were very different, with one stating at a planning subcommittee that Bar Hill was getting “grottier and grottier” and threatened to become a “first class rural slum”\textsuperscript{52}. His concern was raised by a resubmitted planning application for houses on the site which had previously been rejected on the grounds of poor design.

The concerns of planning officers about the quality of work being done by Nunn’s were paralleled by the veiled distrust of Kenneth Nunn indicated by the Cambridge Evening News journalist in the 1971 article. Nunn, they said “smokes cigars in a silver holder and drives a blue Rolls Royce (reg. no. KCN1)\textsuperscript{53}. The most positive accounts of Nunn describe him as a ‘colourful’ character, and more commonly he was described in less complimentary terms - it was certainly evident from the very earliest days of his involvement that he had precious little respect either for the legal agreements which bound the site (dating from the original planning permission), or for the design concepts which had guided development thus far. On the 21st September 1971\textsuperscript{54}, the local press reported the appearance of television aerials on the roofs of Bar Hill houses. This was of interest because the original permission banned roof aerials (television reception was provided by cable from a central receiver which proved troublesome, and residents had sought alternatives). It emerged that Nunn had been providing residents with aerials, and only later had asked Chesterton RDC for permission to replace the central transmitter with roof aerials. What began as such small local disputes eventually became much more serious.

By 1974, the same newspaper was treating Nunn to an expose about the shoddy workmanship and late delivery of the houses he was building at Bar Hill\textsuperscript{55}. A year later, when Nunn’s collapsed, leaving 30 houses unfinished along with a string of debts, it was

\textsuperscript{50}Woods, 1971b.
\textsuperscript{51}Cambridgeshire & Isle of Ely County Council, 1971a.
\textsuperscript{52}Cambridge Evening News, 1975b.
\textsuperscript{53}Woods, 1971b.
\textsuperscript{54}Cambridge Evening News, 1971.
\textsuperscript{55}Petty, 1974.
revealed that by the time of the expose, the company were already suffering from cash flow problems. Such chaos merely reflected the state of the village, and particularly the ideals with which it had originally been launched.

The progress of development between 1968 and 1975 was determined by several key issues. These were the aforementioned change in housing design and layout, retail provision in the centre of the village, the completion of the flyover junction on the A604, the changing arrangements for communal maintenance and provision, and the development of a golf course and 'fairway housing' outside of the main distributor ring road. These issues were not only important because they changed the physical nature of the site, but because they also changed the ideals on which development was based, and the concepts of social organisation and community structure which were intended to develop.

The sale of the site had thrown considerable doubt upon the eventual completion of Bar Hill, and the new owners were in a strong position to negotiate with the County planning authority. Thus, whilst planners were keen to preserve the integrity of the original scheme, they were also aware that the progress of the site, and hence its remaining credibility, depended upon them reaching agreement with the developing companies. The planning which went on at this time was described by one interviewee as 'survival planning', aimed primarily at getting through a particular crisis. However, this hand to mouth planning seems to have gone on for several years, with only a limited strategic context, and the planning authority under constant pressure to concede to the wishes of the developers.

It is difficult at this remove to ascertain which parts of the Trafalgar House group were involved in negotiations, and which held responsibility for particular developments and decisions. Certainly neither Trafalgar House nor Ideal Homes admit to having any surviving records of the site from this period, and thus the progress of events has to be pieced together from interviews with planners and former planners who were responsible for the site at that time, and from contemporaneous records derived mainly from the personal archive of Mr Bill Norton, the headmaster of the primary school at Bar Hill from its opening in 1968, until his retirement in 1991. This consists mainly of newspaper
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cuttings, but also contains minutes from the meetings of various community organisations, and copies of Bar Hill News, an early publication of the residents association. Other contemporaneous material includes two short internal reports published by the County Council in 1971\(^{58}\), and a short article from 1973, published in *era*, the journal of the eastern region of RIBA\(^{59}\).

As at Martlesham Heath, there was considerable discussion as to the arrangements made for the maintenance of communal land and buildings. The scheme at Martlesham Heath, using a private management company, with all house owners as shareholders, was devised in the light of the debacle which occurred at Bar Hill\(^{60}\). Originally, it was intended that a Trust would be established to maintain the community facilities, which would be funded from leasehold rents\(^{61}\) on the houses (the Trust would hold the freehold to all properties). Buildings and land would be handed over to the Trust by the developers as development progressed. However, the Leasehold Reform Act of 1967 effectively curtailed any possibility of the village being funded in this manner, because it gave all house owners the right to purchase the freehold on their property\(^{62}\). It might have been possible to arrange for a specific exemption from the provisions of the Act on the Bar Hill site, but a lack of organisation, and legal arguments, delayed such an application beyond the deadline provided in the Act. Even by 1973, there was considerable concern about the responsibility for communal facilities\(^{63}\).

Maintenance charges had been levied from the first year by the developers, but there appeared to be little accountability or transparency about what this money was spent on. Moreover, most of the communal provision which existed had been provided by means other than such communal arrangements. The main community building, the Church Centre, had been provided by the churches, and by private fund-raising efforts, and the

\(^{58}\)Cambridgeshire & Isle of Ely County Council, 1971a, 1971b.


\(^{60}\)Interview with Chris Parker.

\(^{61}\)Chapter 2 discusses the scheme of leasehold rent proposed by Ebenezer Howard for his theoretical garden city.

\(^{62}\)Interview with Brian Falk.

village green had only been seeded when the parish council undertook to contribute to costs. Thus, if we recall one of Waide's original parameters of the site, namely that the costs falling upon the community as a result of new development should be minimised, and also the intention stated elsewhere that the costs falling upon the public purse as a result of development should also be minimal (i.e. that the costs of infrastructure should be largely internally generated), we can see that one of the original aims of the scheme (and one which defined the nature of part of the village's social organisation) had not been met. Community infrastructure provision was both underfunded and haphazard because the new developers were unwilling to provide on the terms originally agreed, the local state had always tried to avoid a role in financial provision, and the community itself was not provided with the intended mechanism to generate investment and maintenance moneys. Costs therefore fell on the lowest rung of the local state, the parish council, on private fund-raising, and on various ad hoc community organisations such as the Residents Committee.

The provision of shops on a site such as Bar Hill is both a commercial and community undertaking, and the extent to which the priorities of both are reflected in the physical development of the site indicates the 'balance of power' which existed at any given time. As has already been identified, the original community oriented aims of development were subsumed from 1968 onwards by commercial imperatives. These were at best pragmatic, and contrasted with the idealism of earlier years. As has already been discussed, the original intention at Bar Hill was to provide a parade of shops, initially a dozen, but eventually as many as 45, which would become an alternative retail pole to surrounding town centres (principally Cambridge itself) on the lines of American out of town malls, and would also provide higher level retail services for surrounding villages.

The village centre

Shortly after Trafalgar House bought the site, the first shops were completed. These included a small supermarket, bank, hairdresser, post office, and an electrical goods shop.
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The supermarket had negotiated an open ended clause in its lease which allowed it
monopolies on particular types of goods (and hence restricting the competition it was
likely to be subjected to from other shops in the mall). It was the supermarket which had
the power to decide when to give up these monopoly powers, not BHDL. At this stage,
with the village comprising only 100 households, it was not surprising that there were only
four small shops and a supermarket, when even this initial development provided for
twelve units (with parking for 200 cars). However, by 1973, several of these shop units
remained empty, and Bar Hill Developments were considering quite different solutions to
the continuing shortage of shopping provision. They proposed a much larger supermarket
on the site, on land adjacent to the existing shopping parade. This signalled the demise of
the original concept of a large number of individual shops, but the developers made efforts
to persuade public opinion that this was effectively what had been intended in the first
place - that building a large supermarket fulfilled the original aims of out of town
shopping. This was disingenuous - the previous approach had failed commercially, and the
solution was itself entirely commercial. The supermarket was opposed by residents
because it was out of scale with what they considered to be appropriate for a village, and
because the design of the supermarket was seen as industrial. The resident’s committee
chairman felt that it would "destroy the village atmosphere"67, and initial reaction from
residents was opposed to the development (though they were concerned both about the
lack of shops on the site, and by the increasingly dilapidated state of the arcade).
Opposition was ameliorated not only by arguing that the supermarket proposal was not at
variance with the spirit of the original plan’s intention, but also by suggesting that jobs for
village people would be created, and also by offering a substantial contribution towards the
flyover at the entrance to the village. As we shall see later, the completion of this flyover
junction was of huge practical and totemic significance to Bar Hill residents, and by
suggesting that the supermarket project might by turns bring about its completion (because,
as the developers were keen to stress, the supermarket could not be opened until the
flyover was complete), the residents were placed in something of a quandary. The
developers also undertook an elaborate consultation exercise with residents and their
representative organisations, but this tended to formalise opposition, and when detailed
plans were finally submitted in December 1975 by Tesco, there was opposition both at

parish and district level on grounds of poor design, and plans had to be resubmitted in June 1976. The tacit approval of the parish council was then received68, and the supermarket was opened in June 197769.

Both the changes in design and layout of housing and the superimposition of an unsympathetic supermarket development were indications of the erosion of idealism, both social and architectural, which had occurred since Trafalgar House had taken over. Bar Hill had ceased to be a cohesive whole, and was treated by the developers as series of lucrative development opportunities, to be pursued whether or not they conformed either with existing planning guidelines, or with the spirit of the original village design. In its early days, the development of Bar Hill had shown too little pragmatism, but through the early 1970s, it had become dominated by hard-nosed and short term commercial judgements. Both threatened the continued growth of the village.

**Development outside the perimeter road**

There were other examples of this change of approach. Since Trafalgar House had taken over the site in 1968, they had pursued the idea of a golf course on land immediately to the east of the planned village perimeter road, and in 1971 submitted plans to construct an 18-hole course. Whilst this in itself might not have been too far removed from the original designation of land outside the perimeter road as green belt, the developers also submitted plans for a club house, a motel, and what was termed 'fairway housing'. All of this was to be constructed outside the perimeter road, breaching another basic principle of the original concept, namely that all building was to be within this perimeter (for two reasons; firstly as a way of limiting the physical extent of the village, and making that boundary defensible in future years, and secondly, as a part of the Radburn concept - development outside of the perimeter road would have made it necessary for pedestrians to cross a main road in order to access village centre facilities). The developers tried to sell the golf course concept as a new Wentworth, suggesting that what would be created would be a championship course on a par with the famous Surrey course, though planning officers were apparently

sceptical, especially once they had visited the real thing\textsuperscript{70}. Nevertheless, permission was granted, almost certainly because planners had very little choice if they wanted any continued progress at Bar Hill, but also because there appears to have been little opposition from residents, and the provision of sites for luxury houses (some of which were stunningly individual and architecturally commended creations, and one of which was the subject of an extensive article in Architects Journal\textsuperscript{71}). The golf course itself was received warmly by the local press when it opened in 1974\textsuperscript{72}, and was seen as a relatively prestigious new sporting facility in Cambridgeshire, rather than as a breach of the spirit and intent of a 1963 master plan.

However, there was another proposal for development outside of the perimeter road, this being for 30 acres of industry, which was submitted at about the same time as plans for the golf course. This development proposal generated considerable controversy, not least because it involved criticism of the county's industrial policy. The solution proposed was that the new site (there was already 13 acres of industry designated within the perimeter) should be for warehousing and distribution demonstrably connected with Cambridge. Even so, the developers resorted to threatening withdrawal from the golf course scheme if permission was not granted, and the buck was passed between the Minister and Cambridgeshire County Planning Authority, before permission was finally granted. Like the golf course, the passage of time has obscured the need for such bitter disputes. The area of industrial development concerned is tucked away in one corner of the site, and is opposite other industrial development, rather than housing. However, it was evident that during this period, little regard was paid to any planning structure on the site, and that both the golf course and associated developments, and the new industry, were potentially precedents for continued piecemeal development, and erosion of the original master plan concepts.

\textsuperscript{70}Booth, 1973.
\textsuperscript{71}Sergeant, 1985.
\textsuperscript{72}Potter, 1974.
The flyover junction

The development of the flyover junction from the village to the A604 was originally envisaged to be completed by the time 200 houses were built, and hence very early in the development process. In reality it was delayed both by funding problems, and by delayed policy decisions, such that building did not begin until 1976. In the mean time, it became the major cause of residents concern about the development of the village, and became a metaphor both for their concern about the nature and progress of development, and about the broader comedy of errors which had been the development history of Bar Hill. The A604 was not at the time a trunk road, though it carried a heavy load of traffic between Cambridge and the A1, and has over the intervening years been dualled, connected to the M11, and finally incorporated into the A14 cross country trunk route. There was, therefore, considerable prescience in the county surveyor’s recommendation of a flyover junction, and it seems that such a scheme was also seen as a way of providing for a grade-separated junction for a turning on the other side of the road, close to the point on the A604 where the Bar Hill access was expected to join. It appears from the documentation that exists that part of the surveyor’s enthusiasm for such a junction was because it would be provided at the developer’s expense, as part of the planning gain on the site. A former county development control officer confirmed in interview that there was certainly no provision made in the public sector for the costs of the junction, but neither was there a legal agreement (then a Section 52 agreement, now known as a Section 106 agreement) for the developer to provide this as part of the scheme. Thus when the ownership of the site changed, this, like much of the original scheme, was placed in jeopardy.

It appears that it was not possible to approve a design and agree funding for the flyover junction before HHC were ready to start building houses. Thus the condition attached to the formal permission for development stated that a simple T-junction would suffice, as long as no more than 200 houses or 15 shops were built. Although not explicitly stated, the willingness of the planning authority to proceed without first securing the method of progress on a major element of infrastructure, when other conditions were imposed on other much less important issues (the National Institute of Agricultural Biology had objected to the development, and had eventually succeeded in getting a condition on the permission which stipulated that residents should not allow certain sorts of vegetable to go to seed in their gardens), seems to suggest that the planning authority already felt under
some pressure to proceed with development. HHC, of course, neither completed 200 houses, or completed any shops, before selling to Trafalgar House.

In the same year, 1968, the Ministry of Transport proposed the M11 extension west of Cambridge, intended to follow the line of the A604 on its way to Huntingdon (in the end, of course, the M11 joined the A604 some 2 miles east of Bar Hill, and got no further). This further delayed any final decision on the flyover scheme, because until there was a decision on the M11 and its route, no progress could be made on the Bar Hill junction scheme. Trafalgar House having bought the site, there was a lull of about a year whilst they negotiated with the planning authority, but it was now clear that the housing limit would have to be raised if development was to continue (which, as we realise from some of the later developments granted permission in contradiction of the original master plan, the planning authority were desperate to encourage). In March 1970, therefore, the housing limit allowed with the interim T junction was raised to 400, and further to 600 in September 1971.73 Thus any justification for such limits was itself undermined, for if the junction was deemed safe first for the traffic generated by 200 houses, then by 400, and then by 600, what was the point at which it would not be safe without a flyover? In reality of course, the decision on safety was contingent on considerations of political expediency ('Bar Hill must be seen to be progressing'), which both the developer and the residents quickly realised. The developers almost certainly concluded that whatever the decision on the M11, they could procrastinate and delay the commitment of resources to the flyover, whilst the increasingly annoyed residents, their safety threatened by a series of accidents at the existing junction (including at least one fatal crash74), placed increasing pressure upon the local authority to 'do something'.

Bar Hill Developments Ltd. had circulated a letter dated the 26th June 1969, explaining to residents and others what intentions they had, and highlighting their achievements75. The letter has the air of a damage limitation exercise, and seems to be responding to criticism that they had done very little in the previous year, since their purchase by Trafalgar House.

74Recorded over time in the local press by a series of articles highlighting accidents, and continued correspondence to the press from residents concerning these incidents.
75Matthews, 1969.
In this letter, they state that the design of the flyover is complete, with drawings in the hands of the county, and the MoT. The contractors were "working on the price", and the hope was expressed that "we can start work later this summer". They did not, and on Wednesday 22nd October 1969, a car crashed into a bus queue on the main road outside Bar Hill, injuring a woman and three children. In a meeting with village representatives on the Friday of that week, the county surveyor contradicted BHDL by saying that detailed plans had only been submitted to the DoT two weeks before, presumably having spent the intervening four months with the County. At the meeting, chaired by the local MP, Francis Pym (the newspaper article does not make it clear whether he was there because of the crash, or for other reasons), the ire of the villagers was directed at the County Council, the parish council presenting a resolution calling on the county council to "honour their obligations to the residents, particularly as Bar Hill Developments will honour their undertaking to contribute a large sum towards the cost of a flyover". Significantly, this was accompanied by a 250 signature petition, presented to Pym, demanding that the junction be "made safe" - at the time this must have represented the vast majority of the adult population of Bar Hill. This is quite a feat considering the mere two days that any organiser would have had between the crash and the presentation. Thus, whilst it can be argued that the villagers were misdirecting their blame, their level of organisation and sense of common purpose is evident. This is one of many occasions when Bar Hill seemed to prove that adversity strengthens community spirit - the sense of shared experience reinforcing the perceived difference between those within Bar Hill, and those outside. Indeed, the accident had simply proved what the residents of Bar Hill had realised themselves some time before, that the present junction was a hazard, and solutions were needed. Moreover, since residents were under the impression that the reflective signs they were still awaiting when the accident happened had been ordered as early as October 1968, and that flyover construction would start in 1969, their annoyance was understandable.

77 Bar Hill Residents Association Newsletter No.6, September 1968.
78 BHRA Newsletter No.7, October 1968.
In a letter dated 21st March 1970, Pym wrote to Bill Norton, who was then both the headmaster of Bar Hill school, and the Chairman of the Bar Hill Parish Council, reporting correspondence with the County Surveyor, Mr Lacey, who had in turn been meeting with the Ministry of Transport and BHDL. Lacey had assured Pym that the Ministry hoped to build the flyover in 1971, and that BHDL would “contribute the appropriate portion of the cost”. By April 1972, the Cambridge Evening News was reporting a fatal accident on the road, when a pedestrian crossing the road from the village was hit by a vehicle - villagers at a public meeting which followed a few days later were told that BHDL and the county had agreed plans for the flyover junction, but that progress was being held up by inquiries into the Cambridge by-pass (by which part of the M11 extension was also known).

Work on the flyover junction finally began early in 1975, by which time Bar Hill was about to undergo a series of changes which would mark its transition from something of a liability, and a constant source of frustration, both to residents and planners, to a more stable and secure development. Whilst it would be wrong to suggest that completion of the junction in early 1976 was catalytic in its effect, it was one of a number of events which significantly changed the prospects of the village for the better, and heralded the relatively uncomplicated growth which persisted to the present day. The completion of the flyover was part of a cumulative accretion of confidence and permanence. It is significant that it took the intervention of the public sector, both in funding this major piece of infrastructure, and in reconstructing a strategic planning framework for the village following the near free for all in the early seventies, to bring about the secure phase of Bar Hill’s history. This post-1975 history is discussed in the next section; meanwhile it is necessary to understand the way in which community organisations developed and reacted to the turbulent history we have so far traced.

**Local organisations**

Three local organisations articulated and organised the views of the residents at Bar Hill, their roles changing and evolving as time progressed. The Residents Association was formed to act as representative and advocate for the residents with Bar Hill Developments
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Ltd., and other development interests, but it was also significant in shaping local views more broadly through its publication of a monthly newsletter. The Parish Council, formed a little later, took on a more formal representative role, and became significant in lobbying and campaigning (its role in campaigning about the A604 junction, a role it shared with BHRA, has already been noted). The third organisation was Bar Hill Church, which was innovatory in its organisation, and, as in East Goscote, played a significant role in the early social and community life of the village. These three organisations did not act autonomously - there is evidence of continued sharing of issues, ideas and personnel. As we have noted both at East Goscote and Bar Hill, the social network which developed encompassed a number of key individuals who were often involved in several organisations, either at the same time, or at different times.

The Residents Association held its inaugural meeting on 20th October 1967, with the stated object of its original constitution being to "promote the interests of the Village pending formation of the Village Trust." Its initial role appeared to be representative, liaising with BHDL about mundane issues of building progress and completion, both of houses and the wider village. They communicated with the wider village by use of a newsletter, the contents of which are a chronicle of the development history from a very different angle to the ‘official’ history, as told by municipal documents, and press sources. It is essentially a ‘folk’ history, one written by the recipients rather than the makers of history, though to see the residents as essentially powerless in this discourse is to underestimate their significance in the decision making process, and their role in shaping opinion. Also, since the writers of the newsletter, and the members of the resident’s association committee had power in the process of social formation, the story they tell can never entirely reflect the experience of the average Bar Hill resident. Nevertheless, at this remove, it is the nearest it is possible to get.

81The events surrounding the formation of these community organisations have been compiled from interviews with Mike Duce and Martin Avery, from contemporary documents published by the Resident’s Association and the Parish Council, and from newspaper reports.
82Interviews with Mike Duce, James Newcome; Cambridge Evening News, 1972c.
83BHRA, 1967.
84The archive of BHRA newsletters is considerable, and those consulted date from 1967 to 1987. The accounts contained in them have been supplemented with interviews (Mike Duce and Martin Avery).
There are several points to note about the newsletter. Firstly, much of what is discussed is necessarily parochial, the issues of discussion at BHRA's inaugural meeting\textsuperscript{85} being a list of concerns about the provision of community facilities (library, buses, telephone box etc.), the quality of development (property defects, condition of residential roads, TV signals from the communal receiver), organisational issues (the 1967 Leasehold Reform Act), and the beginnings of an ongoing discussion about acceptable behaviour and social rules within the village. Even at this earliest stage, there was some conflict between the design ideals of the village, and the individual wishes of residents - in this case concerning the design and size of garden sheds (and villagers themselves were divided on the issue). This appears to have been a similar dispute to that which arose at New Ash Green about the freedom to paint front doors in other than standardised colours - essentially a conflict between a communal design ideal, and individualism. It appears that BHRA played a significant role in defining a compromise position, and defusing such conflict. Rumours appeared to spread in the village about such things, and BHRA saw its role as correcting such rumours, presenting what it saw to be the truth, if necessary supporting the site agent against some of the more exaggerated stories.

The newsletter started out, and remained, a very literate publication for a village resident's association, a product, one presumes, of its constituency\textsuperscript{86}. Certainly its lyricism comes as a surprise in comparison with publications in, for instance, East Goscote. The paragraph which quashes a rumour about the banning of garden structures in the issue of April 1968 (No.3), for instance, sustains an elaborate ornithological metaphor to make its point. As well as acting as an advocate to BHDL, and a buffer between them and residents, BHRA extended its role of quashing rumours and defining the ‘truth’, into shaping opinion about issues concerning the village. This was never more the case than when discussing the flyover junction, but this also extended further still to defining what was, and what was

\textsuperscript{85}BHRA, 1968.

\textsuperscript{86}It was envisaged even in its earliest days that Bar Hill residents would be an articulate constituency. The proximity to Cambridge, it was assumed, would attract workers from the city’s intellectual community, and from its related and developing high technology industries - people with management, communication and advocacy skills - and, notably, the first company to move into industrial premises at Bar Hill was an electronics consultancy).
not, acceptable behaviour in the village (for example, concerning the speed of cars around the village, the correct use of green areas in the village, and the appropriate method for the disposal of garden rubbish). This points to two things - firstly, the immense importance of the Residents Association in defining the rules of community in Bar Hill, but also that if there was a need to state, and make a plea for, certain forms of accepted behaviour, there were evidently those who were not behaving as others would have liked. Thus, there must have been contested interpretations about what Bar Hill was about, and about what community constituted there, even if such a contest of meaning was essentially one-sided in terms of the printed word, only occasionally becoming apparent, as in the minutes of early BHRA meetings concerning the garden sheds issue. The authority, or at least utility, of the Association appeared to be acknowledged however, with the majority of households being paid up members (80% according to the newsletter of July 1968).

Nevertheless, the Association was always keen to recruit residents who remained non-members, partly because it argued that greater numbers gave it greater influence with the developers, and partly because, as was suggested in the BHRA Committee’s report to the General Meeting of 7th June 196887, piecemeal approaches on communal problems to the developers and site staff tended to “negate the aims of the Association” by diluting the efforts of staff, and increasing the workload upon administrative staff, thereby exacerbating delays. Essentially, this was a plea for the central handling of liaison with the developers (either corporatism or communitarianism as an alternative to individualism), for reasons which may have been perfectly rational, but which tended to concentrate power and influence in the hands of a small, if well intentioned, group of people. This appears to have been an inevitable pattern at all three new settlements; the administration of the community, and the shaping of its common ideals, fell into the hands of a small group of activists. In this regard, new settlements appear to be no different from most other organisations.

The almost symbiotic relationship that had been established between BHRA and BHDC in the time of HHC was undoubtedly disrupted by the Trafalgar House take-over, though initially the approach adopted by BHRA towards the new developers was positive. As we
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87BHRA, 1968.
noted in the earlier episodes of the development of the flyover junction, there was a tendency to accept at face value the statements of the developers, though later there was criticism about the rate of progress on communal facilities. The BHRA newsletter of July 1968 stated that “impressions... are that our community growth will accelerate under the impetus of specialists in the building of houses for ‘retail’”\(^{88}\). This statement was, of course, followed by at least a year when no housebuilding whatsoever took place, and it is also worth noting the implicit criticism of HHC, in suggesting that their houses were not for ‘retail’, reflecting the difficulties there had been in finding customers for the original groups of houses.

It is notable that as time progresses, the newsletters published by BHRA become less dominated by immediate issues of building, and more by the more general community life of the village. It also appears that they become less stridently campaigning, and instead feature reports from various social organisations, clubs, societies and the like. Given the increasingly precarious state that the village was in during the early seventies, this seems a contradiction. However, it must be remembered that events as seen by residents were not necessarily those concerning the planners and developers involved. Residents were primarily concerned with their own lives, and the social life of the village, and only involved themselves in the wider development issues when these impinged directly upon them (the grassing of communal areas, the state of roads and paths, street lighting). Increasingly, it seems, as the village got bigger, the sense of involvement with the whole, which had marked the pioneers in the early days, diminished. It might also be suggested that as the village grew, albeit precariously, during the early 1970s, the sense of impermanence, and the need to will the village into existence as a corporate act of faith, diminished. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that despite the difficulties, a great deal of building went on between 1968 and 1975\(^{89}\), and the appearance of progress must have reduced the anxieties of the average Bar Hill resident. The change of emphasis and thinking is discussed in a letter to the editor printed in the newsletter in October 1971.

\(^{88}\) BHRA newsletter, July 1968.

\(^{89}\) As the discussion of housing completion figures in Chapter 4 indicates.
The anonymous author argued that rather than blame the developers for all the problems of the village, or regard them as 'eternal providers', the village should grow up and face its own responsibilities. Such sentiments seemed to mark that, firstly, the symbiotic relationship between developers and residents had begun to unravel, and, secondly, that the residents themselves were capable of, and should therefore take responsibility for, organising their village and its facilities. In essence, we see here the demise of the defensive community as the primary unifying theme, and the development of a more proactive community, one which had the confidence of itself to do things, rather than simply to act together in pressing somebody else to do things for them. The author goes on to cite several examples (the playgroup, church, and horticultural society) of communal effort, generated from within the village, achieving results. The defensive community, and the community of opposition were still evident, especially in areas where no amount of common effort by the villagers could provide the required result (the key issue here being the flyover junction), and lobbying was also the only effective way of improving the bus service. Nevertheless, the early 1970s marked the demise of the faith in the developers to provide exactly what had been promised, and perhaps also the belief that a sense of community could emerge simply from the built environment.

The first parish meeting at Bar Hill was held on the 14th March 1968, some five months after the inaugural meeting of the Residents Association. For a short while, this parish meeting fulfilled a limited role in liaison with Chesterton Rural District Council, but by July of that year, the County Council was in the process of making an order to constitute a parish council for the village. The formation of the parish council, was delayed until the completion of the October 1968 electoral register, which became effective in February 1969, and on which elections were conducted for the parish in May 1969 (elections carried out on the basis of the October 1967 register would have disenfranchised more than two-thirds of the residents). Initially, a five member Parish Council was elected, though this number was increased in later years as the size of the village itself increased.

BHRA newsletter, October 1971.
The Parish Council\textsuperscript{91} came into being about a year after the sale of the site to Trafalgar House, and at about the time that new architects and builders were being appointed. The entire period of HHC's involvement as developer had passed prior to this, with BHRA fulfilling the role of representative body of residents to the developers. Thus the formation of the Parish Council also required the Residents' Association to begin to reappraise its role. Inevitably, the Parish Council's formal role in the review of planning applications, and in representing the village at higher tiers of local government, meant increasingly that it would, \textit{de facto} and \textit{de jure}, usurp the role of primary representative body for the village. As was seen in the specific case of the flyover, BHRA were involved in representations with BHDC in the HHC period, but increasingly, and especially during the early 1970s, it was the Parish Council which spoke for the village, and campaigned on their behalf\textsuperscript{92}. Nevertheless, BHRA continued to fulfil an important role in the dissemination of information via the newsletter, and later Bar Hill News, and also expressed its opinions via editorial material in the newsletter. The relationship between the Parish Council and the Residents' Association remained close - the Residents' Association newsletter carried detailed reports of parish council business, and communications form the PC to the residents. By the mid-1970s, it is clear that the Residents' Association had retreated from its early role, and concerned itself primarily with the social life of the village, and the publication of the newsletter's successor, Bar Hill News.

The demise of the plan for the Village Trust, following the Leasehold Reform Act, also gave the Parish Council another role which was not envisaged at its genesis, though which became apparent quickly afterwards. As has happened at Martlesham Heath with Martlesham Consultants, the developers began to hand over communal land, facilities and house freeholds to the Parish Council, which the Parish Council then managed using the parish precept (the first handover of this kind appears to have occurred late in 1976, transferring the freehold of 500 houses and the completed amenity areas from BHDC to the Parish Council\textsuperscript{93}). Unlike Martlesham, where the community assets were handed over to a

\textsuperscript{91}The history of the Parish Council is drawn primarily from the organisation's own minutes, as well as interviews with Martin Avery and Mike Duce.

\textsuperscript{92}Increasingly, for example, it is a Parish Council representative quoted in newspaper reports about village issues, rather than the Residents Association.

\textsuperscript{93}Cambridge Evening News, 1976b.
private company, albeit one with a substantial amount of community control, at Bar Hill these assets were passed from the private to the public sector, though more by default than design. Martlesham Consultants were established precisely because Bar Hill was seen as such a poor blueprint for the management of community assets, with financial and managerial responsibilities blurred and sometimes undefined. Much of what happened at Bar Hill was reactive, with structures being developed in response to unfolding events, with the consequence that they were often short of resources - funds for the village hall, completed in 1980, were raised by private initiative and donation⁹⁴, whilst earlier in the process of development, it proved difficult both to find the funds for the seeding of the village green, and to determine who should be responsible for the job (in the end, the Parish Council provided the funds).

The church at Bar Hill was perhaps in some ways the most radical of the social institutions in the village. At East Goscote, there were at various times proposals for churches from at least three denominations, Catholic, Anglican and Methodist, of which only the Anglican building emerged, albeit relatively early in the development process, and forming the focus of much of the earliest community organisation on the site⁹⁵. At Martlesham Heath, an Anglican Church was also completed, albeit much later in the sequence of development, after much of the building, and the social institutions of the village, were in place⁹⁶. At Bar Hill, it was agreed amongst the churches shortly after the inception of the village that the church building in Bar Hill would be developed as an ecumenical project, in which most of the mainstream denominations, with the exception of the Catholic church, participated⁹⁷. The churches appear to have shared the same idealism which had infused both the early planning and architecture - moreover, their aspirations lasted considerably longer than those of the first developer.

The Bar Hill church was developed within a national context, emerging from the British Council of Churches Nottingham Faith and Order Conference of 1964, from which arose the aspiration for ‘visible unity’ between denominations by 1980. Towards this end,

⁹¹ Interviews with Rev. Dr. D.F. Brewin, Roy Longdon, John Nixon.
⁹⁶ Interview with Rev. Brian Lillistone.
⁹⁷ Cambridge Evening News, 1972c; interviews with Mike Duce, Rev. James Newcome.
experimental ecumenical projects were recommended, of which Bar Hill was one, and perhaps the most ambitious\textsuperscript{98}. Bar Hill was seen as a perfect opportunity for such an experiment precisely because it was a new village, and thus the churches started with a situation which was as close to a clean sheet of paper as they could hope to find. The fledgling church was led by two men who were to have significant roles in the early social life of the village - Rev. W.H. King, a retired Congregational minister, and a veteran of the first world war, having reached the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and Rev. Hugo de Waal, rector of the adjacent parish of Dry Drayton. Notably, it was King who chaired the inaugural meeting of BHRA\textsuperscript{99}, and subsequently went on to be Chairman of the Association, thus placing the church at the centre of the earliest of village community structures, and involving it in the shaping of community life, and in defining the values and attitudes of the Association (which in turn played a significant part in defining the agenda for the morality of community life in the new village).

The appeal to raise funds for the multi-purpose church building (no money was directly forthcoming from any one of the participant denominations because none had structures which allowed for the funding of such ecumenical projects, though contributions were made to a joint funding body which had been established) was announced late in 1968, with the hope that building would start within a couple of years. In reality, like much at Bar Hill, things took a little longer, and the foundation stone was not laid until 1972\textsuperscript{100}. King, though he had retired from his post at Bar Hill in 1971 (he was by then 80 years old), returned to Bar Hill both to lay the foundation stone, and for the official opening of the building in October 1972. Prior to the completion of the church centre (it contained several multi-purpose rooms which were intended to have wide range of social uses, in addition to worship), the church congregation at Bar Hill had met initially in a private house, in a

\textsuperscript{98}Times, 1968.
\textsuperscript{99}BHRA, 1968.
\textsuperscript{100}Cambridge Evening News, 1972c; moreover, according to contemporary reports, fund raising had not begun in earnest until early 1972, though it is not clear what had happened in the interim - though in the ten months between start and completion, the people of Bar Hill had raised funds nearly sufficient to pay for the project, with \pounds 6000 of the \pounds 28000 required raised within the village.
prefabricated hut provided by the developers, in the part-completed shopping precinct, and latterly in the newly completed primary school.

In its early days, the church at Bar Hill had a large congregation, sometimes up to 200, but settling at about 70-80. At first, a combination of good leadership, a clear idea of direction, and, as a later minister of the church suggested, a basic need to get together amongst the first residents, gave the church its impetus. It appears that later on, differences in personality between two of the ministers later assigned to the church caused problems, and by the early 1980s, congregations had sunk to the mid-30s. It is also worth speculating whether the decline in the church at Bar Hill was a result of the change in atmosphere in the village, which has already been noted, occurred as the 1970s progressed. If, as appears to have been the case, the early success of the church arose from the radicalism and the sense of pioneering which drove all aspects of Bar Hill community life in the first years of its existence, then the decline of that initial motivation may also have had an effect on the life of one of the village's key institutions, its church.

Establishment and Completion - 1975 to the present

By the end of 1974, according to a survey carried out by the Parish Council, Bar Hill had a population of some 1700 people, a little over a third of its intended final population. It has already been noted that by this time, the site had seen both its sale by the original developers to Trafalgar House, and the collapse of the main housing developer active during the period from 1969 to 1974. Since the purchase of the site, design principles and planning guidelines intrinsic to the original concept of the Bar Hill village had been discarded, and development had proceeded in a manner which might charitably be described as pragmatic. Despite this, social institutions had developed, and a sense of community life appeared to have been generated. The developed area of the village had expanded steadily, if not as fast as had been anticipated, and the initial anxiety of villagers as to the future of their home seems to have receded.

101 Interview with Mike Duce.
102 Interview with Rev. James Newcome.
103 Reported in the BHRA newsletter.
1975 marked a turning point in the history of Bar Hill for several reasons. Following the collapse of Nunns\textsuperscript{104}, new arrangements were made to provide for housebuilding on the site, which for the first time took development out of the hands of a monopoly supplier. The flyover junction, the delays to which had for many years been a practical limitation to the further growth of the village, was nearing completion. Likewise, the future of the village as a shopping centre appeared to have been secured by the purchase of the mall by Tesco, and their plans to build a large supermarket (completed in June 1977). However, what perhaps marked the watershed most clearly was the production of a local plan for the village by the newly formed South Cambridgeshire District Council. For the first time since the master plan was effectively abandoned in 1968, the village had clear planning guidance with which to shape its future.

It is advisable to be wary of adopting the official County Council history uncritically. The official version of events\textsuperscript{105} indicates that the first factor which improved the situation at Bar Hill was the production of a local plan for the village (the implication being that it was the primary and catalytic factor). As we have noted, the plan arrived at a precipitate time (it had been in gestation since 1974) but its arrival coincided with the events listed above, all of which were crucial. The completion of the flyover removed the need to consider limiting development on safety grounds, and Tesco’s arrival secured the village centre as a viable commercial entity (and turned it into the sub-regional centre that it was originally intended to be - with the supermarket attracting ‘out of town’ trade that the small village shops could never have supported). The collapse of Nunn’s caused Trafalgar House to reconsider their policy for development of the housing areas (though why and how they decided to proceed may well remain a mystery as the company claim to have no records of the period); subsequently, parcels of land were sold off to a number of national housebuilders, and the only control over design and phasing was one of commercial imperative and planning law.

The local plan was, in essence, an acceptance of the current situation, “a consolidating document\textsuperscript{106}, rather than an attempt to reinstate the whole of the original Bar Hill concept.

\textsuperscript{104}Cambridge Evening News, 1975a.
\textsuperscript{105}Cambridgeshire County Council, 1985.
\textsuperscript{106}South Cambridgeshire DC, 1975.
As such, the most radical policy within it was to forbid further residential development outside the main perimeter road, though tree planting, wildlife habitats, allotments and a picnic site were encouraged. An end date population was stated, effectively capping the population, though only very broad guidelines were given as to the nature of new residential development, and the plan avoided specifying housing densities. Policy 6.02(iv) in the plan suggested the provision of “doorstep play areas”, at approximately one per thirty dwellings as an intrinsic part of residential schemes, and there was considerable emphasis on landscaping, tree planting and footpaths (to the extent of defining, though not re-imposing, the original Radburn concept of vehicular-pedestrian separation, and the nature of its application at Bar Hill). The extent of industrial and warehousing development was also capped at the level of existing permissions.

Development proceeded apace after the mid-70s, with the highest rates of housing completions (over 200 units per annum) being achieved in the early years of the 1980s\(^{107}\). Although the local plan asked little of developers in comparison with the original master plan, the absence of the doorstep play areas, and the relative lack of landscaping suggest that even this was disregarded or circumvented by housebuilders. At least four volume housebuilders (Wilcon, Wimpey, Bovis, Ideal) were involved latterly in building houses at Bar Hill\(^{108}\), and the standard and style of their work varied considerably, as did their commitment to high standards of design and planning at Bar Hill. A planning officer involved at the time described one of these companies as ‘appalling to work with’\(^{109}\), and whilst Wilcon went as far as to design new house types for the site, both Ideal and Wimpey merely transplanted standard house designs. Whilst the original conformation of the village was maintained (village green and centre in the middle, housing groups surrounding, feeding from an encircling ring road), the difference between earlier and later phases of housing is quite considerable. The earliest housing is marked by formal layout, Falk’s modernist designs, an adherence to the Radburn principle (though this was subverted by residents), and considerable informal open space (small greens around which houses are

\(^{107}\)South Cambridgeshire District Council housing completion figures.

\(^{108}\)The identity of the housebuilders in the latter period of Bar Hill’s history has been ascertained through extensive research in planning files.

\(^{109}\)Interview with Jeremy Beicham.
clustered, space alongside circulation paths). As development proceeds through time, the house designs become very conventional, the Radburn principle is eroded, as is the level of open space provision. By the time the early eighties arrive, classic Essex design guide estates predominate, as do the typical estate house designs of the period. The later developments sometimes show greater variety and invention, but some of the last built show exactly the same features in layout and design that typify contemporary mass produced estate housing all over the country. This is not to say that the development completed during the eighties at Bar Hill is bad - it is merely ordinary, generic and lacking any originality or invention. It could have been far better, but by that time, the aims and ideals of the original Bar Hill had long been subverted by a baser commercial imperative. Perhaps the worst impression left by comparison is the degree to which later housing has been crammed onto the site, giving a claustrophobic air which neither Martlesham Heath, nor East Goscote (for all its bleakness) share.

Nevertheless, there is much at Bar Hill which has succeeded. Unlike so many of the stillborn schemes of the late 1980s housing boom, Bar Hill is a new settlement which exists - in that sense it is a credit to the strategic thinking of Waide. Moreover, it is complete to the size intended, which must be credited to luck, the resilience of the pioneer residents, and the perseverance of planners in Cambridgeshire (though in 1977 Cambridgeshire County planners proposed two scenarios for future village expansions in Cambridgeshire, one of which would have taken Bar Hill to a population of over 7500, suggesting that, after 1975, the problem was not securing any development at Bar Hill, but rather deciding how much more development the site could take, and trading off the impact of this against development options in other parts of Cambridge). Bar Hill is, in its broad sweep, still recognisable as the conceptual plan which Falk developed in 1963 - it has retained its village green, its village centre, its perimeter road and the series of housing developments which feed off it. It is still possible to walk from almost any house to the centre of the village, and to key facilities such as the school without crossing anything more than an estate service road, which is creditable in a settlement of 5000 people, and

\footnote{See sketches of the early house designs and photographs of early housing in the illustrative annex.}

\footnote{It is interesting to note the reported opinions of F.J. Osborn about vernacular architecture (reported in Chapter 2) in this context.}

\footnote{Cambridge Evening News, 1977.}
must be a considerable attraction to those with young families, just as it was envisaged thirty years ago. The village has, through a variety of means, managed to obtain a range of facilities which make neighbouring villages envious - a library, village hall, primary school (extended in 1983 with a further four classrooms, by 1986 it had 412 pupils113), a large supermarket and other smaller shops, and a newly extended church centre. It has a vast village green, and although the place lacks the sheer extent and wildness of open space which Martlesham Heath offers, it is still a pleasant place, and appears neither claustrophobic nor particularly urban once out of the newer housing areas.

The local press, of its nature, tends to pick upon dissent in a locality, and throughout the history of the new village, the Cambridge Evening News appears to have been a considerable focus of criticism about Bar Hill. As such, it was resented by residents and developers alike, providing a platform first for the doubts about the viability of the site, then for critics of its design and scale, and in the early eighties, criticisms of social provision in Bar Hill. The irony, therefore, of the newspaper’s hagiographic reporting of the village’s 21st anniversary in December 1986114, is significant, and it should not be overlooked. The editorial in the edition published on Wednesday 3rd December 1986 stated of Bar Hill that “this thriving and vibrant community on the outskirts of Cambridge has already earned itself the key of the door to recognition as a worthy place to have on the county map”. This appears to get to the root of the resentment of Bar Hill in Cambridgeshire, and indeed in other places - that new villages are upstarts, which do not belong until they have proved themselves ‘worthy’. Another adjacent article points out that a ‘recent survey’ had discovered that 87% of residents liked living in Bar Hill, and that earlier criticisms were ‘premature observations’. This may seem rather a tardy conversion to the cause of Bar Hill by those forming opinion in the rest of Cambridgeshire, but perhaps this should be viewed this in another way. In twenty five years, Bar Hill had gone from being merely a theoretical concept, to being the home of many apparently satisfied people. It had attained the status of a place, accepted as part of the Cambridgeshire landscape and geography, with its own identity its own history, and its own local heroes. That this transition occurs should indicate the strength of the desire to create place identity, and to build social organisations and institutions where none existed before.

Chapter 7

Martlesham Heath

Introduction
Martlesham Heath is the third case study in this research. It is a new settlement of over three thousand people, recently completed, and located in eastern Suffolk. Though of a similar size to East Goscote, and a private sector led and executed development, the two villages display very different forms of new settlement development. Martlesham Heath is newer, has an almost entirely different process of development, is aimed at a different market, was far more consciously designed, is built at a much lower overall density and to a far higher standard, and emerged from a process of conscious theoreticisation, as much as from financial expediency. In its theoreticisation, it is far closer to Bar Hill, and the two villages share other strong links, particularly in that Martlesham Heath was conceived in the light of events at Bar Hill, and its development and organisation was partly shaped by the positive and negative experiences of the Cambridgeshire development.

The location of Martlesham Heath
Martlesham Heath is located in the east of Suffolk, some five miles east of Ipswich, the county town, and some three miles south west of Woodbridge. Whilst functionally it is a satellite of Ipswich, in much the same way that East Goscote is of Leicester, it is in Suffolk Coastal District, whose administrative centre is in Woodbridge. This is significant in that it places Martlesham Heath in a rural, adjacent district to Ipswich, from whence it views the city with some suspicion, fearing suburban encroachment and higher local tax bills. Indeed, Martlesham Heath’s relationship with Ipswich seems ambivalent - many residents work there (though fewer than the equivalent relationship with Leicester at East Goscote), and it is the major centre for shopping and social life; but it is equally seen as a source of urban values and urbanism, at odds with the rural community residents believe they have in Martlesham Heath.

1 An issue which emerged in interviews with members of the parish council and Martlesham Consultants Ltd.
Woodbridge, by comparison, is a small Suffolk town, with many picturesque streets and buildings, and with shops aimed at an expensive, often tourist, market (tourism is mainly linked to the town’s marina on the Deben estuary, which is used for yacht mooring). Martlesham Heath itself is located on the peninsula of land between the Deben and Orwell estuaries, its nearest neighbours being Kesgrave, a ‘bungalow suburb’ on the eastern edge of Ipswich, and the existing villages of Martlesham (now often referred to as Old Martlesham, whilst to further avoid confusion, Martlesham Heath is often locally referred to as ‘the Heath’) and Brightwell. Martlesham Heath, Martlesham, and Brightwell form a single Anglican parish², whilst both Martlesham and Martlesham Heath form one administrative parish, the consequences of which are discussed later in the paper.

Martlesham Heath straddles the A12 dual-carriageway trunk road, with the residential village on the west of the road, and the industrial estate on the east. The A12 itself, which was only realigned along the stretch of dual-carriageway through Martlesham Heath after building had started there, runs south-west to Colchester and on into south-east Essex, and north-east through Woodbridge and on to Lowestoft. This places Martlesham Heath on the main trunk route through this part of Suffolk, enhancing its attraction as a commuter settlement for a wide catchment area³.

Site history
The location of Martlesham Heath is exactly what the name suggests - heathland. The site has sandy soil of low fertility, and of little productive value, and appears to have been uninhabited for most of its history. It is exposed and windswept, supporting gorse heathland and birch woodland. Like the more famous Sutton Hoo on the other side of Woodbridge, Martlesham Heath has several Anglo-Saxon burial mounds. Apart from this, human activity only really began to affect the heath during the first world war, when it began to be used as a military airfield, most notably by Douglas Bader⁴. The airfield continued in use, increasingly as an experimental station, during the inter-war years, and during the second world war was used by American bomber squadrons, as well as

²Interview with Rev. Brian Lillistone.
³Interviews (for example, Ian Buckingham) indicated the extent to which residents prepared to commute in order to continue living in the village.
⁴The history of the site is recorded in Parker, 1982, and was clarified in interview. Jackson, 1985 appears mainly to have drawn on earlier sources such as this.
continuing in use as an experimental station (the “Dambusters” bouncing bomb was tested from there). Military use declined in the post war years, and the RAF surrendered its lease in 1963. One might take this as interesting history, but of little relevance to the new settlement which now occupies the site, but for the fact that this history is constantly recalled to project character upon the village. The Anglo-Saxon burial mounds, after all, confer antiquity and an air of pagan mystery upon the village which many older settlements cannot claim, and the relatively recent military use confers an instant history of heroic myths - a claim upon characters and events which are already part of the regional and national mythology of struggle, heroism and victory. So much so that the pub in the centre of the village, on the edge of the village green is called the Douglas Bader, and is packed with memorabilia from the wartime airfield. The old barrack blocks used by the American airmen are still standing in good repair, and are used as part of the industrial estate, whilst the old control tower is the venue for village playgroups, one old hanger is used for sports recreation, and another as a warehouse. Part of the airfield runway still exists as a parking area next to the village centre (distinguished by the rectangular blocks of the old concrete surface), and another larger section on the undeveloped western section of the site (known as the “western corridor”, a designation which remains from the time when this part of the site was earmarked for the realigned A12). Thus sufficient icons remain to constantly reinforce the memory of the site’s past history.

The former military use highlights Martlesham Heath’s similarity to East Goscote, and to other former military sites where new settlements have been proposed (notably Kettleby Magna in Leicestershire, and the former USAF base at Bentwaters, north-east of Woodbridge, where re-use as a new settlement has been considered). Both sites were released from military use at about the same time, following a period of semi-dereliction, and both have the potential to draw upon this prior site history to add to and enhance the history and identity of the new village. It is Martlesham Heath which has made the greatest symbolic use of this, but it has also had the greater physical impact, with most of the

5 A brochure produced by the developers (Bradford Property Trust, 1983) reproduces pictures of the wartime airfield and aeroplanes, whilst the official village crest incorporates an aircraft propeller.


7 The possibilities for redevelopment of this site became evident during discussions with staff at Suffolk Coastal District Council.
former military buildings being re-used for industry (giving the village a much larger industrial area than either East Goscote or Bar Hill), and the original runways are still largely in existence. This physical presence reinforces the link with history - the past is still present.

**Planning History**

According to Christopher Parker, Bradford Property Trust acquired the Martlesham Heath site early in the war years as part of the purchase of the Brightwell Estate, itself some 7420 acres on the Deben peninsula. The Martlesham Heath site was itself already in use as an aerodrome, and was leased at a rent of £90 per year to the Air Ministry on a 999 year lease. When the RAF decided to leave the site and relinquish its lease, the Bradford Property Trust negotiated for the buildings and other installations to be left intact, in contradiction of the Air Ministry’s usual practice, which involved stripping and demolishing everything on the airfield before leaving. The cost of running the complex in 1963 was estimated at £3,500 per annum - it was essential therefore, for Bradford Property Trust to gain some return on its investment.

Temporary planning permission existed on the site to use the existing buildings for industrial uses, and on 12.11.63 a planning application was made for: “residential, commercial, industrial and recreational uses in accordance with a new road system; the layout and phasing to be prepared in conjunction with the local Planning Authority”.

Preliminary research commenced with the co-operation of East Suffolk County Council, and the application was also called in by the Ministry of Housing and Local Government. Before work had got very far the Ministry informed the County Council and the Bradford Property Trust that Ipswich had been designated for large scale expansion under the New Towns Act, as a result of the South East Study of 1964 which had designated Ipswich for London overspill growth. The original village project was abandoned, and Culpin Partners, BPT’s architects, began work on a proposal for development for between 10 and 40,000 people on the Martlesham Heath site, the report on which appeared in February 1965.

---

8 Parker, 1982.
9 Parker, 1982.
10 Culpin, Clifford and Partners, 1965.
The Ministry considered a linear town along the north bank of the Orwell in order to expand Ipswich, and when this generated protest, the Shankland Cox report was commissioned, which approved the general principle of the original village proposal at Martlesham Heath, whatever else might eventually emerge for the expansion of Ipswich (in the end, no radical expansion plans for Ipswich ever reached fruition).\textsuperscript{11}

Exactly what happened next in the story is disputed - though Chris Parker\textsuperscript{12}, who was certainly the closest, of those recording the events, to what actually occurred, makes no mention of the Ipswich Fringe Statement, but simply states that a new village plan was prepared “with the full co-operation and help of the County Planning Department”. In responding to an earlier draft of this chapter, Parker\textsuperscript{13} says that about four years prior to the publication of the fringe statement, he put the idea of a village development at Martlesham Heath to the then Chief Planning Officer for Suffolk who “turned it down flat”. This would have been about 1966\textsuperscript{17}, shortly after the Shankland Cox report. Four years later, the CPO’s successor included the village in the Fringe Statement and as Parker states “it was not for me to quarrel if County Planning wanted to do what I did”.

Whatever the exact order of events, by May 1971, the Martlesham Heath proposal was the subject of a week long public enquiry.\textsuperscript{14} The decision which emerged from the Ministry on June 7th 1972 (ref. SE6/690/220/1) agreed with the Inspector’s verdict in relation to the site, though “reluctantly”.\textsuperscript{15} The reason for refusal was that the site layout as submitted interfered with the line of the proposed Ipswich bypass (ironically never built - in the end the A12 dual-carriageway which splits the industrial and residential areas of Martlesham Heath was deemed to serve the same purpose), but the letter from the Ministry concurred with the Inspector, seeing “no reason...why, given a revised layout, taking account of the line of the proposed Ipswich bypass, the development of this site should not be acceptable”. Thus, like East Goscote, Martlesham Heath was originally given a refusal for permission which was effectively an approval in principle.

\textsuperscript{11}Ministry of Housing and Local Government, 1968.
\textsuperscript{12}Parker, 1982.
\textsuperscript{13}Letter from Chris Parker to Chris Owen, dated 14.10.93.
\textsuperscript{14}Chris Parker’s cautiously optimistic minutes of this inquiry survive (Parker, 1971).
\textsuperscript{15}Ministry of Housing and Local Government, 1972.
The Ministry handed the power of decision on any revised layout back to the County - again as at East Goscote. Another application was submitted on February 7th 1973, and permission granted on the 12th October of that year. The permission (ref. E/7763/28) ran to five pages, with 28 conditions, and substantial reserved matters. This is short compared with more recent permissions, but substantially longer than the single page, 7 condition permission granted for East Goscote some ten years before. Some of the more interesting conditions, for instance, restrict the size of development phases, and ensure that all utility services are run underground. The final size of the development was restricted to 1000 dwellings.

Thus, from the site lease being surrendered in 1963 (an equivalent act to the auction of the East Goscote site in 1961), the Martlesham Heath site took another ten years to reach the stage of planning approval in 1973, a status East Goscote achieved in only three years, by 1964. The reasons for this are many, and not simply due to the Martlesham Heath site being enveloped in the periphery of the state new towns programme, though this was certainly the main factor. The site was much larger than that at East Goscote, and the development upon it less intrusive, less visible, and less intensive, meaning that the Planning Authority felt less urgency to clear the site at all costs. A low density development solution seems to have emerged because the prior use itself was low intensity, and because the new towns process itself had rejected a higher density solution on the site. Moreover, the decision to limit both the size of development phases, and the final size of the settlement were both methods of ensuring the low density, dispersed nature of development on the site. It is this urban form which has made Martlesham Heath so successful in design terms, and arguably, to retain a far more rural feel than either East Goscote or Bar Hill.

---

17 Leicestershire County Council, 1964.
19 Interview with Lindsey Clubb.
20 Three architects, Clifford Culpin and Partners, Mathews, Ryan & Partners and Peter Barefoot & Partners, were provided with a brief in October 1973 which indicates that the organisational structures for managing the design and building process were already well established by that time (Bidwells, 1973).
It will be recalled that house sales in East Goscote slumped drastically in 1973/4 as a result of the oil crisis and the consequent impact on the national economy. This was, of course, a national phenomenon as an article in Estates Gazette\textsuperscript{21} suggests. In 1973, as Martlesham Heath was receiving its planning consent, and the decision was made to appoint Bidwells as project managers, house prices peaked, with a house price to earnings ratio of about 4.7. They then fell rapidly, so that by the time the first families moved onto Martlesham Heath, the same figure was down to below 3.5. This gives some significant indications as to the nature of the developers. BPT were essentially landlords, as we shall see later, and had no experience of a development role, especially of an entire new village; and whilst Bidwells were established surveyors, and land and site managers (based in Cambridge), they too had no experience to compare with that of Martlesham Heath. They were thus faced with the start of a large project, of a largely untried type, of which they had little or no experience, and at the beginning of a major slump in their chosen market\textsuperscript{22}. And yet they persevered, and maintained very high standards of specification. This does suggest a culture of long term investment and return in the companies, and, despite denials, a moral dimension to the project - there was more than mere profit at stake. Thus we note an important feature in the nature of Martlesham Heath - namely that it owed something to a benevolent corporate culture; one which looked beyond immediate return, and valued some level of vision, commitment and integrity. This will be unravelled further at a later stage in this paper. This also contrasts with the situation at both East Goscote and at Bar Hill. At the Leicestershire site, the developer was a local builder, whose aim was no more than to realise the development value of the land at the highest density possible, and to satisfy a market for housing which already existed, and which the company were already familiar with. East Goscote was simply one more housing development, and one more way of making money, albeit unique in its urban form. At Bar Hill, whilst the project was thought through and placed in a strategic context, the vision of Cambridgeshire County Council only stretched five years into the future, when it envisaged that the development would be complete, thus solving an immediate strategic problem of containing and directing growth in Cambridgeshire. The developer’s view was even more short term, and when market conditions became difficult, they cut their losses and sold the site.

\textsuperscript{21}Boleat, 1978.

\textsuperscript{22}Interview with Lindsey Clubb.
Despite the housing market downturn, BPT moved relatively fast in getting underway with development, with a tranche of three applications being made to what was now Suffolk Coastal DC, following local government reorganisation, in June 1974; one of these was for the first link road, the other two for the first phases of housing. The year by year progress of applications gives some idea as to the way in which the development was phased, and the timing of provision for various pieces of infrastructure. Applications and approvals for housing proceeded at a fairly regular pace in the years 1975 to 1987, whilst the first of the non-residential buildings for which approval was granted was the first phase of the village centre, in 1975, closely followed by temporary approvals for a bank and a newsagents and greengrocers, in 1975 and 1976 respectively. These temporary approvals, especially, indicate the understanding the developers had of the need for early retail provision on site, something which was also realised at East Goscote, and encouraged by subsidised rents.

A private social club and squash courts were approved in 1976, though these were located just over the A12 pedestrian bridge from the village, in the industrial estate (though within a few hundred yards of the village centre). The permissions for the pub and village meeting room were given in 1978, whilst, in addition to ongoing housing development, 40 single person housing association flats were permitted in 1982. Further extension to the village centre (shops, offices, a bank, dental surgery, and other leisure uses) was granted in 1983, followed by a dance studio and gym in 1985. Further flats and sheltered housing arrived in 1986, though approval for the church centre was not sought until 1987, along with the primary school. This is a notable contrast with Bar Hill, where both a church and school were considered necessary building blocks for the embryonic community, and with East Goscote, where a school was provided relatively early in the construction process. However, spare school capacity existed elsewhere in the area, and the new school was not

---

23 The following account is derived from data assembled from the planning application records of Suffolk Coastal District Council.

24 In interview, Lindsey Clubb, who succeeded Parker as the site manager at Bar Hill, said that in order to ensure early housing sales, and hence the longer term viability of the project, the developers managed shops themselves, until they became commercially viable, at which point the units were leased on the open market. The shopping centre is shown in picture 33 in the illustrative annex.
immediately necessary (at least in educational terms), and the church considered the parish church in the old village to be adequate for many years\textsuperscript{25}.

All the house building is now complete, and sales of the remaining few newly built homes occurred in 1993. The new school is in use (previously the village used surplus capacity in a school on a site between Martlesham Heath and Kesgrave), and the church is also complete and in use. Phase 3 of the village centre remains to be built - it is interesting to note that the plans for this aroused much opposition in the village because the buildings would occupy an area much used for informal recreation and valued for its openness. The developers, whilst being caused problems by this opposition, see it as a healthy sign of strong community feeling and belonging. Certainly the strength of feeling in only 10-15 years from inception, especially against new facilities (when after 25 years East Goscote is still crying out for more facilities), is impressive, even if one can despair at the short and selective memories of the people involved.

\textit{The layout of Martlesham Heath.}

The plan of Martlesham Heath could crudely be described as "beads on a string", in that it has a series of housing hamlets connected to a main distributor road. The hamlets themselves, usually of around 100 houses, and sometimes substantially less, are separated from each other by tracts of open land often overgrown with gorse and other heathland vegetation, and by natural and artificially planted woodland. The control over housing design appears to have been unique to Martlesham Heath. The job of designing each hamlet was given to one of a number of architectural firms, generally fairly local. These included Culpins themselves, and other practices such as Mathews Ryan, Hoopers, and especially latterly, Fielden & Mawson. It is evident that firms, within a brief, were encouraged to give their houses distinctive design, such that each hamlet has quite a different character from others. The philosophy behind this was essentially anti-uniformist; 'real' villages were built over a long period of time, and derived their interest and character

\textsuperscript{25}However, it was the policy of the developers, as recounted in interview by both Parker and Clubb, that they would wait for the community to define its needs, and then provide help that they considered appropriate. They felt it would not have been helpful (or indeed economic) to build community facilities for which no need arose.
from a diversity of building type and design. If Martlesham Heath was to get near to achieving this, then there would need to be diversity in its design, encouraged by allowing many different architectural ideas to be given expression in different parts of the site. Nevertheless, given that the choice of architect lay with the developer, BPT, some control must have been exercised, if only through the desire to produce a result which was approved of, thus ensuring repeat business.

The main facilities are located in a broad east-west swathe through the middle of the village, and include a pedestrian square around which shops and offices are arranged, the village pub ("The Douglas Bader"), the new church centre, and car parking. Adjacent is Bader Court, an extensive sheltered flats complex, and next to that the new primary school. Running south from the centre is the village green, large enough for cricket, though more often used by local children, which is very much the visual focus of the village design. South again from the village green is a large area of birch woodland, running to the southern leg of the distributor road. The size of this wooded area is quite remarkable given that it is situated in the middle of a modern housing development - it is large enough to get lost in, and large enough to lose sight completely of any housing. To the west of the village is another large tract of land, part of the village site, but consisting mainly of gorse heathland. The northern end of this is the site of the control tower, used for crèche and nursery groups, and an old hanger used for recreation. Part of the south of this area is designated as an SSSI, and contains a rare species of butterfly. Such large acreages of wild land and open space means that Martlesham Heath is teeming with wildlife of all sorts - probably far more so than somewhere surrounded by cultivated farmland.

Given that it also shares playing fields, and a community hall with the village of Old Martlesham, and has a squash club and bowling alley within walking distance of the

---

26 The architect's brief states that the architects should provide a model of their site proposals to be installed in Bidwells offices, but there is no explicit mention of any intention to modify or veto designs. Both Parker and Clubb, in interview, made it clear that in order to produce diversity, they were prepared to encourage creativity amongst the architects, even if this sometimes produced results that they personally did not like. This was the basis of Parker's 'controlled chaos' (see Aldous, 1983).

27 Such details appear to be important to the local people. The local guide (Martlesham Parish Council, 1987) contains both a local and natural history of the parish.
village on the adjoining industrial estate, Marllesham Heath seems well endowed with both communal facilities, and means of formal and informal recreation, as well as a pleasant physical environment. This did not occur by chance - it is the result of a complex web of factors; development economics, the culture of particular companies, the nature of the site, the timing of the development, and the visions and ideals of particular key personalities. Moreover, it was a very consciously designed settlement, envisaged and created as an idea and as an ideal before it was ever built, and it attracted a particular market of people (and indeed, who moved in, and why, has a complex of reasons specific to Martlesham Heath).

\textit{The roots of the Martlesham Heath concept}

In 1963, when the RAF were in the process of giving up the lease on the Martlesham airfield, the agents acting for the Bradford Property Trust were Bidwells, a Cambridge based firm of land agents. Their employee, Chris Parker, was manager of the site, amongst others in his portfolio, and was the individual who negotiated the terms of the lease surrender, and the state in which the site was to be handed over. The imagination of Chris Parker was from this point crucial\textsuperscript{28} - indeed he had already shaped the future of the site by negotiating the lease handover, so that the buildings on the site were left intact, to use as an industrial estate\textsuperscript{29}. The existence of a thriving industrial estate on the site was later seen as a great advantage when the new village proposals were considered by planning authorities.

Being based in Cambridge, Chris Parker had occasion to deal regularly with the then chief planning officer of Cambridge, Leath Waide. The Cambridge CPO had spent some time in the US, and been impressed with some of their new settlements. He returned sufficiently

\textsuperscript{28}Parker regularly put his ideas into words, and tried to build a theoretical justification around what was being attempted at Martlesham Heath. His thoughts were essentially anti-planning ('a revolt against convention' Parker, 1979) which he felt was unable to produce the necessary diversity in design and layout. This approach may also be related to the difficulties he had with the state planning system, which delayed the project by ten years, and his experience of seeing the problems which Bar Hill, which was an initiative of the local planning system, faced in its early years.

\textsuperscript{29}Something that was very important to the viability of the site - the more usual practice was to destroy all the existing building before handover, but Parker realised that the main revenue potential of the site lay in re-using the existing buildings, until longer term plans for a new village were realised. He was, after all, first and foremost, a commercial estate manager.
enthused by the concept to want to try it in Britain, and in the process, he also managed to enthuse Chris Parker, who saw this as a potential use for some of the sites in his portfolio. Chris Parker initially considered a site in the vicinity of Cambridge, but as the Cambridge CPO was already in the process of promoting and organising what was to become Bar Hill, Chris Parker knew his proposal would be resisted, and began to look at other sites. Fortuitously, he had recently negotiated the handover of the Martlesham airfield, and had been asked by his superiors what use he intended for the site - an industrial estate had, it appears, been a stopgap measure in his mind. Hence he began to work on the premise of developing a new village on this site.

But why did this idea of building a new village so appeal to Chris Parker - after all, in 1963 it was an original but risky and untried idea (East Goscote had just obtained planning permission, but was not nationally known - indeed it is still not so, even amongst those most involved and interested). I questioned him closely about this when I met him\textsuperscript{30}. He certainly was not motivated by altruism, or by any conscious desire to do good for humanity (though he concedes that this may or may not have been a by-product of what went on), but rather, if anything, to prove an intellectual point. He shies away from any moral angle upon his actions, though it seems obvious from a distance that there is a distinct sense of a moral project about his intellectual position. His point, as he explains it, is this; from his experience of living and villages, and from his knowledge of the villages around Cambridge, he was increasingly alarmed at the damage done by "the planners" in allowing infilling and additions to existing villages, and as a consequence destroying them\textsuperscript{31}. He saw building new villages as an alternative to expanding old ones, and hence as a way of preserving the character and community in the older ones. If altruism came from anywhere, he suggests, it was from Bradford Property Trust - it is thus apposite at this point to look at the distinctive features of BPT, the developers and landowners.

\textsuperscript{30}Interview with Chris Parker.

\textsuperscript{31}This is much the same justification used by Cambridgeshire County Council to develop Bar Hill, and remains one of the most compelling reasons to consider new settlements as a strategic option now.
Bradford Property Trust

The first point to make about BPT, and perhaps the most significant, is that throughout their history, they had been landlords and property owners, not developers. Their only aberration from this core business, and into development, has been Martlesham Heath - they had not acted as developers before this, and nor have they since. This is significant for at least two reasons - firstly because it indicates the importance of Chris Parker’s ideas as the germ of all that followed, and secondly it points out that the company culture of BPT was not that of a developer, and therefore when it involved itself in development, it was not with the normal values and practices of a developer, and it was in a unique scheme. That they have not done anything similar since should not be made too much of - according to Gregory Zagni\(^{32}\), the manager of the Martlesham office of the company, the company feels positive about its experience at Martlesham Heath - it has made a reasonable return, and has been a successful venture. Moreover, since development at Martlesham Heath has only recently begun to wind down, BPT have not yet begun to think of another project to follow on. It would appear that whilst the company will not chase to find another site like Martlesham Heath, if an opportunity were to arise, they would consider it, given that they now have the positive experience of Martlesham Heath to draw upon.

The second point to make, and one which has been alluded to earlier, is the company culture which allowed Chris Parker’s idea to be taken seriously and acted upon, and which did not demand absolute maximisation of profits at the expense of that idea. This has its roots in the history of BPT as a landlord, dating from the time it was incorporated as a company in March 1928 (the best history of BPT appears to be one written by Christopher G. Poll of Charles Stanley & Co., a city shares firm, in October 1982; this was written as part of a document detailing the investment opportunity which BPT offered\(^{33}\)). BPT has the reputation of being, and of having been, a “good landlord” - presumably in terms of being not only a well-managed and profitable company, but also of being fair to and with its tenants. It is significant that even Poll’s paper, the product of a city broker, talks about BPT’s “social conscience”. Looking through BPT’s list of property acquisitions over time is instructive - most of its property was bought in large numbers of units from corporate

\(^{32}\)Interview with Gregory Zagni.

\(^{33}\)Poll, 1982.
landlords, usually firms who had built the houses for their own workers, and from tenants' and friendly societies. Notable amongst these are Saltaire (964 houses bought in 1933), 300 houses in Letchworth (1934, from Letchworth Garden City Tenants Ltd.), 700 houses at Brentham Garden Suburb (1936 from Ealing Tenants Ltd.), 625 houses at the Hull Garden Village Estate (1950, from The Garden Village (Hull) Ltd.), and 424 houses at Port Sunlight (1953, from Lever Bros.). Both Port Sunlight and Saltaire were constructed by philanthropic industrialists to provide better housing and environmental conditions for their workers, and inspired Howard in his garden city concept, which resulted in the construction of Letchworth. How significant this connection with the earliest attempts at socially progressive town planning proved when it came to Martlesham Heath is arguable; nevertheless these estates would not have been sold to BPT unless they were good social landlords. It is true, however, that BPT were willing to forego not only a quick return, but also the absolute maximum possible return in pursuit of the vision with which Chris Parker presented them - how did they do this, and what was their rationale for it?

The development economics of the site are crucial to what it became, and possibly near unique. The site had been part of BPT's land bank for many years, and the other parts of the estate of which it had been part had sold off in post war years. The land had been acquired purely as insurance against the damage caused by bombing - unlike their housing stocks, land was not an asset whose value could be reduced by high explosives-and once that threat was over it ceased to be an important part of their portfolio. Having leased it to the Air Ministry for an almost negligible rent, it had almost no value until they gave up the lease, and produced little income. In one sense then, any income or value generated on the site would have been an improvement. But how to generate such income - the land was of low fertility and thus of little agricultural use, so building upon it in some way seemed the only productive possibility. But then why were not four or five thousand houses built on the site (which would have been possible given its size) rather than the 1000 originally proposed, and the 1100 finally constructed? Again this was the result of a number of local factors. The area of Suffolk in Which Martlesham Heath is located was, and still is, under substantial development pressure, such that at the time the application was made in 1972,

34 See the wider discussion in Chapter 2, which identifies the links between the philanthropic industrial villages, and their promoters, and later garden cities and garden suburbs.
35 Parker, 1982.
and went to public enquiry\textsuperscript{36} and DoE scrutiny, it was considered against two other nearby sites, in what amounted to a development beauty contest. As the other two proposals were typical estate developments (one of which is just being developed now, some twenty years later), it was hardly surprising that the preferred scheme was the one which offered substantial local amenities, including large areas of woodland and open space, a high standard of design, and visually less intrusive low density development\textsuperscript{37}. It was, apparently only opposed by the rival bids, and curiously by British Telecom (Post Office Telephones as was then), for reasons which Chris Parker was originally unwilling to discuss, but which he later stated was to do with the fact that BPT owned the land on which POT had built, and Parker was able to extract from them a value for their site which reflected the value he could create on the adjacent land (the village site). Effectively POT felt that they were being forced to pay over the odds for their site because of the impending village development.

BPT might well have submitted a poorer quality scheme had they been willing to wait twenty years for the chance to develop the site, but a combination of belief in the worth of the project, the economic advantages of development, and the fact that the site would in any case cost a substantial amount to maintain, even to use only as an industrial estate, led them to submit a high quality development, to give themselves a chance of pressing ahead at once.

On the face of it, their timing was not good, given that the first house sales coincided with a major slump in the housing market. But BPT were better placed than most to weather such economic storms. Unlike other developments, where the costs of land purchase have to be borne as an escalating debt until offset by house sales and other leases, the land for BPT at Martlesham Heath was effectively at nil cost. Nevertheless, they had to pay £129,000 to the local authority for improvements to the sewage system, and undertake to

\textsuperscript{36}Parker, 1971.

\textsuperscript{37}Parker, in interview, believes that offering such a high quality scheme was the reason they were able to develop Martlesham Heath in the 1970s. If they had waited, he suggests, they might have been able to build at a higher density, but they did not want to wait. In addition, one can surmise, Parker attained great satisfaction from seeing Martlesham Heath built in the way that he envisaged, and which vindicated his own principles.
pay 50% of the cost of building the A1093 (now part of the main A12) through the site. On top of this, the cost of the infrastructure to enable the building of the first three hamlets was £1,750,000, to which the cost of building the houses themselves had to be added.

From the beginning, BPT seemed to exacerbate their problems by specifying such a high standard for the housing - 15% above Parker Morris size standards, and with a very high standard of materials and finish. Building societies were unwilling to value houses at their purchase cost (even though at this time BPT were selling at below building cost\(^{38}\)) and hence mortgages offered did not cover purchase price in many instances. Potential house buyers took some convincing that the green and ambitious plans for amenities were realistic, and were concerned at the thought of living on or next to a building site for ten years. As a result, whilst the first houses to be built are arguably the best on the site (hamlet F1\(^{39}\)), subsequent development in hamlet L had its specification cut to the bone, certainly in design terms, and is consequently the least attractive area on site. Like Jelson's at East Goscote, BPT too realised that shops on site were a necessity, even if at first they did not make money. Whilst Jelson's subsidised tenants, BPT themselves decided to operate the supermarket themselves, at a loss, for the first few years\(^{40}\). It was only when a market in re-sales of houses began to develop, which reflected the desirability of the houses and the site in the prices they commanded, and design awards began to arrive, that the risk taken began to seem worthwhile. As sales picked up, infrastructure costs became less of a burden, and design standards picked up again.

**Community Management Structures**

According to Chris Parker, one of the detailed agreements worked out with the planning authority once outline permission had been granted was that relating to the provision, ownership and management of what might loosely be termed the communal assets of the village. There was concern at the time, not simply at Martlesham Heath, but also at most other new developments, that the burden of provision and maintenance should not fall upon the existing parish council, but rather upon the developer, and subsequent purchasers of property on the site. To this end, the approach in fashion was to set up Management

\(^{38}\)Interview with Lindsey Clubb.

\(^{39}\)Pictured in the illustrative annex (29 and 30).

\(^{40}\)Interview with Lindsey Clubb.
Companies, assigned to take over such items as communal open space, village halls and such like, from the developer, and to manage them for the benefit of the community as a whole. Such organisations generally raised funds for their ongoing work by arranging some way of taxing property owners within the village. Both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath were intended to have such companies, but their experiences of them have been very different, with Chris Parker having learnt from his knowledge of events at Bar Hill. It is thus necessary to begin the story at Bar Hill.

The management company at Bar Hill was to own the freehold of all the houses on the site, and would thus have been able to levy a charge to all leaseholders - providing it, effectively, with a way of raising regular income equivalent to a parish precept. Changes in the law, which gave leaseholders the right to buy their freehold should they wish, put such a scheme in jeopardy, and legal delays meant that the site was not able to gain exemption from this requirement before the closing date for such applications. In the end, a conventional parish council was established. It remains a mystery why East Goscote, whose planning permission was gained at very much the same time as that for Bar Hill, was never subjected to the idea of a management company (it seems such a possibility was never entertained or raised, but the parish council which was established inherited a dowry of assets sufficient for it to operate perfectly effectively). One can only speculate that whilst East Goscote was developer led, with the planning authority having little more than administrative and control roles, Bar Hill was planning authority led, and as such was subject to far greater intellectual and conceptual consideration before it was built. Hence, it became a place for the latest, fashionable ideas in public sector planning to be tried out. By the time Martlesham Heath had reached the final stages of planning, what had been experimental in the early 1960's had become *de rigeur* by the early 1970's. It was perhaps the scepticism of Chris Parker which actually made the management company, Martlesham Consultants Ltd., a relative success.

Whilst the company constitution of Martlesham Consultants Ltd. is necessarily complex, in simple terms it operates thus. MCL was able to levy a contribution to its coffers of about

---

41 Interviews with a number of individuals at Bar Hill confirm this sequence of events.

42 Indeed, well into the 1980s, Parker was convinced that the Management Company would eventually fail.
£60, as each new house was purchased from Bradford Property Trust. This was a compulsory part of the transaction, for which the property owner received one voting share in the company. This is passed on with the property upon subsequent sale. Since the income from this source began to diminish as the village was completed, the company either had to rely on its capital some thus acquired, and the interest accruing upon it, to fund its activities in perpetuity, or raise further funds via an annual levy upon members. This second option has been taken up in the last few years, the annual sum being about ten pounds. Even so, financial stability is not assured - the company faces large bills for the maintenance of the Heath’s large tract of woodland, amongst other things, and the fear has been expressed by at least one board member to me that should this levy rise appreciably, the apparent consent upon payment which exists at the moment may evaporate.

MCL has a board of fifteen people, the functional equivalent of a parish council, though there are substantial differences in electoral procedure and operation. A third of these board members have to stand for re-election at each AGM (meaning that every member of the board has to be re-elected at least every three years), though if sufficient shareholders wish, an EGM can be called at any time, at which individual members of the board could be voted off, and indeed, the entire board, should the electorate wish it. The current members of the board are a more mixed group than one might expect given the thesis of Thatcherite “active citizenship” - they are not entirely the male, elderly “great and good” of the village. Such people dominate, but there are younger members, as well as two women, and a local shopkeeper amongst their number. Nevertheless there is a predominance of those with such backgrounds as retired senior civil servants, retired RAF officers, retired accountants, magistrates, insurance brokers and managers. To their credit, even those who appear fairly patrician on paper are aware of the need of the board to have upon it more younger members, more women, and more people with employment backgrounds which are not of the senior managerial establishment order. But this is no more than the problems experienced by parish councils, panels of magistrates and so on, in many places, where it is only those who have the time, or the financial security, or the job

43 The detailed operation of Martlesham Consultants Ltd. was confirmed in interviews with Les Hutchinson and Ian Buckingham, and is detailed in its articles of association (Birkett, Westhorp & Long, 1990).

44 Interview with Les Hutchinson.
flexibility, to allow them to take on such roles - and these tend to be older, wealthier, and professional.

The board members I spoke to were similarly candid about the positive aspects, and the limitations of the democratic structures of the company, in comparison to the usual parish council structures. They were keen to stress that they could be ousted at any time, unlike their parish council counterparts, who were elected for three years, come what may. They felt that as a result, the board was more likely to be accountable to its electorate, and unlikely to end up with something similar to the financial scandal which had recently been unearthed in Martlesham PC. The company structure does, however, disenfranchise renters, who, as they do not own their houses, are not members of the company (though they can buy in). As each household only has one vote, large households are obviously comparatively disadvantaged, and small households advantaged. Moreover the vote is more likely to be cast by the senior male in the household, comparatively disenfranchising women. Other acknowledged drawbacks concern MCL’s nature as a limited company, forcing it to pay corporation tax (unlike a residents association, trust or PC), but those involved seem to feel that this is at present worthwhile given the level of local control that the management company model provides. In terms of its role, MCL fills the niche that a parish council would in other places. It has responsibility for the maintenance of the village green, the woodland, village car parks, other communal land, and several local buildings, including those used by the playgroup, youth group and social club. However, given that there is also a parish council covering both Martlesham Heath and Old Martlesham, there are inevitable conflicts over finance and boundaries of responsibility. MCL’s role continues to change as more of the communal land is handed over by BPT, and as the village moves from a period of continuous growth to one of relative stasis. Once the land known as the Western Corridor is handed over to MCL, it will have in its remit the management of an SSSI, entailing new relationships with the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the Nature Conservancy Council, who will become sub-lessees, recruiting a new and different workforce of volunteers into the structure, and enabling new sources of finance to be tapped.

45 Interviews with Les Hutchinson and Ian Buckingham.
46 Interviews with Lindsey Clubb, Ian Buckingham.
The role of the parish council, and its relationship with MCL

The act of establishing MCL necessarily complicated the position of the parish council in two distinct ways. Firstly MCL duplicated the role of a parish council, and secondly, by establishing the company, parish boundaries were not reorganised to take account of a new and separate village (parish boundaries were redrawn both at East Goscote and Bar Hill so that each of the new settlements was encompassed entirely within a new parish, to the exclusion of all nearby villages and hamlets). The upshot was that whilst MCL deals solely with the affairs of Martlesham Heath, Martlesham Parish Council deals with both the new village and the pre-existing village of Martlesham. The parish council has ended up with problems of responsibility and demarcation with regard to the Heath, and a split personality by trying to resolve the differing and often opposing needs of its two constituencies. To give examples, there are constant problems of who uses what, how much, and who pays for it. If people from Martlesham are using the Heath woodland and open spaces for their recreation, do the parish council as well as MCL have some responsibility for their upkeep? Who is responsible for sports pitches in Martlesham Heath, and who tenders for their maintenance? There is an inevitable overlap in the social and recreational spheres of the two villages, but no hard and fast way to resolve areas of responsibility for each body. Such issues are resolved by negotiation and bargaining, and are thus heavily dependent in their outcome upon the personalities involved, and the current state of relations between the individuals and the bodies they represent.

The situation is both complicated and simplified by the dual membership of some individuals in both organisations (eg. the chair of the parish council is also the vice-chair of the MCL board), giving key roles and substantial real power to one or two people, who will strongly influence the outcome of issues concerning both bodies, and especially those where there is confusion or dispute. Financial issues are also a cause of rancour between MCL and MPC - all residents of the parish pay a precept to the parish as part of their local taxation, whilst MCL members are also paying their annual levy to the company. Moreover it would appear that the Heath contributes about two thirds of the parish income, but claims only to receive about one third of its spend. The resentment of some

47 Meeting with members of the parish council.
48 Ian Buckingham, interviewed as part of this study.
49 Interview with Les Hutchinson.
Martlesham Heath residents is then understandable - they feel that they are subsidising their neighbours in Martlesham.

Neither does there seem to be any consensus as to the future of the relationship between MCL and the parish council. The cultures of the two organisations are very different - the parish council is very much more genteel and amateur, whilst MCL projects itself as far more businesslike and efficient, and often appears either impatient or indulgent of the parish council. Such matters rose to a head recently when it was discovered that the parish treasurer had been (apparently autonomously) running a surplus budget, and salting away vast amounts of money in a bank account which the parish council as a whole claimed to be unaware of. Whilst the treasurer had kept records of the money, and the account was in the name of the parish council, he had failed to keep the council informed of its existence or the amounts involved. It was the current chair of the PC (he was not so at the time), and hence the vice-chair of the MCL board, who sorted the exact financial situation of the parish, and reported upon it. MCL's attitude appears to be that such a thing could not have happened with them, and if it had, more drastic steps would have been taken, simply because the members of the company would have called an EGM and sacked the members of the board responsible, or even the board in its entirety. This informs the current attitudes of both MCL and MPC towards merger of the two bodies. It is indicative of the political sensitivity of this issue that Gregory Zagni of Bradford Property Trust refused to comment on the roles and future of these organisations (suggesting, politely, that they themselves would be best placed to comment), though Lindsay Clubb of Bidwells, the site manager, thought that merger would come about eventually, though not without resolving difficult constitutional issues first. MCL feared a loss of accountability if it merged with the parish, and also legal problems with maintaining the open space of the Heath in perpetuity. The parish feared either that the old village would be swallowed by the new in a merger, or that the Heath would go its own way, leaving the old village as a small rump parish, with very little clout at district level, and a much reduced income.

Interview with Gregory Zagni.
Interview with Lindsay Clubb.
Meeting with members of the parish council.
The Social Construction of Martlesham Heath

One of the most impressive figures I encountered in my discussions was the reported number of returns which a student from Oxford Polytechnic had received from a postal questionnaire - in canvassing all the households at Martlesham Heath, he received over 500 replies, a return rate of some 50% - this in comparison to the more usual expectation of around 10%\textsuperscript{54}. This says much, for the Heath is used to being the subject of academic and professional interest, and regularly has its life disturbed by visiting parties and inquisitive researchers. In this light such a return rate indicates a high level of commitment and loyalty to Martlesham Heath from its residents. Although this is difficult to quantify for comparison, it would appear to be similar to the sort of loyalty to their home village shown by East Goscote residents. This begins to give substance to the rebuttal of the null hypothesis that new settlements are by their nature social deserts, to which people have no sense of belonging. But analysis of the social structure of Martlesham Heath - its aspirations, values and self-images - give the lie to the assertion that new settlements are likely to be alike in their social construction.

What Martlesham Heath is now, in social terms, appears inextricably linked with what it was originally conceived as by Chris Parker thirty years ago, and especially what it emerged in reaction to. He was disillusioned with the quality of post-war estate development, most notably with the monotony of their layout and design, and also with the destruction of traditional villages by their expansion. Thus his was essentially an aesthetic critique from a non-architect (he was by profession a surveyor), in reaction to the modernist aesthetic then in favour in the architectural mainstream. The alternative, so described by Parker, was to build what he refers to as a C20th community - a combination of the character, charm and traditions of the “village”\textsuperscript{55}, but one which also encompassed the requirements of modern life, most notably the car. It is worth pointing out that in drawing up an alternative to suburban post-war monotony, the heady iconography of the “typical English village” was engaged, complete with village green and pub - and from the earliest days, Martlesham Heath was thought of as a stand alone settlement, rather than as a suburb. Parker at least realised that the parameters he began with were vague (although he seemed unaware of their iconographic significance, at least at a conscious level), but this is

\textsuperscript{54}Interview with Lindsey Clubb.
\textsuperscript{55}Parker, 1979, 1982, 1992.
arguably one of the strengths of his ideal, that it started out not so much as a set of technical requirements, to which an image was later added, but rather that it started as an image, upon which technical specifications were only later overlaid. Thus, with the image at the core of the project, it was that that survived, rather than being discarded in the subsequent processes of rationalisation and mediation, through which all such projects pass.

The next layer to be added upon Parker’s embryonic building site was that of the nature of the people which it began to attract. According to Lindsay Clubb\textsuperscript{56}, the current site manager, and successor to Parker, Martlesham Heath did not attract those specifically seeking village or community life, but rather those seeking a particular sort of estate housing. He tells of the informal exchange system which operated for a time between the sales office at the developing Martlesham Heath, and its opposite numbers at nearby Barratts developments. Those customers arriving at Martlesham Heath show houses and asking where the carpets, curtains or washing machine were, were directed towards Barratts, with the advice that the customer would probably find what they wanted there, whilst those turning up at Barratt developments, and complaining about room sizes, garden sizes and house design, were similarly pointed towards Martlesham Heath. Thus buyers began to be sorted, and to sort themselves, according to the criteria on which they judged a development, with Martlesham Heath attracting those who appreciated design, space and layout, rather than those looking for a maintenance and work free bargain. They were thus not typical of new house buyers, who typically look for a ready made pleasant house, upon which they need to do little work, and which they do not intend to personalise (as they often wish to move on frequently, and the broad, if soulless attraction of a standardised house makes resale easier). Rather they seemed to share traits with those house buyers who choose on the character of a house and neighbourhood, tend to buy older houses, which they settle in, work on, and personalise. There is little evidence that BPT, Bidwells or Parker had seen their market in such analytical terms, but they led the market by several years.

\textsuperscript{56}Interview with Lindsey Clubb.
Whilst most of those individuals involved in the management and organisation of the development are wary of describing the people of Martlesham Heath as anything other than diverse, it appears that there are characteristics shared by a broad majority of those resident. Most clearly, it is a middle class settlement, unlike that at East Goscote, with a high proportion of graduates and those in technical, managerial, and professional occupations. They appear to value Martlesham Heath as a rather pleasant suburb (for all its village pretensions), though they seem to share some of the same motives as those moving to both suburban and peri-urban locations - namely that it is a pleasant, safe environment, with plenty of safe open space, good schools, and few if any social pathologies. Yet it gives the impression, despite this, of rather apologetic snobbery - it is not a place which appears to flaunt wealth or exclusivity (despite the premium on house prices), or to value the sort of hedge and guard dog privacy of wealthier suburban enclaves. In any case, there are sufficient proportions of rented property, smaller houses, flats and specialist elderly housing to prevent it becoming too socially monolithic. People do appear genuinely to know their neighbours, to talk to each other, to take an active interest in village life and village affairs, and to walk, rather than drive, around the village (but the road system is designed to encourage that - the intention was to allow vehicle access and parking space, whilst allowing it the car the minimum domination of layout and land use).

Like all social groups, the residents of Martlesham Heath do have their fears, both real and imaginary. Their outlook with regard to the future of the settlement varies considerably from that of those involved in its ongoing development. The residents view is essentially one of conservation, or even fossilisation, of what already exists ("we like it the way it is, and want to keep it that way"), whereas the development viewpoint is still one couched in the future tense, of working towards a future vision of what will be (and the present is a fluid, transitory position, resulting from the pursuance of an end goal). Moreover, some of its apparent advantages can also become the source of fear. Notable in this regard is Martlesham Heath's equidistant position between Ipswich, Woodbridge and Felixstowe, which originally placed it advantageously for commuting to all three, but now seems to threaten it with suburban expansion from both Ipswich and Felixstowe. This appears to be more fear than reality, for whilst the suburbs of Ipswich are expanding in Martlesham Heath's direction, it is protected by green wedges, and a strongly defensive local plan, and
Felixstowe's urban edge is still several miles away. Pressures of recession have hit the Heath as hard as anywhere else - those in work feel greater pressure to contribute there, and have less time to put into community involvement, whilst others are losing jobs, or worried about losing them. The high level of design at Martlesham Heath can to some seem contrived - in its early days, so one interviewee told me, it was rather like living on a film set. The analogy is an interesting one, conjuring up images of impermanence, shallowness, artificiality and facade. It also brings up the idea of landscape as theatre, for there is surely an element of this in the design and use of Martlesham Heath.

**Selling Martlesham Heath**

It is fortuitous that there exists a great deal of the original sales and advertising literature relating to the site. This is in marked contrast to the situation at East Goscote, and as much as can be gathered, also somewhat different from the situation at Bar Hill. At East Goscote, what evidence there is suggests that there was little such material to begin with, and whatever there was has long ago been discarded as worthless, and of no interest (as with most of the records that one might have expected the developer to retain). In the case of Bar Hill there is some remaining material, but like the history of the site itself it is fragmented, and often appears to have been more wishful thinking than concrete plans. Such differences do, however, mirror the different backgrounds of each development, and are as such instructive.

The existence of a relatively complete archive for Martlesham Heath suggests that the significance of what was being done was recognised at the time, and there was intent to preserve and record what was happening. This tallies both with Chris Parker's idealism, and also with the level of documentation and intellectualisation which went on both before and during the development of the village. In comparison, East Goscote went unnoticed at all but the most local level both before and during building, nobody appears to have written any contemporaneous documentary material, and it was certainly not the subject of any

---

57 Martlesham Heath's character is well protected by local planning policy, if one is to judge by Suffolk Coastal District Council's own policy, and the very positive attitudes of their officers towards the site.

58 Interview with Rev. Brian Lillistone.

59 See Duncan, 1995; Cosgrove, 1992; Daniels and Cosgrove, 1993.
serious theoretical examination, either by those developing it, or by any branch of the academic or trade related press. Both Martlesham Heath and Bar Hill made early appearances in the architectural press, Bar Hill as early as 1963, and Martlesham Heath certainly by 1979\textsuperscript{60}, and probably earlier. Thereafter, whilst regular updates of progress and reports upon the latest stages of development appear in the press about Martlesham Heath, there were considerable periods of silence at several points about Bar Hill, whilst it went through its long periods of crisis, changes of ownership, and slow development. There is evidence that both were the subject of periodic academic attention, though that given to Martlesham Heath was again more consistent and less critical than that upon Bar Hill.

There is another major feature of Martlesham Heath’s publicity material which differentiates it from that which exists about Bar Hill - in that what is shown is almost exactly what very soon got built. The road layouts shown are as they were built and the house plans and sketches are of properties now built. Right from the beginning the evidence points to a great concern within BPT to maintain credibility with the development, to deliver promises, and to work within a fairly short timescale. Whereas the earliest plans and sketches of Bar Hill attempt to show the entire village and its layout\textsuperscript{61}, and as a result make promises which could not be guaranteed (and were rapidly reneged upon), Martlesham Heath is only ever shown conceptually, with detailed information only about hamlets due to be developed within the following couple of years. This is in turn a consequence of the differing ways in which the planning of each settlement was organised. The Bar Hill project began with grand concepts of master planning, which were soon disrupted by the unforeseen interventions of the market and hold-ups with other projects which had a bearing upon the site. In comparison, the organisation of Martlesham Heath had an inbuilt fluidity, allowing individual architects free rein within their given hamlets. This allowed fluctuations in markets and circumstances to be accommodated without drastic revision to a master plan, thus retaining an aura of greater credibility and certainty.

\textsuperscript{60}Parker, 1979; Darley, 1979.

\textsuperscript{61}See the diagrams in the illustrative annex.
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Chapter 8

Synthesis

Introduction

This chapter brings together the material discussed in the previous chapters, drawing out the common themes which underpin the development of new settlements, as well as illustrating the ways in which individual site histories are driven by local contingencies, rather than wider patterns. In addition to drawing parallels and indicating contrasts between the three sites under discussion, this synthesis also places these histories within a wider theoretical and historical context; that of the garden cities and new towns movements.

The chapter is divided into a series of sections, the contents of which are broadly as follows:

◊ the temporal context of the events discussed, especially in relation to wider political and social events;
◊ the new settlements movement and the relationship of these three settlements to it;
◊ the role of groups and individuals in new settlements;
◊ the historical context of new settlements;
◊ the genesis of the three new settlements studied;
◊ the individual nature of the three settlements;
◊ self-containment;
◊ social diversity and differentiation;
◊ defining place in new settlements;
◊ the attraction of new settlements;
◊ design;
◊ initiative, philosophy and approach;
Following this extensive synthesis of ideas and themes in this chapter, the final chapter which follows this draws out the conclusions of the thesis.

_A Temporal Context_

The events discussed in this thesis have a specific temporal context, which has implications for the intellectual world in which events occurred. In the early 1960s, when all three of these new settlements were first conceived, the political consensus which had operated in the UK since the second world war was still intact. Part of this consensus was a state led and interventionist planning system, of which the state new towns programme was an intrinsic part. In residential architecture, the dominant state approach was one broadly termed modernism\(^1\), characterised by a functionalist approach to design. Typical products of this were deck access and high rise flats, built using prefabricated reinforced concrete to replace slum housing. As noted later, some of the design elements which characterised this approach were evident in the early design sketches, and some of the early building in the three new settlements studied. One of the underlying philosophical assumptions of this modernist approach to planning and municipal architecture was that society was perfectible\(^2\), or at least improveable, through the application of town planning and rational architecture.

---

\(^1\)Modernism is a term applied in far wider contexts than planning and architecture. Reference to modernism in this context should be taken as being limited to the fields of planning and architecture. As Bradbury suggests, "no one is quite sure of the why, the when, the what, the where and the how of modernism: at what point it might be said to have developed; where the epicentre lay...what the defining characteristics are" (Malcolm Bradbury (1995) "From here to modernity" Prospect Vol. 3 December 1995 pp.34-39) - it is axiomatic to the argument here that, in contradiction to Bradbury, who asserts that modernism ended with the second world war, and that events thereafter in art and culture are manifestations of post-modernism, modernism in architecture and planning persisted into the late sixties, before being eroded by the failures of its own grand projects.

\(^2\)This approach, the inherent perfectibility of human society through the application of rational planning and socialism is evident in the Fabian pamphlet of Norman Mackenzie (Mackenzie N. (1955) - _The New Towns - the success of social planning_ (Fabian Society)), and also in the proofs of evidence given to the Bar Hill public enquiry by Wyndham Thomas and W. Leathley Waide (Proposed New Village - Dry Drayton; Proofs of Evidence (Cambridgeshire County Council, December 1963)).
As the 1960s progressed, the erosion of post-war certainties was paralleled in planning by failures in the modernist project. These occurred for a number of reasons, two examples being structural failures such as the collapse of the Ronan Point high rise flats in London in 1967, and the failure of grand redevelopment schemes such as Hulme in Manchester to meet the needs and aspirations of residents. Thus the early development of East Goscote and Bar Hill took place against a background of increasing uncertainty in planning, as well as in the wider national political project, exacerbated by the economic problems brought about by the 1973 oil crisis. The post-war consensus was finally brought to an end by the election of the Thatcher government in 1979, which subsequently ushered in a political epoch which saw the market as pre-eminent, and the intervention of the state as anathema. By this time, East Goscote was complete, but Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath continued development throughout the 1980s, and thus that decade shaped not only their social development, but also their built environments.

The New Settlements Movement

The 'laissez-faire' approach to planning encouraged by planning guidance in the 1980s, characterised most clearly by Circular 22/80, the presumption in favour of development, and rising house prices, produced a rash of speculative proposals for new settlements, most of them in the south-east region, and often on green belt land. Many developers proposed new settlements, though the most notable protagonists were Consortium Developments Ltd (CDL) who were involved in a number of schemes, none of which came to fruition. Eventually changes of guidance from subsequent secretaries of state, which laid greater

---

2The first list of the new settlements proposed in the eighties boom appears to have been Potter, Stephen (1986) - “New towns in the real world” T&CP November 1986 pp204-309 which lists 12 sites already started (including Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, but not East Goscote, and also several sites which were no more than village or town extensions), and 26 proposed sites, of which 10 were CDL proposals. This list was considerably expanded and updated by Amos, Chris (1991c) - “Flexibility and variety - the key to new settlement policy?” T&CP February 1991 pp52-56 which lists 133 sites, most of them merely proposals. This was at the high water mark in terms of the number of sites, and later Owen, Chris (1993b) - “Over to local processes” T&CP November 1993 pp305-309 reports that changes in the planning environment (both in guidance and legislation), as well as the collapse of the housing market, had reduced the number of recorded potential sites to 57.
stress upon environmental protection, and key appeal decisions, both of which were driven
by increasing public concern about development in the countryside, coincided with the
collapse of the housing market, and the disappearance of many new settlement schemes.
However, the large number of new proposals had stimulated a great deal of interest, both in
the academic and professional worlds⁴, which raised the profile of new settlements as one
solution to development constraints in the local plan process. As a result, new settlement
proposals began to appear in structure plans, local plans and unitary development plans⁵.
The rising interest in new settlements amongst local authority planners led both to specific
guidance in PPG3⁶, and in Regional Planning Guidance⁷, which, for the first time,
provided central government policy on new settlements, some twenty-five years after they
had appeared.

⁴The early involvement of the TCPA gave the 'movement' academic, professional and perhaps most
importantly, moral credibility, notably hosting a seminar on the 20th May 1985 entitled “New Settlements or
New Suburbs? - Current Private Sector Initiatives”. At about the same time, Oxford Polytechnic reprinted
two papers first published some time before: Bray, Carl (1981) - New Villages: Case Studies: No.1 New Ash
Green (Oxford Polytechnic Department of Town Planning Working Paper No.51) and Bray, Carl (1981) -
New Villages: Case Studies: No.2 South Woodham Ferrers (Oxford Polytechnic Department of Town
Planning Working Paper No.52). This all occurred in the same year that CDL first became active. Persuasive
and respected names in planning also placed their opinions behind the new settlements idea, notably David
Hall (eg. Hall, David (1991) - “Time to prepare for a new settlements boom” T&CP November 1991 pp291-
2) and David Lock (eg. Lock, David (1989b) - “Second honeymoon in the marriage of town & country?”
T&CP June 1989 pp174-175). In 1989, Lock was Visiting Professor of Town Planning at Birmingham
Polytechnic. Links like this, and the interest of groups such as the New Settlements Research Group at
Loughborough University, gave an academic dimension to the discussion about new settlements. Academic
papers were few in number however, and the period seems not to have produced a book to document its
thoughts.

⁵Examples of such sites brought forward through the planning process include Dickens Heath, currently
being considered as part of the Solihull UDP, and various sites in and around Loughborough, namely
Garendon Park, and sites at Cossington, Cotes and Rearsby, which were considered as part of the Charnwood
District Wide Local Plan (Hankin, David (1993) - Approach to New Settlement Planning in Charnwood
(paper to New Settlements Research Group Annual Seminar 1st June 1993))

⁶DoE Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 - Housing (March 1992) paragraphs 32-37 (HMSO)
⁷For example Draft Regional Planning Guidance for The West Midlands (1992) which states in paragraph
3.11 that “large new settlements can provide a sustainable form of development and will in many cases be
preferable to development in the Green Belt or the incremental growth of small settlements”.
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Thus many of the current new settlement proposals are in a similar planning position to that of Bar Hill in 1963. These current proposals are conceived within the framework of strategic or local planning policy, but require liaison between public sector planning and private sector development interests to bring them to fruition. In these new schemes, there appears to be a greater degree of genuine public-private sector partnership than was the case with Bar Hill. At Bar Hill, the initiative was certainly with Cambridgeshire County Planning Department, and the developer was only brought in once parameters such as the site had already been decided. In the newer schemes, sites may already have been suggested informally by developers to planning departments before they are incorporated into plans. What appears to remain the case, however, is that new settlements remain essentially local in their inception, in response either to constraints identified for development land elsewhere in the plan area, or to interests held on a particular site by a developer. This is something of a change from the new settlements boom in the mid and late 1980s, when national development interests were actively promoting the concept in relation both to a range of specific sites, and as a general approach. Here, the approach was at a national scale (though concentrated, in terms of specific sites, in the South-East and East Anglian planning regions). In addition, the new settlements boom also generated a number of local schemes, such as Tircoed in South Wales.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{8}}\text{Though there remain persistent, if unverifiable, suggestions that unofficial approaches may have been made by, or agreements made between, individuals in the planning department and private interests, probably landholders, as to the choice of site. This may even have been the source of the idea for a new village, though there is no evidence or suggestion to this effect.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{9}}\text{And even then, the opportunity was rejected by at least two developers before being accepted by Holland, Hannen and Cubitt.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{10}}\text{For instance Consortium Developments Limited (1985a) - Tillingham Hall Outline Plan (CDL), which according to Potter (1986) op cit., formed the basis for up to ten other proposals. The general approach of CDL was outlined in Consortium Developments Ltd. (1985b) - The plan for New Country Towns (CDL). CDL comprised Barratt Developments PLC, Beazer (Homes) Ltd, Bovis Homes Ltd, Broseley Estates Ltd, Christian Salvesen (Properties) Ltd, Ideal Homes Holdings PLC, Tarmac PLC, Wilcon Homes Ltd and Wimpey Homes Holdings Ltd.}\]
The three new settlements discussed in this thesis have had only a limited effect upon what is now termed the new settlements movement. East Goscote appears never to have had any coverage in either planning or academic literature at any point in its history, with the only academic research of any kind having been undertaken by the author. Bar Hill, as the chapter discussing its history makes clear, was the subject of extensive coverage in professional journals early in its history, but thereafter became increasingly ignored as continued problems delayed its development and eroded its conceptual purity. During the 1980s, further new settlement sites were considered around Cambridge, in the A10 and A45 corridors, and articles discussing this made brief reference to Bar Hill, though the site was more often damned with faint praise than cited as an example of good practice.

Martlesham Heath, in contrast, has been the subject of continued academic and, especially, professional interest, both because it was the latest of these sites to be developed, but also because its aesthetic success and relative lack of problems in development made it a very presentable subject. Evidence from interviews and from archive material suggests that

---

11 The term ‘new settlements movement’ is of uncertain genesis, but was certainly in use by the late 1980s, and has come to be understood as embracing both the private sector boom of that time, and the later generation of planning led proposals which continue to emerge up to the present day.

12 The only published reference to East Goscote found during the research period was one brief article, Anon. (1990) - “Thirty years on - two new villages of the 1960s revisited” Rural Viewpoint Issue 38 August 1990 pp8-9. This thesis, and an earlier issue’s report, Owen, C.R (ed, 1992) - East Goscote Project - Issues Report (New Settlements Research Group, Department of Geography, Loughborough University) form the only substantial research work done on this particular site.

13 A full list of the sites under consideration at that time can be found in Amos, Chris (1991c) op cit., whilst Owen (1993b) op cit. updates progress on these sites two years after this.

14 Smith C. & Vigor M. (1986) - “New settlements the answer in the fens?” T&CP Vol. 55, Part 11 (November 1986) pp322-3 says “The idea of new villages or communities is not new in the county. It is nearly 20 years since the first buildings were constructed in the new village at Barr Hill (sic), which is now moving towards completion. The townships in the county’s new town of Peterborough, also nearing completion, are other examples of new community culture in Cambridgeshire”.

15 Martlesham Heath is cited as an exemplary development in an undated (though of late-eighties vintage) lobbying report, New Homes Environmental Group (n/d) - More Homes and a Better Environment, as well as approving features in professional publications: “Martlesham Heath Village, Suffolk” Architects Journal 5th September 1979 pp484-503; Williams, Anthony and Partners (1988) - “Martlesham Heath” Building 25th
Martlesham Heath is a very popular subject for field visits and investigation by a range of academic and professional groups. Thus it would be a mistake to see these three settlements as part of a seamless history which culminated in the new settlements boom. Indeed, one of the roles of this thesis is to inform those now developing or planning new settlements of what has happened in new settlements which have already been completed. Rather, each of these sites should be seen as a local and contingent response to particular situations, and not as part of any wider movement.

**Groups and Individuals**

New settlements should be seen simply as one option amongst many, which may emerge as a solution to particular local opportunities and conditions. Two points follow - firstly, that new settlements should not be thought of as the ‘next big thing’ in town planning, rather as they became for a short time in the speculative ferment of the mid and late 1980s. They are one option amongst many, which may be suitable in a given set of site, financial and policy circumstances, but not as a universal panacea. Neither should it be assumed that new settlements are a new idea - as chapter 2 makes clear, the idea of building new villages, towns and cities has often recurred, either as part of a speculative (and often maverick) intellectual counter-culture, or sometimes, co-opted into the dominant ideology. In the ecology of ideas, new settlements appear to be persistent, if rather opportunistic, and rarely dominant.

The second important issue here, and one which is supported by research findings, is that neither individuals nor groups are internally consistent in their intellectual frameworks. Thus, it should be expected that the views and understandings held by groups and individuals may contain ideas and ideologies which are accepted as self-evident, when rigorous analysis might suggest that they are either in direct contradiction, or at least held in tension. The social organisations of these new settlements bear this out - the dominant understanding is a compromise, a set of public views, put together from a whole range of

---

**November 1988 pp43-54; Aldous, Tony (1983) - “Controlled chaos proves a winner” Chartered Surveyor Weekly 29th September 1983 pp662-3.**

16 The archives of Chris Parker contain a copy of “Notes for visiting students” dating from the mid-1980s.

17 This understanding may be seen as the set of commonly agreed views which concern the nature of the village, its community, its accepted forms of behaviour, its accepted narrative history and so on. It may or
experiences and sources. This understanding is negotiated by a group of individuals, often relatively small in number, who by being in control of the means by which ideas are disseminated, or in positions which confer moral authority, and often because they have arrived relatively early in the history of the village, are able to define and retain the accepted ideas. That is not to say that such ideas are agreed by the whole body of the village - just as in wider society, there are sub-dominant ideas present, which find expression in a number of ways; for instance, as direct challenges to the dominant group in the local press, in the built environment by breaking the accepted norms of house maintenance, or simply as views expressed to those that ask.

The Historical Context of New Settlements

It was suggested earlier that new settlements are simply the latest manifestation of a much longer history of attempts to build new places. In a sense, there is common ground here between the understandings of the ways in which new towns were established in North America, and the manner in which space itself became mythologised as a geography of places. In a British context, as Chapter 2 suggests, there is a history of new places, prior to the nineteenth Century often built by landowners to house estate workers (either on an idealised plan for altruistic motives or merely to ensure the supply of local, tractable may not include a dominant view about issues such as politics - such issues may be agreed, or open to contest.

18 Key amongst these include community publications, such as newspapers and magazines, but also minutes and reports of meetings. Access to the local press, to tell an official story, or lobby on particular issues also plays a significant part, but this presupposes the ability to articulate views in a manner suitable to press needs.

19 In this, the church formed a key centre of early moral authority, and in some cases the local controlling group built itself on this foundation (as in Bar Hill) even if the church was replaced in its role of nominal authority by community organisations such as the parish council. Subsequently, community organisations have provided a platform of authority, as have local institutions such as the school, and election to the district council.

20 Inasmuch as thus suggests both the official (dominant) and unofficial (sub-dominant) story of a village, the findings of this research appear to bear out the understandings of relict village organisation presented by Cohen, Anthony P. (1985) - The Symbolic Construction of Community (Routledge) and Cohen, Anthony P. (ed. 1986) - Symbolising Boundaries (Manchester University Press), the difference being that such structures have developed in new settlements within the space of one generation, rather than over a much longer period.

21 For example, Milton Abbas in Dorset.
labour). In the nineteenth century, the industrialisation and urbanisation of society changed the scale of such undertakings, but often not the motives behind them. The most celebrated of nineteenth century new villages, towns and suburbs were, of course, those built with altruistic or idealistic motives (Saltaire, Bourneville, Port Sunlight to name but three), but given the persistent advantages of tied accommodation in providing employers with a tractable labour force, there is every likelihood that the practice was also used less scrupulously in other, entirely unrecorded, situations\(^{22}\).

However, there is no indication that up to this point, the notion of building new places, for whatever reason, had become widely accepted in political circles (though it was tolerated alongside other ideas, partly because the progenitors were wealthy men, and partly because it belonged with the Victorian zeitgeist of eccentric inventiveness). Ebenezer Howard, arguably the single most influential thinker in the arena of new settlements, first entered the arena of new settlements debate at the turn of this century. His ideas were for many years, counter-cultural, and it took many years for him to achieve the support he needed to begin Welwyn Garden City\(^{23}\). Moreover, by the time Letchworth was begun, it seems evident that the movement that Howard's ideas had created had run beyond his control, and away from the idealised vision he himself promoted. It was only at this point that the notion of building completely new places was adopted as state policy, as the end of the second world war and the need for substantial reconstruction brought the need for radical

\(^{22}\)Though some indication of the extent of such developments can be gained from examination of Poll, Christopher G. (1982) - The Bradford Property Trust PLC and subsidiary companies (Charles Stanley & Co.), which details some of the housing, taken over by the Bradford Property Trust, and previously the property of corporate landlords, intended for their employees.

\(^{23}\)Aalen, Frederick H.A. (1992) - "English Origins" in Ward, Stephen V. (1992, ed.) - The Garden City Past, Present and Future (E & FN Spon) Chapter 2 pp28-51, details the early years of Howard, and the development of his ideas and influence. Hardy, Dennis (1991) - From Garden Cities to New Towns (E & FN Spon), the first volume of a comprehensive history of the Town and Country Planning Association also discusses the role of Howard in the early years of the garden cities movement, as part of the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association (GCTPA) which he founded, and which was the forerunner of the present day TCPA.
new solutions, such as that embodied in the 1946 New Towns Act, introduced by a new and radical socialist government\textsuperscript{24}.

The Genesis of the Three New Settlements

What this thesis refers to as new settlements, the building of new villages such as East Goscote, Martlesham Heath and Bar Hill, took root during the time when the building of state New Towns was still a dominant idea and a key part of national planning policy. In a sense they were ideologically parasitic - they were not part of the state programme, but used it to give the idea of building new places a veneer of official legitimacy. There is, however, very little evidence of an ideology of common ideas linking our three sites together into some wider movement. Nevertheless, the fact that all three were conceived at almost the same time does beg the question as to whether they did have some connection with one another. Undoubtedly, there is evidence that Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath did have common roots, but persuasive as it might be to try and tie East Goscote into this, there is no evidence that this third site was aware of the others prior to the concept of a new village being agreed upon.

As the discussion of Bar Hill makes clear, W. Leathley Waide, the Chief Planning Officer for Cambridge, may be officially credited with the idea of building Bar Hill, as a way of pursuing an existing strategic planning framework, albeit one which had gone awry. Chris Parker, who was working as a site manager for a private firm of chartered surveyors in Cambridge at the time was fired by the idea of new settlements, though he was at odds with much that Waide tried to do, thinking his plans impractical. With little chance of furthering his own ideas in Cambridgeshire, he pursued them on another site in Suffolk, which became Martlesham Heath. Whilst the idea for building at East Goscote occurred at the same time, the evidence of those that were party to discussions at the time suggests that the crucial idea of building a new village (as opposed to an extension of an existing settlement) had emerged before the architect had begun to seek inspiration by looking at the plans for, and articles about, Bar Hill in the technical press of the time\textsuperscript{25}, as well as a

\textsuperscript{24}The view of new towns as a socialist solution is clearly articulated in Mackenzie (1955) op. cit., a Fabian pamphlet from the ideological zenith of state new town development.

\textsuperscript{25}Interview with John Nixon of Allen & Nixon, the East Goscote architects, Tuesday 11th February 1992.
number of other sites both in the UK and abroad. However, it appears to be the case that Bar Hill was, in many ways, the genesis from which many other new settlements sprang. As we have noted, it directly inspired Martlesham Heath, and there is also evidence in the historical record that one of the developers who originally evaluated the Bar Hill site (SPAN) rejected it in favour of the site which became New Ash Green. It is unclear as to whether SPAN already had the idea of building a new village prior to their involvement with Bar Hill, or only became aware of the concept having been brought in as potential developers. If it was the former, then Bar Hill will, at least, have been instructive, and if the latter, then the relationship with New Ash Green is much the same as that with Martlesham Heath. And whilst Bar Hill did not inspire the idea for a new village at East Goscote, it was certainly a site whose conceptual designs and drawings were in the planning and architectural press whilst East Goscote was itself being designed, and these were used as a source of inspiration for the architects who designed East Goscote.

**The Individuality of the Three New Settlements**

However, both the circumstances of the individual sites, and the philosophies which underpinned their conception were very different. East Goscote was conceived entirely as a development site, a way of utilising a derelict site profitably. This approach suited both the local planning authority, which by the standards of new settlements applications today, operated in a minimalist, laissez-faire manner, with the result that the village was built down to a price, and to the most conservative and basic of designs. The planning approval had only seven conditions and occupied only a single sheet of foolscap paper, in considerable contrast to the lengthy and complex approvals that would accompany such a development now. Two main reasons can be suggested for such an approach - naivety, or the fear that constraining the developer to any greater extent would harm the chances of development. The local planning authority were very keen to see the site redeveloped, and may have felt that, having decided upon the development option offered by Jelson Ltd,

---

26The involvement of SPAN in the Bar Hill site is recorded in Cambridgeshire County Council (1985) - *A history of Bar Hill* (CCC)

27By current terminology, the East Goscote site was definitely 'brownfield', being almost entirely occupied by derelict military buildings, some of them substantial in construction. There were, therefore, considerable costs to the developer in site clearance, though these were to some extent defrayed by the existence of drainage and power supply systems on site resulting from its prior usage.
were in a relatively weak position to demand too much. However, it seems more likely that they were unable to grasp the planning implications of a new village, and were prepared simply to trust the developer. Comparatively, it was the one of the three which came nearest to being merely functional in concept - it fulfilled the need to redevelop a site; it did so in a manner which was economically viable and cleared a secure profit for the developer; it provided sound, spacious, affordable housing; and it made provision for a number of communal facilities, such as shops, a pub, a village hall, playing fields and so on. However, unlike Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, it had no ‘vision’ behind it other than to fulfil these functions. In contrast, Bar Hill had a guiding design philosophy, and was embedded in a wider strategic policy for Cambridgeshire, which included strong philosophical ideas about the manner in which village life could be maintained and enhanced in the county.

Martlesham Heath was created around the ideas of Chris Parker, specifically his concept of the ‘20th Century Village’. Parker, along with the landowners, Bradford Property Trust, had clear ideas about the way in which the design of their new village should be shaped. Around a core layout, and some broad principles about the structure of the village, they selected different local architects, gave them a broad brief for a group of houses, and did little more than approve the designs which resulted. It was an approach which aimed to emulate the organic way in which older villages had grown, by eschewing a common set of architectural design motifs, and deliberately aiming for diversity. Crucially, whilst Bar Hill was undermined by its financial planning, and the continued involvement of

\[^{28}\text{A crucial part of this was county education policy, which had developed the innovative ‘village college’ approach, which in concept preceded the now common ‘community school’, and had the twin aims of retaining secondary education in the rural areas, in key villages, and providing an educational and social centre in that area for the whole population. It is perhaps no surprise that one of the key members of Bar Hill’s ‘ruling group’ was the headmaster of the village school, and a strong advocate of village colleges, and their ideological superstructure (interview with Bill Norton). It seems much of this philosophical approach rubbed off on the way in which Bar Hill envisaged itself.}\]

\[^{29}\text{This concept is most clearly and fully articulated in Parker, Christopher (1982) - Martlesham Heath, Suffolk, a XXth century village (private paper).}\]

\[^{30}\text{In contrast, the original architectural design for Bar Hill deliberately adopted a set of design motifs, supposedly representative of existing Cambridgeshire village vernacular, into essentially modernist designs, as Chapter 6 illustrates, by use of the pictures in Appendix 1.}\]
commercial developers who were keen to realise short term profit, the approach of Bradford Property Trust was different - they were not developers and had a long record as private sector, but socially responsible, landlords. Their profit horizons appear to have been less constrained\(^3\), so that they were able to wait longer for their return, which was, apparently, quite satisfactory. The result was that the approach taken at Martlesham Heath was not compromised by the need to cut costs and sell houses, which resulted in higher densities and more conservative house styles in subsequent years at Bar Hill.

**Common Parameters**

Despite such diverse approaches, there are common threads which run through all three of these sites, and allow new settlements such as these, as well as others built at the same time, and built or planned more recently, to be placed in philosophical comparison with other types of new settlements, such as Howardian garden cities and state new towns. Table 7.1 (reproduced as a plate following this page) indicates a range of parameters through which such settlements can be compared and characterised, these being:

- the degree of self-containment;
- the social mix of residents;
- the attitude implied towards the city and the country;
- design;
- the initiative for development;
- the principal philosophical approach;
- the envisaged social structures; and
- the nature of land ownership.

---

\(^3\)Partly because the land on which the village was built was acquired at effectively nil cost, and they were not saddled with debt charges they needed to defray with the returns from house sales - thus they could allow the village to develop at a pace dictated by the needs of the village design, and its social development, rather than the year end accounts.
Self-Containment

Chapter 2 notes that the concept of self-containment ran through all new settlement thinking, from the first theories propounded by Howard, and throughout the state New Towns period. Its citation was talismanic, used to provide the moral link back to Howard, and thus to the original theoretical justification of the garden city ideal, though its meaning changed through time. This was a contingent response to the manner in which social organisation developed in the garden cities, as well in the state new towns. Self-containment, in the sense which Howard meant it, was the containment of all the cities needs and functions - social, commercial, residential, industrial and agricultural - within the boundaries of the new development. Even Howard realised that such self-containment was impossible within one garden city of 30,000 people, and envisaged several such cities linked in a wider matrix, which would be the unit of self-containment.

By the time of the state New Towns, it was becoming apparent even to those promoting their ideology, that self-containment in the Howardian sense was not a reality, even if they were unwilling to undermine the ideal by directly admitting this. In fact, both garden cities and new towns functioned in much the same manner as other towns of similar size, forming economic and social links with their wider environs. As contemporary commentary notes, the wealthier employees of new towns tended to avoid living in them, and to move to surrounding older towns and villages, whilst the labour markets of new towns also became part of the wider locale, with commuting flows occurring into and out of the new town to other towns and villages in the locality.

In response to such realities, the self-containment concept was first redefined so that the first state new towns were seen as satellites of larger settlements, intended for overspill and relocated inner city populations. Later, the understanding that new towns were part of their wider city-regions became more acceptable, and the amenity levels of such towns were planned with the expectation that some requirements would be met elsewhere. This was, of course, helpful in reducing the cost of new towns in terms of the infrastructure and communal building which was required, and it also meant that the meaning of the concept

---

32 As is apparent in Mackenzie (1955) op. cit.
33 See Wirz, H.M. (1975) - Social aspects of planning in New Towns (Saxon House)
of self-containment was changed to meet new realities whilst retaining the link with the past that the term itself represented.

New villages such as Bar Hill, Martlesham Heath and East Goscote could never, of course, achieve the level of self-containment that Howard envisaged for garden cities. They are, in that sense, as far removed from the Howardian ideal as can be envisaged - they are only possible as a small addition to an existing urban matrix. The role intended for each of our three sites within that matrix was, however, slightly different. In accordance with the strategic planning policy in place since the war, the aim at Bar Hill was to direct development away from the city of Cambridge itself, both to smaller towns within Cambridgeshire, and to the villages of the county. The plan had designated some villages (usually the larger ones) for the provision of higher level amenities such as village colleges. Bar Hill was intended to drop into this organised network of expanded villages, and, in its case, provide a retail and employment centre for surrounding villages. The employment in the village was originally envisaged as serving little more than local needs, but was expanded as subsequent developers demanded more industrial units and warehousing, giving it greater significance in the sub-region.

The shopping centre was originally planned to provide a substantial mall of shops which could not possibly have been supported by the Bar Hill population alone, and was justified partly by reference to the American experience of ‘out-of-town’ shopping (prior to this becoming a significant phenomenon in British retail culture), with the centre at Bar Hill intended to divert retail activity from the surrounding villages away from the city itself. As it was, this plan was undermined by the very forces it tried to ape, such that when new developers took over the site in the early seventies, the plan for a mall of shops was replaced by one for a site dominated by one large supermarket, which was later joined by a gardening centre. This was truly ‘out-of-town’ shopping as it has come to be understood in the British context - retail sheds on arterial roads, built on greenfield sites well out of the main urban centre.

---

34 Enshrined in the Holford Plan, conceived by Sir William Holford between 1948 and 1950, which was incorporated into the Statutory Development Plan for the County published in 1952, and approved by the Ministry for Housing and Local Government (MoHLG) in 1954.
In contrast, neither Martlesham Heath nor East Goscote was intended to serve its hinterland in the way that Bar Hill was, though the role of Martlesham Heath was complicated by two factors. Firstly, by an accident of its history, and because of the intervention of Chris Parker to prevent the usual practice of site clearance by demolition, the village was left with a large number of former barracks, hangers and workshops which were re-used for a range of purposes, some industrial, some commercial, and some related to community activities. That meant that there grew up adjacent to the new village an industrial estate which occupied these old buildings\(^{35}\) which was of sufficient scale\(^{36}\) to be a centre of employment not only for the immediately surrounding villages, but also for workers from Ipswich itself. This was also exacerbated by the relocation of the Post Office Telephones research facility from London to an adjacent site in the early sixties\(^{37}\).

The second way in which Martlesham Heath’s position was complicated was its location within an existing parish, in which there was already a village (Martlesham, now locally known as Old Martlesham). This meant that some of the community facilities were constructed under the auspices of the Parish Council, serving both villages - indeed, the village hall is located in open country equidistant between the two. Thus, whilst East Goscote can largely be seen as dependent upon larger centres for higher level services, for much of its employment and so on, the relationship of both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath with their locales is far more complex, and far less hierarchical. They are both dependent for some services (for example, secondary schooling), but providers in other respects (retail services in Bar Hill, employment in Martlesham Heath). Moreover, Martlesham Heath can be seen as co-dependent socially with its older neighbour, though the true balance of power is probably with the newer, larger settlement.

---

\(^{35}\)The new ‘residential’ village occupied the area formerly taken up by the airfield itself, and remnants of the old runways are still visible.

\(^{36}\)507,040 sq.ft. in 1988, according to Bradford Property Trust plc (1988) - *Martlesham Heath Village, A Community in the Making*.

\(^{37}\)There remains a BT research facility of considerable size there to this day, which is a major employer within the Ipswich region.
Thus, Howardian garden cities and new villages are at opposite ends of the scale in terms of their self-containment, though in practical terms, the garden cities which were built were themselves part of wider urban matrices. In our three new settlements, self-containment has ceased to have any functional significance, though the importance of physical separation, and of symbolic self-containment through distinct boundaries, has, if anything increased. This aspect of new settlements is discussed later in this chapter.

**Social diversity and differentiation**

Another strand of the Howardian ideal was that of social diversity, or, in planning terminology, social mix. Howard envisaged cities in which all classes and social groups were represented, thus providing a *social* self-containment. However, all places select those who live there, using a number of mechanisms, which include hurdles such as the purchase cost of entry (for instance, house prices), and cultural signals such as design and acceptable forms of behaviour. In this way, the first garden cities attracted a certain type of resident (who were at the time lampooned for being sandal-wearing bohemians). The state new towns, whilst they too maintained a rhetoric of socialist equality, also saw social sorting mechanisms operate, both through market effects, and through the tacit zoning of richer and poorer parts of the town. The tendency for richer residents to move out of the new town into existing older towns, immediately skewing the town itself towards a lower level of affluence, has already been noted. Likewise within new towns, zoning on the basis of wealth and social class developed, driven by the presence of old villages and towns within the new town structure, variations in house size, proximity to industry or to the edge of the town, and, latterly, by the operation of the private housebuilding market, driven by demand, which reinforced pre-existing divisions based on other criteria.

In new settlements, the sorting occurs not so much within the village as between it and the surrounding towns and older villages. The three sites studied in this research appear to have been too small to develop anything in the way of distinct, socially differentiated neighbourhoods, though this does not mean that distinctions of class and status were not apparent in other ways. Rather, social sorting occurred within the urban matrix of which the settlements formed part, both on the basis of market forces, and by more subtle means (for instance, the aspirations of individuals for community or place identity). Chapter 4 also indicates the degree to which the residents of new settlements are sorted by age, so
that populations are initially skewed towards young adults and their children. This is a tendency which affected all three sites, because those willing to move to new settlements did so, and continue to do so, as a result of a complex series of trade-off decisions. In the light of the clear evidence of the Population Census data discussed in Chapter 4, and supported by evidence from a wide range of interview and literature sources, the following can be suggested.

Young couples, either in the pre-family stage, or with young children, are seeking a family house in an environment they consider suitable for bringing up their children. Their youth, and their young families, mean that they are not generally wealthy. Their ideal is to move out of the city, which they characterise as anomic, with busy roads and higher levels of crime (especially the random acts of theft and violence which threaten the security both of their family home and their children), but they cannot afford the exurban villages they would ideally prefer. This is retained as an aspiration for later life, and a model for an ideal lifestyle. Their alternatives are suburban areas, smaller towns and, in these occasional cases, a new settlement. The suburbs may be too close to the city, or not sufficiently like their rural ideal, whilst the smaller towns may also have an entry price hurdle they cannot afford, or be too far away. The new settlement, however, offers housing which is equivalent in price to suburban estates, plus several appealing advantages of village life - low traffic volumes, an environment of containable size, a local ‘village’ school, and a better environment in terms of air quality and open space. This is not to suggest that such people are consciously so calculating - much of this occurs sub-consciously, and the conscious explanation may only be that ‘we liked the house and we could afford it’.

The three new settlements are thus both linked and differentiated by their socio-economic structures. They share between them the distinct new settlement characteristic of being relatively narrow cross-sections of society, defined by income and life stage. We should not view them so much as entities in which we should expect distinct neighbourhoods, but rather that they themselves are neighbourhoods with very distinct characteristics within a wider locale. They are at one and the same time, both part of the wider city, part of

\[38\] Especially the case in East Goscote, where house prices were lower than for equivalent new houses in established suburbs.
'exurbia'\textsuperscript{39}, but also detached from it. This paradox is both essential to the distinct nature of new settlements such as East Goscote, Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath (and also essentially post-modern) - new settlements are essentially internally contradictory, holding conflicting ideas in tension in order to exist. They have to be, at one and the same time, both part of, and \textit{not} part of, the city. They are, and need to be, functionally part of the city, but a significant part of their appeal lies in their symbolic separation from the city - their symbolic representation as part of the non-urban realm.

In Martlesham Heath, anecdotal evidence suggests that differentiation also occurred on a basis far more subtle than income or life stage. There appears to have been an informal mechanism operating in the house sales office at the village, which directed some potential customers towards a nearby Barratt estate, and from which some potential buyers were directed to the new village. Customers were assessed on what they appeared to want in a house - if they valued design over fittings and fixtures, they were directed towards Martlesham Heath. In the private housing market, the basis of choice between one house and another (and therefore between buying into a new settlement, or one of a number of alternatives) is not simply upon functional criteria such as cost and practicality, but also on issues related to \textit{taste, aspiration and imagery}. Thus whilst new settlements can be characterised by their socio-economic status within a wider urban matrix, there are further issues which shape the nature of new settlements which are less clearly defined.

All three new settlements have distinctive identities shaped by socio-economic factors alongside issues such as design and locale. Low relative house prices made East Goscote particularly attractive to young, white families moving from city centre neighbourhoods of Leicester, to whom design was not a concern, but for whom the location of the village, and the basic practicality of the houses, were considerable attractions. Martlesham Heath was particularly attractive to those who valued its diversity in design, and its apparent contradiction of the rules which shaped more conventional estate housing. It, perhaps more than either of the others, served a style-driven niche market, and was the least driven by conventional approaches to development (a product both of Parker’s original vision, and the complete lack of development experience of the development company). Bar Hill has

\textsuperscript{39}Herington, 1984.
been shaped by its long and chequered development history, which planted a strong 'frontier' approach in its early residents, but also by its proximity to Cambridge, which provided it with articulate residents (evident in its community publications), and the wider context of rural growth which deliberately countervailed against the centripetal effects of the city. Thus whilst the common factor of diversity between settlements because of their narrow socio-economic profile mitigates against new settlements being seen as the heirs of Howard's utopian, diverse garden cities, they are also, because of their very local distinctiveness and individuality, closer to the first garden cities - they share much in common with the opportunist beginnings of both Welwyn and Letchworth, and have little to do with the state-led initiative which marked the new towns.

**Defining place in new settlements**

This chapter has begun to suggest that the way in which individuals and groups view and characterise their spatial world has important implications for the discussion of new settlements. Intrinsic to this are views held upon the nature of the city and the country, and also about the way in which space is bounded and defined. Howard himself entered the arena of the city-country dichotomy, though this was already well-trodden territory by the time he propounded his thoughts. Chapter 1 examines the nature of nineteenth century sociological thought, which placed moral values upon social organisations characterised as rural and urban, and which developed from a rigid dichotomous model, of the sort posited by Tonnies, to models which based themselves on a continuum of possibilities. Howard, however, whilst clearly informed by the moral subtext applied to the rural and urban worlds, used a model which was neither bipolar nor continuous, but rather tripolar, to explain his concept of a social organisation of space which was both city and country, but distinctly different from either. Moreover, if we accept the argument implicit in Berman that post-modernism has always existed within earlier theories, then we can also see in Howard the necessity to hold two essentially conflicting ideas in tension in order to express the truth he was seeking, the rational town and the romantic countryside. He saw the practical and economic advantages of town life, but was concerned that such a life had a tendency to corrupt morals, and the wider culture. Likewise he recognised the functional

---

40 Howard, 1945 [1902].
41 Berman, 1982.
limitations of rural life, but saw this as preserving culture. As an individual too, Howard could convincingly be characterised both as a rationalist and a romantic - indeed, it is probably the tension between these two facets of his intellectual character which made his work so compelling, and so enduring within the subconscious collective mind of town planning.

New settlements sit within this landscape of polar opposites - urban and rural, rational and romantic, functional and symbolic, modernity and nostalgia, new and traditional, good and bad - and try to rationalise their essential polarity by holding them in constructive tension. As an example, the nature of the new settlement within the urban matrix can be considered. The new settlement is, as we have established, functionally part of, and dependent upon, the urban system. It could not exist without the organisation of space which results from urbanisation, and is a manifestation of urbanity. Such settlements, as do all villages and towns, rely upon the land use planning system, established in law, to define and protect their physical separation. They are sustained by the network of communications and supplies which run from and between all settlements. This is their rational context, and yet, at the same time, they inhabit a symbolic world which, though dependent upon the rational, urban world to sustain it, appears to deny its objective existence. New settlements are not merely referred to as new villages to distinguish them in terms of their size, but in order to say something about their symbolic nature. It is a faux pas of considerable proportions to refer to East Goscote as an 'estate' within earshot of those individuals who define its dominant ideology, rather than a village. There is a clear and conscious effort here to define the new settlement as other than urban, and as part of a non-urban realm. The symbolic world, in this example played out in language, thus assumes considerable significance. Such symbolic representation not only uses language, but also interpretation of physical features of the village (such as the village green - a combination both of a symbolic space described with symbolic language). Such features may be incorporated into a place specific narrative, which itself gives meaning (for example, the appropriation of former military features and installations to give Martlesham Heath links back to a heroic history). The manner in which places and features are portrayed and interpreted, and the appropriation of history into a narrative of justification, are discussed below.
This begins to pull together several strands of thought; the moral nature of rurality, the mythological world which new settlements inhabit, and the symbolism used to reinforce both of these. The underpinning theme of nineteenth century social thinkers such as Tonnies and Howard, is that the city, and urban life within it, is corrosive to the human spirit and to social structures. It is a theme which persisted not only through the ideological underpinnings of the state new towns\textsuperscript{42}, but also seems to underlie more recent portrayals of the inner city. This pathological, anomic city is well portrayed by Jonathan Raban\textsuperscript{43}. Whether or not this represents any objective reality, such a view tends to be self-fulfilling, because it drains urban areas of those who have a choice to move, and hence of more affluent residents. This concentrates poverty, which, if anything corrodes the human spirit and social organisation, is surely the culprit, not urban life itself. However, the association of urban life with poverty, crime, social dislocation and other social pathologies is enough to act in pushing the affluent and mobile out, however tenuous or circumstantial the real evidence.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to be wary of overplaying the reasons for which people may leave the city. Whilst there is some evidence that such reasons were part of the reason for some movement into East Goscote from Leicester, as a result of ‘white flight’ from Asian settlement in some wards of the city, there is little evidence that the populations of Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath were fleeing from nearby towns because of the social problems of those cities. Indeed, Cambridge and Ipswich are precisely the sort of smaller regional centres to which population is attracted from larger conurbations. The growth of both Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath have to be seen as part of this wider pattern - indeed the reason for Bar Hill’s inception was the strong pressure for population growth in the Cambridge region, driven at least partly by relocation from the south-east. Thus the difficulties of city life do not explain the attraction of these two new settlements over their regional towns for mobile populations, though they do partly explain movements of population at a regional scale towards the periphery of the south-east. It is necessary, therefore, to look to factors of attraction; to the positive moral virtues which are accorded specifically to village life, and to the countryside.

\textsuperscript{42}Mackenzie (1955) op. cit.
\textsuperscript{43}Raban, Jonathan (1974) - \textit{Soft City} (Hamish Hamilton)
The Attraction of New Settlements

Raban’s account of urban life\textsuperscript{44} clearly singles out loneliness and isolation, and the fear of them, as two of the anxieties which characterise such existence. This does, of course, contain strong echoes of Tonnies’ gesellschaft society - an atomised society of individuals interacting only on a superficial level. As a recent article by Bunting\textsuperscript{45} suggests, individuals first find meaning through family ties, and then through the community in which they live. The loneliness and isolation which Raban describes are the antithesis of meaningful life; thus there is a strong sense in which urban life has been robbed of human meaning. In geographical terms, space is without meaning or value, whereas place is what is made of space when human meaning and value is ascribed to it. If then, the experience of urban life tends to erode the meaningful relationship of the individual with place and people, urban life itself becomes placeless. In seeking to escape this, individuals seek to find a place to which they can ascribe meaning, and a community within that place in which they can find a meaningful and secure identity. This then links two ideas crucial to this entire discussion - place and community.

The factors which attract residents to new settlements would seem to be a desire to find place and community, and to find that social role within society which the placelessness of urban life denies. Certainty afforded by place and community may to some extent compensate for the insecurity of roles, especially in employment, engendered by post-Fordist\textsuperscript{46} reorganisation of production, and associated processes such as the hollowing out and ‘downsizing’ of corporate organisations, the rapidly changing needs both for types of

\textsuperscript{44}Raban (1974) op. cit.
\textsuperscript{45}Madeleine Bunting, in an article in the Guardian (11.12.95 pp4-5) discusses the ideas of John Macmurray with Peter Thomson, a friend of Tony Blair, and a key early influence upon the thinking of the Labour leader. Macmurray, a Scottish Christian philosopher, argued that the Cartesian dualism of ‘I think, therefore I am’ was wrong; that thinking was not what defined human existence, because we live before we become fully conscious of living. Rather our humanity is determined by our sense of belonging, first to a family and then to a society - we become what we are, and achieve, through our social context and rootedness. Crucially such a philosophy was seen as a third way between individualism and collectivism, echoing Howard’s three magnets, and the third way between town and country.
\textsuperscript{46}Cooke, Philip (1990) - Back to the future: modernity, postmodernity and locality (Unwin Hyman) provides a useful discussion of some of the implications of post-Fordist reconstruction.
worker, and the skills they are required to have. If there is no longer sufficient certainty to be found from the identity the individual finds in employment, or in the values and aspirations of wider society (given the failure of both of the main projects of the twentieth century, individualism and collectivism), then for some people at least, a place based community may form a useful substitute (and holds in tension both individual self-determination and some form of local, limited collectivism). It is one option amongst many which may be sought to anchor personal identity in the increasingly turbulent economic currents of post-Fordism and cultural currents of post-modernism.

There are particular advantages to new settlements in meeting the specific needs discussed above. The social organisation apparent in any place based community, such as a new settlement, is a product of the negotiated wishes of those living there. Even within the constraints of control by a ruling or dominant group, the social structures will reflect both the nature of individuals which make up the whole, and their changing aspirations over time (which are conditioned partially by external stimuli, such as macro-economics, and concomitant cultural changes). In older villages, not only is entry often more difficult, and determined by the high cost of house purchase, but the extent to which newer residents can affect the nature of social organisation, and the way in which it meets their particular needs, are constrained by the views of older established residents, who may have different aspirations, and control over the levers of power and influence. In new settlements, the population is made up entirely of relatively new arrivals, so the chance of social organisation providing what these particular individuals need is much greater, and much more likely to respond to change as perceived by them. The new settlement then, represents a form of contingent security, not too rigid to adapt when necessary, but considerably less fluid than other alternatives, and more secure both than the individuals working life, or the wider cultural context.

The existence of a community is predicated on the prior existence of a defined and bounded place. Places are created from undifferentiated space through a process of definition, which includes both bounding and naming that space. These three new settlements are some of the very few examples in the British context of creating entirely

new place identities where none existed before. Creating such an identity includes physical processes such as defining the boundary of the settlement, but also goes beyond that to create a mythology of place. Creating a clearly definable and defensible boundary has been an important part of creating place identity in each of these new settlements. Indeed, it is, above all, their physical separation from the city, with its defined and complete boundary circumscribed by a green cordon, which most clearly characterises new settlements as different from large new suburbs attached to the edge of existing towns and cities.

At East Goscote, the site is bounded on two sides by roads which existed prior to construction, a railway line, and a small brook. The Queniborough Depot which previously occupied the site also made use of these boundaries, so there was prior justification for using them, and when the site was initially sold in two main lots, it was seemingly taken for granted, both at the public enquiry, and in the plans drawn up by the architects, that the smaller of the two lots would eventually be incorporated into the village site, even though the land was not then in the hands of Jelson Ltd, the developers. Thus the external boundaries of East Goscote were already well-defined, and the site formed part of a dense matrix of other villages, close to each other, but separated by open farmland.

In contrast, the task of defining Martlesham Heath’s boundary within the expanding eastern suburbs of Ipswich was more difficult. The site was a “bleak and open wasteland...a neglected area of heather, bracken, scrub, trees and gorse bushes”48, with the total site, including existing buildings, of about 750 acres. This is considerably larger than either the site of East Goscote or Bar Hill, with the result either that the village would be considerably larger than the other two, or that it would be built at a considerably lower average density. The latter approach was adopted, both on the commercial premise that the scheme would be easier to sell (both for the purposes of planning permission and to potential residents), and because it met the philosophical demands of Chris Parker’s twentieth century village ideal. The site is bounded to the north by the A1214 road, and to the west by a minor road. As part of the planning agreement attached to the permission, the residential and industrial sections of the site were separated from each other by a north/south dual carriageway road, which became the new A12. This had the effect of

placing a new and very clear boundary to the east of the residential village, whilst another new road provided a southern boundary. Such was the extent of the site, that considerable tracts of open heathland were able to be left around the edges of the site to provide a barrier of open land in the control of the village itself. Thus, unlike East Goscote and Bar Hill, the physical isolation of the village is not dependent upon future planning policy, or the actions of others.

Bar Hill was the only one of the three sites to be built on open farmland, the other two being to some extent built upon existing human geographies. The lie of the land itself gave little sense of location, with the only defining landmark being the Cambridge-Huntingdon road, now part of the A14, which ran to the north-east of the site. Thus the boundary of Bar Hill is, on three sides, entirely created through the process of building the village. Its edge is defined by a perimeter road, and by the direct contrast between the densely built village, and the open farmland. Of the three, it is Bar Hill which gives the greatest impression of having been dropped on top of the existing landscape, rather than into it, though at ground level, both it and East Goscote still appear as considerable urban intrusions into the agricultural landscape.

All three village plans recognise the significance of providing a central focus to the village, but significantly choose to use both buildings and open space to provide this core. However, each village is significantly different in the way this is achieved. Again, it is East Goscote which is closest to the merely functional. Its original plan shows both a larger shopping mall and central square, and larger tracts of green space, including a village green. The actual result fulfils the need to provide shops, a pub and a village hall, with a small car park, but it is both smaller in scale and has a much poorer quality in its built environment than either Bar Hill or Martlesham Heath. The ‘village green’ has actually evolved into an area of children’s play equipment adjacent to the church and primary school, and, in contrast to Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, has its main tract of open recreational land at the edge of the village, rather than in the middle, adjacent to the village centre.

The original concept for the village centre in Bar Hill was to be a mall of some forty small shops. The idea foundered when ownership of the site changed hands, and the retail
floorspace was provided by one supermarket, leaving only the first stage of the mall, about ten shop units. This inevitably results in a village centre which of considerably greater scale and mass than East Goscote, as befits the larger size of the village and its intended sub-regional role, but its proximity to a large area of open land, also termed the village green, reduces its impact, as does the positioning of the retail centre within large tracts of car parking. The other village centre buildings, notably the church centre, are also of considerably greater impact than those in East Goscote, adding a degree of height, as well as architectural distinctiveness, to the central area. The conformation of the village as a whole also lends greater strength to the focus offered by the village centre, with both residential ‘wings’, and their internal footpath linkages, directed towards the centre. Meanwhile, Martlesham Heath makes use of building height, architectural distinctiveness and extensive open space to provide strength to the focus of its centre. However, the more dispersed nature of the village is also reflected in its central areas, such that the village green is bounded at its southern end by a large tract of beech woodland. The built spaces in the Martlesham Heath centre are of a much higher architectural quality, and indicate, as much of the rest of the village does, the continuance of a strong vision behind the development, which never existed in East Goscote, and was considerably undermined at Bar Hill.

The inherent difficulty of new settlements is the short space of time available to create a sense of place where there was no place before. Moreover, their size, their aesthetic difference from other villages around them, and their impact within the landscape all mitigate against them being accepted as true villages. It is significant that all three sites, to a greater or lesser extent, use key features to try and signal a village identity. As discussed above, they all either created or used existing features to provide a clear boundary, and at all three sites, the need to maintain their physical separation from other towns and villages has been paramount, and apparent both in the planning process, and the concerns of residents. The use of the village green, as suggested earlier in this chapter is another important reference used to justify a new place’s right to be called a village. Other buildings, such as a primary school or a church also appear to have had greater significance than their function. At Bar Hill, the approach taken by the churches in working ecumenically was intended to be novel as the village itself, and the church has proved a significant catalyst for community activity in the village. It is no surprise therefore, that the
church building is the most visible landmark of the village centre. Likewise the primary schools at East Goscote and Bar Hill seem, symbolically, to have put each village on the map, and as Chapter 4 notes, appear to have been a significant attraction to the young families who form the bulk of incomers to new settlements. At Martlesham Heath, in contrast, the church was completed much later in the village’s history, because of the village’s position within another parish, and the developer’s approach of only providing non-commercial social facilities when there was proven need, backed by financial contributions.

Another way in which the villages have attempted to cement their identity has been by assimilating themselves into local history in some way, through the ‘appropriation’ of historical events and symbols, and by fabricating their own local history49. There are then as this suggests, two strands to this manufacturing of historical identity. The appropriation of history is the process whereby the past history and use of the site is co-opted into an accepted narrative history of the settlement, in order to link the new to the past, thus rationalising its existence whilst establishing its individuality. At East Goscote, this has occurred firstly in the naming of the settlement, which uses the name of the medieval hundred in which the settlement is built, and also in the incorporation of the history of the former munitions factory, and the recollections of those billeted there, and hence East Goscote’s first residents into the history of the village50. Similarly, Martlesham Heath has utilised the military history of the site (as a wartime airfield, from which Douglas Bader flew, and from which the Barnes-Wallis bouncing bomb was tested), not only in official history51, but also in naming the pub, The Douglas Bader, and in the village crest, which

49This concept of appropriation and fabrication was first raised in Owen C.R. (1993a) - Observations on the development of ‘community’ in existing new settlements (New Settlements Research Group Seminar Paper, 1.6.93)

50Talbot, Aideen M. (1991) - Potted history of East Goscote (private publication)

51For example, Bradford Property Trust (1982) - Martlesham Heath, Twentieth Century Village (BPT), a publicity brochure published by the developers which describes the military history of the site, and includes a number of sepia and black & white photographs of airmen and aeroplanes from the first and second world wars. This brochure also attempts to tie the history of the site back even further, pointing out that the only occupation prior to use as an airfield was for Bronze Age burial mounds, the barrows of which are still visible. This does have the effect of tying the site into a wider local history - Martlesham Heath is only a few miles from the site of Sutton Hoo.
incorporates an aircraft propeller and a swift. It is interesting to note that in East Goscote, the historical appropriation was done by residents after development, whereas at Martlesham Heath, the developers themselves sold the image to the residents, who then adopted it as part of the place's identity. Bar Hill had no such heroic history, but simply adopted the name of the farm which had stood on the site. Rather its justification appears to have been strategic, as part of the ongoing development of Cambridgeshire villages. Nevertheless, there is in all three cases a suggestion that each village was in a sense 'waiting to happen'; a natural progression from what already existed.

Bar Hill has appeared to rely far more upon the 'fabrication' of history, presumably because it lacked such a convenient prior site history as at East Goscote and Martlesham Heath. The process of fabrication is the rapid transition of events in the settlement from mere events to events with meaning to the settlement. Thus when the story is retold it not merely recounts events, but places in them some greater meaning, generally about the nature of that particular place, and the people that live there. Such stories\(^2\) in new settlements tend to revolve around key characters, or around events which indicate how much community spirit and neighbourliness there is in the village, or point out the triumph of the pioneer spirit of the earliest settlers over the adversities of living on a building site. Such storytelling was apparent in all three villages, but most evident in Bar Hill.

Thus there are a number of strategies adopted in order to create place identity and community life where neither existed before. The cues given by the built environment are important. A boundary defines the extent of the village, what is inside and outside, and provides a barrier between the controllable world of the village and the external world. A clear centre, defined both by architecture and by symbolic open spaces, gives the village a focus. In Martlesham Heath especially, the style of the architecture throughout the village is also used to provide meaning and reinforce village identity. Place identity is reinforced by justification of the role and history of the village within its setting, and the moral history

\(^2\)At Bar Hill, an example of such a story is that of the football matches held between two groups of early residents drawn from those 'up the hill' in one wing of the village, and those 'down the hill' in the other wing. It neatly illustrates the early extent of community life in Bar Hill, and its triumph over the adversities of living in two small pockets of housing separated by a half-complete village centre and acres of mud.
of the community can reinforce both the link between place and people, and its sense of identity.

**Design**

The issue of design returns this discussion to the structure of Table 7.1, and to the placing of these three new settlements within the wider context of garden cities and new towns. As has already been made clear, the design of each of the three new settlements discussed in this thesis are very different, though they do share some common features. The design of each settlement results primarily from local, site specific and temporal factors. East Goscote was built to a price, with little overall vision beyond the sale of houses for profit, and as the interview with the architect makes clear\textsuperscript{53}, what vision was attempted in the design of the site was squashed by the innate design conservatism of the builder, and site constraints\textsuperscript{54}. Bar Hill was in concept considerably more visionary, and the first houses are much the same as illustrated in the early design sketches. This was the result of the site's role as a showpiece of County Council Planning Policy. However, the sale of the site resulted in a loss of control by the Planning Authority, and in far more conservative house designs, with much more constrained layouts\textsuperscript{55}, as well as the erosion of the original site plan's Radburn\textsuperscript{56} derived layout. Martlesham Heath resulted from a clear and sustained

\textsuperscript{53}Interview with John Nixon of Allen & Nixon, the East Goscote architects, Tuesday 11th February 1992 op. cit.

\textsuperscript{54}Two bunkers on the site had been constructed for shell filling and would have been almost impossible to demolish. Their site had originally been designated for housing, but instead they were earthed over and incorporated into the playing fields. Instead, extra housing land was taken from the green corridor intended to link the village green and centre with the playing fields. As a result, the feature was reduced to little more than a footpath between houses. The size and quality of the village centre was also reduced by financial constraints and the desire to build and sell more houses.

\textsuperscript{55}This can be seen by looking at the aerial photograph of the completed village. Early development close to the village centre is characterised by far more rectilinear street patterns, a footpath system separate to the road system, on the Radburn model, and considerably more space between groups of houses, often taking the form of small patches and corridors of open land.

\textsuperscript{56}Named after the town of Radburn in New Jersey, where the design plan separated vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns, thus producing separate footpath and road networks. The front of a house was usually directed to the path network, and the rear to a vehicular access. The pattern became very popular in state New Towns, and can be seen on many estates, for instance Brookside in Telford.
design philosophy, which was in part shaped in reaction to what occurred at Bar Hill. Such a philosophy was able to be sustained because the site was maintained in continuous ownership by Bradford Property Trust, who actively supported and promoted the approach taken, and because they were not trying to support the cost of land purchase in their own costs.

Because two of the sites, East Goscote and Bar Hill, were started whilst the state new towns programme was still a considerable influence both upon town planning and architecture, it should not be surprising to find common design themes. However, as has already been noted, the design of housing in East Goscote was compromised from the original architectural vision by the desire of Jelson Ltd., the builders and developers, to use more conservative house designs, similar to those that they were selling successfully on suburban estates elsewhere in Leicestershire. As a result, East Goscote has more in common, in design terms, with suburban owner-occupied estate architecture, than with that found in state new towns of the same period. Consequently, houses in East Goscote do not have the typical modernist design feature of asymmetric pitched or flat roofs, and use ‘conventional’ window styles, rather than the wide, shallow window shape evident in design sketches, and in some of the early houses built at Bar Hill. Significantly, it is the features of design and layout which vary from the typical conventional model - a house with its own garden, entrance, drive and attached garage - which are least popular with residents now. Features such as detached garages and separate garage blocks are often left poorly maintained, and are seen as an invitation to criminal activity, because they are not visible from the houses which use them, and are often poorly lit. Whilst residents do not seem to have difficulty in maintaining those parts of their property which are exclusively theirs, and expect the parish or district council to maintain and regulate the use of those parts of the village which are common property, there appears to be a difficulty in organising responsibility for property or spaces which are common to a small number of households. Here, the urgings of the parish council do not seem to be sufficient for many

59 See pictures of Bar Hill houses and design sketches in the annex.
60 The poor maintenance of garage blocks, and especially their doors, is a constant source of frustration to the parish council, who regularly urge residents to repair them, through the medium of the parish magazine.
owners to spend their own money or time on communal property. This is not to suggest that problems with such communal property and spaces are confined to East Goscote - the author’s experience suggests that this is ubiquitous to all communal areas in private housing developments, where legal ownership and responsibility is shared between a number of households. At East Goscote, such communal garage arrangements and houses with separate vehicular access result from the remaining attempts at Radburn design which survived the conservatism of the builders, mainly in the central areas of the village, built earliest. The later parts show considerably more conventional layouts.

The earliest houses built at Bar Hill do show far greater adherence to modernist design features than at East Goscote. However, whilst the earliest housing completed (perhaps 100 to 150 houses in all, prior to the sale of the site to Trafalgar House) shows typical modernist features, including Radburn layout, asymmetric rooflines, unconventional window shapes and patterns, and some three storey town houses\(^1\), the sale of the site\(^2\) in 1968 meant that, as at East Goscote, the interests of housebuilders and developers became pre-eminent, and subsequent house designs were merely the standard patterns used by national developers on many other estates elsewhere. Thus, whilst the layout and the new settlement nature of Bar Hill are distinctive and innovative, the houses themselves, and the layout of their access roads, mimic the prevailing ‘estate vernacular’ of the time. It is possible to identify parts of the village which were built precisely to the Essex Design Guide, and the latest houses, which are typical of modern estate developments up and down the country.

\(^1\) See pictures and sketches of early Bar Hill housing, and an early aerial photograph of the site, in the annex.
\(^2\) The sale of the Bar Hill site to Trafalgar House in 1968, whilst it was mainly attributed to HHC’s commitments to other developments, was almost certainly partly because the first houses were selling only slowly (either because of their design or because of the location in a new settlement, it is difficult to be sure), and were expensive to build. Thus the developers were not making sufficient (if any) profit either on individual house sales, or on the site as a whole.
It is instructive to place this in the context of F.J. Osborn's opinion that "the speculative builder...stands far closer to the ordinary man"\textsuperscript{64}, Osborn's championing of the suburban vernacular, and the strongly anti-modernist stance of the GCTPA\textsuperscript{65}. Thus whilst the modernist aspirations of the first plans for East Goscote, and the early building at Bar Hill are closely related to the state new towns programme, the 'estate vernacular' which emerged at both of these sites has far more in common with Osborn's aspirations in the pre-war GCTPA, and is thus closer to the garden cities movement than to the post-war state new towns. None of the three new settlement sites hark back to the rationalism of Howard's original garden city plan, though neither of the garden cities bore substantial resemblance either.

The case of where to place Martlesham Heath in this scheme is more complex. The temporal progress of the two other new settlements saw them pass from the modernism of the state new towns to Osborn's vernacular design. Martlesham Heath, however, seems at the same time to be the least modern and the most modern of the three settlements. It is a tension well captured in its design philosophy, the twentieth century village - an archaic form in a modern context. In its design, much of Martlesham Heath uses architectural forms which deliberately ape Suffolk village building\textsuperscript{66}. At the same time, it is the most 'designed' of all three sites, with little or no vernacular, ubiquitous housebuilding at all. It is, in this way, the archetypal 'eighties' development, a designer village, a marketing contrivance. That does not do full justice to the ideals of those that created it however - for whilst East Goscote was an exercise in expediency, and Bar Hill rapidly became one, Martlesham Heath remains the most cohesive example of a vision carried to its conclusion, and, of the three, the site which could most clearly be described as idealistic\textsuperscript{67}. In this

\textsuperscript{64}Aldridge, Meryl (1979) - The British New Towns - a programme without a policy, page 10.

\textsuperscript{65}Aldridge, Meryl (1979) ibid. page 18, talks of the GCTPA's (the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association, the forerunner of the Town & Country Planning Association) "three horsemen of the apocalypse: high density, high-rise and modernist architecture".

\textsuperscript{66}See pictures of Martlesham Heath housing in the annex.

\textsuperscript{67}In my original interview with Chris Parker (Tuesday 11th August 1992) I asked him whether he was motivated by any form of idealism. In a subsequent letter (dated 20th August 1992) he replied to the question thus: "I would identify...(my motivation)...as an intellectual challenge based on my experience as a Chartered Surveyor in general practice and from living in a village with close contact with the community: there really
sense, Martlesham Heath is the closest of the three to Howard’s original approach, one which was driven by an ideal of the right way to build places.

**Initiative, Philosophy, Approach**

One of the consistent themes running through this thesis is the extent to which these three new settlements were the product of propitious local factors and the initiative of individuals, or small groups of individuals. They were not part of a wider movement (though they may have ridden to some extent upon the coat tails of the state new towns programme), and the links between them are limited. The initiative for two of the three sites was from the private sector, and at Bar Hill, whilst the initial idea emerged in the public sector, the impetus of the site was quickly usurped by private sector priorities, which largely shaped the village after 1968. This clearly places new settlements a long way from the state-led initiative and priorities of the post-war new towns, though with new towns too, there must be a question about the extent to which private sector priorities overtook the public ones. However, their individual and opportunist nature does place all three new settlements close to the actual manner in which the two completed garden cities, Letchworth and Welwyn, were initiated.

In all three cases, the relationship with the state planning processes were different - East Goscote, despite the public enquiry which was held, was barely affected by planning processes, though the local state, in the form of the Area Planning Committee, met hurriedly, six days before the auction of the site on which the village was built in order to decide on the type of development they most favoured (from the options presented by interested parties). The approval for East Goscote was treated as an exception to the existing strategic policy, and thus the needs of the East Goscote site appeared to drive strategic policy, rather than vice-versa. In direct contrast, Bar Hill was a product of local strategic policy, whilst the site of Martlesham Heath was initially co-opted into the state

---

had to be a better way of providing post-war housing than spoiling existing villages by just in-filling or adding on”. Parker’s idealism is evident here.

68 The Committee met on the 23rd November, prior to the auction on the 29th, apparently having only heard of the imminent sale in October - Tustin, Raymond Eric (1962) - Proof of evidence given at Local Inquiry, Council Offices, Rothley on 14th November 1962 re. planning application 871/62 (Leicestershire County Council)
new towns programme\textsuperscript{69}, then Parker's proposals for the site were turned down, and finally the site was included in the Ipswich Fringe statement of 1971, allowing Parker to proceed in building what he had planned since 1963. Thus it was Martlesham Heath which had the most antagonistic relationship with the state, a result which can be put down partly to personalities, and to changing priorities in the planning process, whilst Bar Hill had the closest relationship to the state, quickly eroded by the exigencies of the market.

Because these three new settlements do not share a common philosophical approach such as that enjoyed by the state new towns, it is unsurprising that the approach which does emerge is essentially pragmatic, responding to changing local factors, and within which the appearance of idealism depends equally upon such site specific issues as individual personalities, and the leeway which the economics of the site allow for such considerations. The history of garden cities and new towns has been marked by initial idealism, later moderated and diluted by pragmatism. Howard's original garden city was idealistic and utopian, offering, in its mixture of rationalism and romanticism, a way of achieving a more perfect society. As Chapter 2 shows, this utopianism was moderated by the more pragmatic Osborn, who carried Howard's ideas through to the post-war era. However, the post-war state new towns were imbued with a new form of utopianism, in which socialism was seen as the method by which a more perfect society was to be attained, and new towns were to be one tool of this wider approach\textsuperscript{70}. Later new towns, such as Telford and Milton Keynes were marked by a far greater involvement of private sector interests, ultimately being developed, much as Bar Hill was, by selling parcels of land to developers for them to develop along the lines they wished. The result was that the

\textsuperscript{69}Clifford Culpin and Partners (1965) - Redevelopment of Martlesham Heath, East Suffolk (Culpin & Partners for Bradford Property Trust) is a report produced as a response to the announcement of the Minister for Housing and Local Government on the 3rd February 1965 in the House of Commons that resulting from wider studies of the South-East Region, it was intended to plan for the substantial expansion of Ipswich. This plan envisaged a "mainly self-sufficient community of 9,000 to 10,000 people" at Martlesham Heath with provision for further extension.

\textsuperscript{70}Mackenzie (1955) op. cit.
later parts of these new towns were far more orthodox in their built environment and design than the first parts to be built.\textsuperscript{71}

**Social Structures and the Issue of Land Ownership**

It may, at first reading, seem odd to pursue together the issues of social structure and land ownership, but both are linked, not only to each other, but also to the preceding debate. Howard's work was environmentally determinist - he felt that a new environment would produce a different and better form of social organisation. It was in this area that he and Osborn differed most radically from each other, with Osborn very dubious as to the extent to which the basic tenets of human nature and social organisation could be changed.\textsuperscript{72} The post-war new towns were imbued with radical socialism which also believed that the nature of society could be changed through creating new and better places. It became obvious, both in theoretical consideration of post-war New Towns,\textsuperscript{73} and the manner in which the later new towns differed from the earlier ones, and later phases of existing new towns differed from the earliest, that the aims of social engineering were largely abandoned, in a gradual process which culminated in new town developments whose aims were little more than the regeneration of derelict industrial land, and the housing and employment of overspill urban populations. The one sense in which the later New Towns, such as Milton Keynes and Telford, remained idealistic was that they were designed to

\textsuperscript{71}The first estates to be built in Telford, such as Brookside, Woodside and Hollinswood were developed by the Telford Development Corporation (TDC), initially for rent rather than sale, though most are now privately owned. Later parts of the new town, such as Priorslee and Aqueduct, as well as some later estates which were added to both older villages and towns within the urban matrix, and to some of the first TDC estates, were developed by private sector housebuilders for sale to private buyers. These latter houses were built to satisfy the market, and the designs they used were similar to private housing estate developments in many parts of the country. The more unconventional designs used on the earlier TDC estates have proved considerably less popular with the private market, so that houses can be bought for half the price on the older TDC estates, in comparison to those in newer, more conventionally designed parts of the town.

\textsuperscript{72}In a letter to Lewis Mumford, Osborn argued of modernist planners; "There exists in their mind an idea that the family home is a dying institution, and that we are on the threshold of a new world in which, somehow, man will be reborn as a social animal in a way different from past and present ways. When I was a younger member of the Fabian Society I was surrounded by people who felt like that; I scoffed at it then as I do now" (Aldridge, Meryl (1979) ibid.).

\textsuperscript{73}For example, Wirz (1975) and Mackenzie (1955).
function more efficiently, and more in keeping with modern urban life, than did existing towns. In practice, this often meant building and planning to cater for the car. In the current climate of environmental consciousness, and the perceived need to limit car use and dependence, such an approach itself seems anachronistic.

Over time, the manner of the control and ownership of land, both that immediately adjoining residential properties, and the wider land in the village or town, has changed. In turn, this shapes the way in which such land is managed through public bodies such as parish councils. The Howardian ideal was that the land in the garden city should be held in common, reflecting his involvement in land reform issues, which predated the publication of his garden city theories. The post-war new towns first envisaged the state as landlord, with land held by the state (either the local state, or, in the first instance, the para-statal new towns commissions, where local control was limited). In both cases, the extent to which the individual had singular control over land was limited, with wider organisations claiming to operate in the individual's interest. The difference was, of course, that whilst what Howard envisaged was essentially a 'bottom up' form of organisational hierarchy, what was first proposed for the state new towns was 'top down' and paternalistic in nature. Both were ideals which, to varying degrees, did not survive practice. Osborn's approach to social organisation seems to have prevailed even in the garden cities, and Chapter 2 details his doubts about the extent to which people would change their fundamental social behaviour when confronted with new environments. His preference for conventional house designs and layouts also suggests that he tended towards a non-communal approach to land, though this was in a period prior to mass home ownership, so the extent to which the individual could truly be said to have control over property was limited. Certainly nothing akin to the utopian co-operativism envisaged by Howard ever developed. Meanwhile, as has already been noted, the post-war new towns soon moved away from idealism towards more mainstream and pragmatic approaches, and in this, the move away from state landlordism towards private ownership both of property and land was not exempt. However, even here, the local state, in the form of local government has remained the
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Such communal ideas do persist however. The small settlement of Lightmoor in Telford continues to run on essentially self-sufficient and co-operative lines, whilst at the New Settlements Research Group Seminar in June 1992, a presentation by the Stroud Village Project proposed a radical green approach to communal new settlement living.
primary vehicle for the maintenance of common lands for recreation, and for many community and public buildings.

In two of the three new settlements studied, however, there was a concerted attempt to move control and ownership over land towards some form of local co-operative status which did not involve the state, even at the local level. At East Goscote, nothing like this was attempted - it was always intended that recreational land and community buildings such as the village hall should pass to the control of a newly constituted parish council, carved from the territory of the neighbouring parishes of Rearsby and Queniborough. There was some resistance from these latter two parishes, which came to a head over the responsibility for street lighting in the new village in the winter prior to the establishment of the new parish. Nevertheless, with the formal beginning of the new parish and its council, the builders began to hand over responsibility for property, whilst higher levels of the local state retained control over facilities such as the school, and, later, the old people's home. Given that most of the housing in the village was owner-occupied and freehold, there was then no issue of communally owned freeholds, and only in the earlier parts of the development was there property which was the joint responsibility of several households. This, as has already been discussed, appears to be one of the few areas in which the management of land and property seems to have failed to produce a satisfactory state of maintenance, to the annoyance of the parish council. In the other main case, the builders, Jelson Ltd., retained ownership of the shopping centre as a commercial venture, and there is dissatisfaction amongst residents and the parish council at the quality of the built environment which exists there.

At Bar Hill, the initial plan was to place common freehold with a community management company, and later with a parish council, neither of which ideas got off the ground because of legal reforms, and the inability of the newly drafted government legislation to come to terms with such a new beast as the new settlement. Nevertheless, the original plan was to sell the houses on the site as leasehold properties, and to maintain the common lands and buildings of the community from the leasehold rents. The early houses on the site were difficult enough to sell anyway, and one might speculate as to how much greater might have been the scepticism of the first buyers had they been confronted with a leasehold only scheme. As it was, once the leasehold scheme had been abandoned, a parish council was
constituted in much the same way as at East Goscote, and communal lands and buildings handed over progressively by the developers. In both Bar Hill and East Goscote, such property is now maintained out of the parish precept.

At Martlesham Heath, however, the lessons of Bar Hill’s failed attempt at levying a freehold rent to maintain community facilities had been noted, but Parker wanted to try and establish some form of private management company, so that the considerable costs of the social infrastructure of the village would not fall upon the local state (and though in both East Goscote and Bar Hill this has not proved to be a particularly onerous burden, the extent of communal open space, including woodland and heathland, is considerably greater at Martlesham Heath, and the consequent costs of maintenance are much higher). As Chapter 7 notes, a management company, Martlesham Consultants Ltd. (MCL) was formed, under the sceptical eye of Chris Parker, who was himself dubious about how well such a structure might prosper. In essence, the management company works on the basis of shareholding through house ownership, rather than universal adult suffrage, as would a parish council. It is therefore not accountable to those who are not owner occupiers, but only to their landlords, and is biased towards smaller households, whose residents have one voting share between them, just as the larger number of residents in larger households do. Despite these weaknesses, which the board acknowledge, the company does stand or fall by the consent of the large majority of shareholders. The company is reliant upon a voluntary contribution from each household, in lieu of a precept or freehold rent, in order to continue its work, which it has no power, other than the force of persuasion, to demand from households. Nevertheless, most pay this levy. Moreover, it was argued forcefully by board members that they were subject to the sanction of an emergency general meeting at any time, and could thus be deposed whenever the will of the shareholders turned against them. This, it was argued, was considerably more democratic than the local state, as represented by the parish council, where the will of the electorate could only be exercised every three years. As the chapter concerning Martlesham Heath also discusses, the existence of a management company and parish council in tandem has created some
tension, and difficulty in determining responsibility (though complications are eased by the presence of some of the same individuals on both bodies).\textsuperscript{75}

Both parish councils and management companies appear to be capable of managing the common assets of new villages. The management company, as currently constituted, would seem to require a considerably higher degree of active consent to function, whereas parish councils can function adequately even in an atmosphere of passive disinterest (because their precept is raised statutorily, and councillors are often re-elected unopposed, or with low turnouts, a common feature for such councils in many parts of the country). Both seem to be run by similar types of people, in majority older and often retired, though not always so. The Martlesham Heath management company is entirely an embodiment of the 'property owning democracy', and whilst this direct relationship with its members ('shareholders') was seen as potentially its greatest asset, providing a very direct form of accountability, it is regressive in that it does not provide universal suffrage to all the village's residents. As a consequence, it is only accountable to the needs of property interests, which do not necessarily coincide with those of residents, and the single household vote is a system which reinforces patriarchal interests.

\textsuperscript{75}This account of events in Martlesham Heath emerged from a number of formal and informal interviews with members both of MCL and the parish council, which took place on a number of visits to the village in Summer 1992.
Table 8.1 - Key features of Garden Cities, New Towns and New Settlements compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>garden cities</th>
<th>new towns</th>
<th>new settlements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>revisionists</td>
<td>idealism</td>
<td>later policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-containment</td>
<td>within social city</td>
<td>individual satellites</td>
<td>redefined- amenity levels in proportion to population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social mix</td>
<td>utopian- all classes and groups represented</td>
<td>tacit understanding of self-selection and imbalance</td>
<td>open acceptance of imbalance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude to city/country</td>
<td>anti-city, romantic countryside, elements of eugenic ideas</td>
<td>city unhelpful- new urban utopias envisaged</td>
<td>population dispersal- cities too large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td>rational, medium density, terraces</td>
<td>modernist, anti-vernacular</td>
<td>municipal modernism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiative</td>
<td>individualist, community based</td>
<td>individualist with state framework</td>
<td>collectivist, state- led, centrist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy</td>
<td>utopian, idealist</td>
<td>pragmatic idealist</td>
<td>utopian socialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach</td>
<td>radical</td>
<td>anti-orthodox populism</td>
<td>paternalist, but thinks itself radical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social structures</td>
<td>environmental determinism- new structures envisaged</td>
<td>improve existing structures- limited scope for wholesale changes</td>
<td>paternalist social engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land ownership</td>
<td>community holds in common</td>
<td>private, some public spaces</td>
<td>state as landlord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1- Key features of Garden Cities, New Towns and New Settlements compared
Chapter 9

Conclusion

This thesis tackles three major questions about new settlements. Firstly, it addresses the manner in which new settlements are created and sustained, and what they reveal about community organisation when it begins with a new place in the latter half of the twentieth century. Secondly, it addresses the extent to which new settlements build upon and inherit from the long history of garden cities and new towns, and to what extent they are a new phenomenon. Thirdly, it addresses the manner in which individual new settlements come to be built, and whether they can be seen as part of a wider contemporary movement, or are merely locally contingent responses.

The first conclusion of this thesis is that all three of these settlements, East Goscote, Bar Hill and Martlesham Heath, appear to have developed a sense of their own identity - a sense of place - and sustainable community structures. The need to ascribe meaning to place and community has overcome the inherent novelty of the new settlement, and began to develop in the very earliest days of each village. Often, a sense of belonging was forged in adversity, or through shared experience or life stage. Particular individuals have been catalytic in shaping the way in which place and community are understood in each village, as well as the standards of behaviour expected as part of that belonging. Village history and tradition have been appropriated or fabricated to support an understanding of the place identity, either creating links back to a history of the site or locality which predated the village, or creating a canon of more recent history which has significance for the settlement. However, this role has been taken in all three villages by a relatively small group of individuals, albeit with the passive or active consent of the majority. Sometimes these individuals have been formally part of the local state in parish councils, though in other cases they exercise influence through non-state bodies, such as management companies (as at Martlesham Heath), or residents associations (as in the early years at Bar Hill). In some cases this has implied that both power and responsibility has passed from the state into private hands, though where this has happened, forceful arguments were made that accountability was, if anything, enhanced and not eroded. However, the maintenance
of Martlesham Heath appears to persist through enlightened paternalism as much as through genuine egalitarian local control.

New settlements say much about the role of place identity and the nature of community organisation which would emerge in contemporary British society, were it ever possible to begin with a clean sheet of paper. Inevitably, residents bring with them existing understandings about place and community, and thus an entirely clean sheet of paper is not possible, but the evidence of these three settlements does point towards the enduring importance which is attached both to ascribing meaning to place, and to a mutual sense of belonging between those people which live within such a place (even if the level of participation and the degree of commitment varies widely between individuals). The need to attach such meaning may be seen in the context of increasing insecurity in other spheres of life, the fracturing of certainties about employment, social and gender roles, the failure of the post-war project to deliver greater social cohesion, and increasing concern about the erosion of common standards of morality evinced by rising levels of crime and anti-social behaviour. The need to seek security by recreating place and community may be one response, though as such it is likely to be merely contingent, because the social values upon which it is based are themselves likely to shift with wider social currents - residents can ultimately opt out as easily as they opted in. However, the contingent security offered by the place and community identity of new settlements has the potential to provide precisely the flexible response which such residents require - stability is provided by structures which allow both commitment, and later withdrawal from that social contract. It is perhaps the case that an increasingly flexible labour market, which requires of even the well-qualified a mobility which undermines long-term place-centred relationships of belonging, that such place-centred belonging has itself to be more flexible than envisaged in the traditional, static village community.

Nevertheless, whilst to some extent new settlements reflect the continuing social need to belong and to find meaning both in geographical and social terms, they also represent a continuing fragmentation in social organisation. Whilst, as has been noted earlier, neither garden cities nor state new towns even approached their achievement of egalitarian social balance, new settlements are the first time that the creation of new places has not only eschewed such aims, but has positively embraced the notion that selection mechanisms will
operate, necessarily resulting in a population which does not reflect the wider regional or
national population structure. This thesis has noted the various ways in which conscious
methods of exclusion and selection have operated, including the provision primarily of
owner-occupied housing, providing an economic hurdle to entry, and also the more subtle
mechanisms which operated on the basis of taste and aspiration (most notably in
Martlesham Heath). Likewise, examination of Census data for the three new settlements
points to the skewed population age structures which developed there, with considerable
over-representation of young adults and their children, indicating that such new places
appeal primarily to one particular life stage group. Whilst the operation of selection may
cause difficulties for the wider society, in isolating those who have no choice in the least
desirable locales, the unbalanced population structures in new settlements appear, if
anything, to provide an additional sense of cohesion. The co-affinity between individuals
which underpins community seems more likely to prosper if residents consider their
neighbours to be 'like us' or 'our sort'. Nevertheless, the bias of population towards
particular age or life stage groups has caused particular practical problems, for example the
overcrowding of primary schools in earlier years, and the inappropriate nature of social
provision developed to cater primarily for young families once such a population begins to
grow older.

Neither are new settlements products of a desire to construct a new form of society, or to
improve the manner in which society functioned, as were both the garden cities and the
state new towns (even though neither achieved such aims to any great extent). Rather than
aiming to shape social organisation towards some more ideal conceptual form, new
settlements themselves are a response to changes in social organisation, as well as to local
opportunities and initiatives. New settlements are not intended as the good example to hold
up against older, less effective and degenerate forms of social organisation in space, as
were their earlier precursors. Rather they underpin the current order, providing that
contingent security required by certain groups in society, in order that they might find
some symbolic shelter from other external uncertainties. They provide a way for potential
residents to buy into an idealised version of rural life, whilst retaining all the advantages of
life within a wider urban matrix. They are not attempts at egalitarian equality, but rather a
way of providing greater division, diversity and, perhaps, exclusion.
New settlements do, however, show considerable similarities with earlier attempts at building new places, both in the state new towns programme, but particularly the earlier garden cities, informed by the ideas of Ebenezer Howard. Howard's concept of the third magnet - the garden city offering the advantages both of the city and the country, whilst being neither one nor the other - is reflected in the way new settlements too appear to try and resolve this dichotomy. New settlements are clearly, in functional terms, part of larger urban matrices, in whose local economies and labour markets they operate. New settlements are merely neighbourhoods within wider urban structures, offering one option in the multitude of choices which urban life provides. At the same time, they are seen in symbolic terms as external to the city, as part of a non-urban realm which is physically separate from it.

There are a number of other ways in which the continuity of new settlements from earlier new towns and garden cities is evident. Chronologically, all three of these new settlements overlap for at least part of their development history with the period during which state new towns were still part of the accepted urban planning policy of UK central government. Both East Goscote, and especially Bar Hill, used the official acceptability of the new towns programme to gain credibility. Martlesham Heath, meanwhile, was first suggested for inclusion as a site within the state programme, providing development land for the planned expansion of Ipswich, before being developed as a physical critique of much that state planning, and particularly the type of state planning espoused by new towns and by Bar Hill, symbolised.

However, in the manner in which each of these new settlements was an opportunistic response to local needs and conditions, they reflect the way in which both of the pre-war garden cities, Welwyn Garden City and Letchworth, were developed. Two of the three settlements, East Goscote and Martlesham Heath, were devised as ways of using brownfield sites, left surplus following the slow disposal of military assets in the post-war years. Bar Hill meanwhile, though it was given a convincing veneer of pro-active strategic planning, was in truth a contingent response to the problems created by existing planning policy in the Cambridge sub-region. This veneer was soon eroded when the original plans failed both to provide sufficient growth, or profits for the first development company,
whereupon development depended primarily upon the exigencies of the private housing market, and the corporate needs of development companies.

All three sites predated what became known as the ‘new settlements movement’, which emerged in the mid 1980s as a largely commercial response to ‘laissez-faire’ planning policy, and a boom in house prices, concentrated particularly in the south-east region of the country. Neither can these three sites be said to have formed any conscious move towards new settlement building which predated the eighties boom in proposals. Bar Hill can perhaps be credited with some degree of ‘genesis’ status, in that it appears to have played some role in initiating the SPAN development at New Ash Green, whilst Martlesham Heath was developed at least partially as a critique of events at Bar Hill. East Goscote, however, appears to have been conceived as a new village before those involved had any awareness of its Cambridgeshire contemporary, though they later used it as an architectural example. In this sense too then, all three of these sites were local and contingent responses, and not part of any articulated wider movement, though the underlying social forces which have shaped their development are arguably similar.

However, their status outside the accepted norms of development practice does mirror the unofficial nature of the pre-war garden cities, and in both cases, common practice and a state response in terms of policy has lagged considerably behind. Just as new towns became normative in the immediate post-war years, so new settlements have become part of mainstream planning culture, albeit in a context where responses are likely to be more diverse and numerous. New settlements first became accepted as a credible approach in certain sectors of the private sector as a response to very specific market conditions, but a state response in terms of policy lagged even behind this, only emerging in PPG3 in the early 1990s. Now, however, new settlements are not only seen as credible in private sector terms, but significantly by many arms of the local state, as proven by their appearance in many structure plans and local plans. The policy justification for these plans appears framed to mitigate the constraints placed upon new settlement development by policy guidance. The nature of policy guidance, which allows new settlements only when a range of other options are not possible, forces those framing local policy to address specifically local constraints and pressures, so that a new settlement policy is justified primarily as a local response to these. New settlements are thus forced into being a reaction of last resort,
rather than a pro-active response to a range of both of opportunities and constraints, and as a preferred option, as new towns were. Only where new settlements approach the scale of towns is the state prepared to consider them as a strategic response, with the blessing of regional policy guidance. However, the approach of the state, though probably based upon innate conservatism and caution, is correct in seeing limitations upon the efficacy of new settlements. These three case studies do indicate the tremendous difficulties which do beset attempts to build new places. The difficulty of building a new village of, say, 1000 houses, far exceeds that of building five suburban estates of 200 houses each, partly because the impact of the new village is so concentrated, and because the local infrastructure, both physical and social, requires so much more work to cope with its needs, but also because the burden of establishing a new place identity, and the social structures with which to support it, is considerable. Conventional development economics struggle to cope with the substantial investment required prior to profitable returns, and without the sort of very long term commitment of capital seen at Martlesham Heath (albeit one which saw an eventual return which satisfied the developer), new settlement sites are vulnerable either to the minimalist approach seen at East Goscote, where the communal parts of the village were clearly built down to a price, or the steady erosion of ideals seen at Bar Hill.

When this research was conceived in 1990, the new settlements movement was already beginning to wane, and recession in the housing market, as well as increasing resistance to key schemes by successive secretaries of state, had already marked the end of the speculative boom which drove the rash of proposals. Nevertheless, an underlying momentum has ensured that new settlements entered the planning and development mainstream, and many developments are still planned, crucially with the support of local and structure plans. However, other changes external to the world of planning have arguably conspired to make this thesis more contemporary now than it was at its genesis. The revolution of the eighties, driven by an obsessive belief in free-market economics and the sovereignty of the individual, itself a reaction to the statism and welfarism which preceded it, is now itself the subject of a sustained and cohesive critique¹. This revolution is increasingly seen to have failed, and to a far greater extent than that ushered in with the

¹The most significant of these critiques in the context of the UK is Hutton, Will (1995) - The State We're In (Jonathan Cape, London)
post-war Labour government. Not only is there an increasing desire to find a third way between the unfettered capitalism epitomised by New Right economics and social policy, and the dead hand of statism, but also an increasing concentration on the importance of place and community, and of the importance of the reciprocal relationship between the individual and the wider society in which he or she exists. This espouses precisely the sort of long term investment horizons which made Martlesham Heath such a commercial success, but also the sort of reciprocal social contract between the individual and wider society which is epitomised by the willingness of the residents at Martlesham Heath to continue paying a voluntary levy for the upkeep of the village. In the world of stakeholder economics and resurgent communitarianism, the subject matter of this study is perhaps more relevant now than it ever has been.
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Staff in the Research Section of the Planning Department at Cambridgeshire County Council
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Gregory Zagni of Bradford Property Trust (developers of Martlesham Heath), Thursday 25th June 1992

Lindsey Clubb of Bidwells (site managers of Martlesham Heath), Wednesday 24th June 1992

Chris Parker, former site manager of Martlesham Heath for Bidwells (11.8.92)

Ian Buckingham, Chair of Martlesham Parish Council, Vice-Chair of Martlesham Consultants Ltd. (village management company)
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Annex: Illustrations

This annex provides a number of photographs, maps and drawings from various sources, of all three sites.

The illustrations of East Goscote comprise pictures 1 to 11, those of Bar Hill pictures 12 to 25, and those of Martlesham Heath pictures 26 to 34. The photographs are the authors own unless otherwise stated.
East Goscote

1. The parade of shops at East Goscote

2. Detached garage block
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3. Housing on the edge of the village

4. Remnants of the Radburn layout, near the centre of the village
5. Village green, with Ling Dale Lodge behind

6. Sketch plan of the shopping mall, from the original architects drawings
7. Detached houses towards the centre of the village

8. Sketch of similar detached houses from the original architects' drawings
9. Sketch of housing at the entrance to the village from the original architects' drawings.

10. Aerial photograph of the ordnance depot which existed on the site prior to redevelopment, circa 1961. The picture looks approximately south-west over the site, with the main road into Leicester leaving the left hand side of the photograph. The site used to build East Goscote is shown bounded by the white line.
11. Sketch plan of site from the original planning application, as reproduced in the local press, late in 1962 (not to scale)
Bar Hill

12. Early housing built around a small grassed "courtyard"

13. Streetscape, showing housing built in the early 1980s
14. Some of the last housing to be built, completed in the early 1990s

15. View over the village green to the Bar Hill church centre, and showing some early housing (late 1960s) in the background
16. Early terraced housing, built on a Radburn plan, close to the village centre

17. Architect designed housing, outside the perimeter road, adjacent to the golf course
18. Perimeter road and view looking south over the village

19. Sketch of early three-bedroomed semi-detached 'Fitzwilliam' house (circa 1965)
20. Sketch of early five-bedroomed detached 'Selwyn' house (circa 1965)

21. Sketch of early four-bedroomed town 'Trinity' house (circa 1965)
22. Sketch of early three-bedroomed split-level terraced 'Selwyn' house (circa 1965)

23. Early sketch plan of the village layout by Brian Falk (circa 1963) orientation shown by north arrow on the original, not to scale
24. Sketch plan of the village layout from Lakin (1973), indicating the first four housing areas completed (1 and 2 by Holland, Hannen & Cubitt, 3 and 6 by Nunns) and the proposed golf course and fairway housing orientation shown by north arrow on the original, not to scale.
25. Aerial photograph of the village circa 1971, showing the village centre, housing area 1, the motel (under construction), some industrial units, and the road junction prior to the construction of the flyover (scale not known)
Martlesham Heath

26. Aerial photo of site (scale unknown)
27. The western edge of the village, showing the heathland which forms the 'western corridor'

28. Typical housing at Martlesham Heath
29. View across the village green, showing some of the first housing to be built

30. Early houses, built in 1976, on the edge of the village green and adjacent to the village centre
31. Later housing, built in the mid-1980s, in the southern part of the village

32. Typical streetscape in Martlesham Heath
33. An aerial view of the central shopping area, reproduced from a Bradford Property Trust brochure
34. Village layout plan from a Bradford Property Trust brochure - completed housing areas are shown in red, the industrial estate in orange, future housing developments in yellow (as at 1982 - these are now built), and open space in green. Orientation as shown on the original, scale unknown.